HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL
TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
May 10, 2023
1:30PM
Minutes

Member Attendance:

Primary-Name	Present	Alternate-Name	Present
Joe Cutrufo	NO	Nikki Knight	NO
Bill Zrioka	YES	Marcel Allen	NO
Elijah Williams	NO	Elizabeth Whitton	NO
Peter Eccles	YES	Dexter Handy	YES
Harrison Humphreys	YES	Amy Skicki	YES
Monique Johnson	YES	Marcus Snell	NO
David Fields	YES	Ian Hlavacek	NO
Kimberly Judge	NO	Shashi Kumar	NO
Timothy Smith	NO	Jay Knight	NO
Todd Stephens	YES	Ruthann Haut	YES
Morad Kabiri	YES	Jildardo Arias	NO
Cara Davis	YES	Christopher Sims	NO
Jameson Appel	YES	Yolci Ramirez	YES
Perri D'Armond	YES	Stacy Slawinski	NO
Katherine Parker	NO	Katherine Summerlin	YES
Bruce Mann	YES	Rohit Saxena	NO
Mike Wilson	YES	Jason Miura	NO
Charles Airiohuodion	YES	Jeffrey English	YES
Lisa Collins	NO	Arnold Vowles	YES
Ken Fickes	YES	Vernon Chambers	YES
Sean Middleton	NO	Vacant	
Albert Lyne	NO	Rachel Die	NO
Brian Alcott	YES	Vacant	

Others Present:
Staff Participating:
Anita Hollmann Matijcio, Stephen Keen, Craig Raborn, Karen Owen, Veronica Waller, Vishu Lingala, Lucinda Martinez, Sanford Klanfer, Eliza Paul, Caroline Bailey, Allie Isbell, James Koch, Gloria Brown, Adam Beckom, Jim Dickinson, Patrick Mandapaka, Carlene Mullins, Daniel Brassil, Diane Domagas, Megan Kennison, Catherine McCreight

1. Call to Order
    a. Chair Morad Kabiri calls the meeting to order at 1:30 PM
    b. Chair confirms quorum
2. Election of Officers
    a. Chair Morad Kabiri nominates Perri D'Armond as Chair and David Fields as Vice-Chair
        a) No other nominations
        b) Motion to Approve, seconded by Ken Fickes, and passed unanimously
3. Acceptance of Minutes from March 8, 2023 and April 12, 2023 Meetings

      a. Chair Perri D'Armond calls for motion to approve
          a) Ken Fickes moves, Charles Airiohuodion seconds
4. Regional Transportation Plan Subcommittee Orientation (Hollmann Matijcio and Keen)
    a. Anita Hollmann Matijcio gives introductory statement
    b. Stephen Keen gives orientation presentation.
          a) The RTP Subcommittee is one of six Subcommittees that inform the Transportation Advisory Committee and, in turn, the transportation Policy Council (TPC).
          b) RTP Subcommittee bylaws include members serving one-year terms, 23 voting members with 50% quorum, the meeting being governed by Robert's Rule of Order, and minutes are recorded by staff. Primary members vote when present, while alternate members only vote when the primary is not present.
          c) The RTP Subcommittee's Purpose is to:
- Direct H-GAC staff in development of planning to be used in future updates to the RTP;
- Direct staff in strengthening the link between the RTP and TIP;
- Ensure that the RTP supports TPC regional vision and goals; and
- Endorse performance measures and targets from the MPO's TIP and TDM teams.
          d) The Regional Transportation Plan is updated every four years with a 20+ year outlook. The Plan is the transportation future for our region that acts as an assessment of needs and priorities and a financially constrained Action Plan. An updated RTP is required to receive funding. The RTP is the comprehensive Plan in the MPO.
          e) The 2045 RTP Update was adopted in April 2023 by TPC. The plan and its associated 33 appendices are available at engage.h-gac.com/2045rtpupdate. These appendices include Appendix A – Project List, which contains all RTP projects.
          f) The RTP Project Selection Process was initiated in April 2023 to the RTP Subcommittee. There is no formalized selection or amendment process. The goal is to encourage discussion for development of a formalized process, led by the RTP Subcommittee.
    c. Questions or comments.
          a) Chair Perri D'Armond mentions that primaries and alternates should be in constant communication to ensure one attends each meeting. She also mentions alternates should be encouraged to participate, even when primary voting member is present.
          b) No further questions or comments
5. Bridge and Pavement Performance Measures and Targets
    a. Karen Owen presents on Bridge and Pavement Performance Measures and Targets
          a) H-GAC sets regional targets for the eight county area. Every two years, staff reports on if targets were met and set future targets. The overall goal is to ensure our infrastructure is in a state of good repair.
          b) TPC has set aspirational targets for the region.
    b. Questions
          a) Catherine McCreight asks if H-GAC will look at facilities other than Interstate and National highways
          b) Dexter Handy asks if conditions correlate with crashes
- Karen says that it's difficult to tie crashes to these conditions.
          c) Amy Skicki if environmental aspects are issues with conditions.

- Karen says weather events and industry can be reasons why pavement has issues. Houston, however, has some of the best pavement conditions in Texas.
  - d) Katherine Summerlin asks what is the percentage of declining targets that TxDOT has sent to MPOs?
    - Karen says the decline is less than one percentage point. H-GAC has not set targets that decline in the past four years.
  - e) Charles Airiohuodion asks if NHS connectors are included in these conditions.
    - Karen says no, it only includes roadway segments.
  - f) No further questions or comments
6. RTP Project Selection Process
   a. Stephen Keen presents on the RTP Project Selection Process
      - a) The RTP Subcommittee will guide the development of a formalized project selection process.
      - b) An RTP Amendment Framework has been adopted by TPC.
        - The charge is to develop the project evaluation portion of the framework.
      - c) There are three amendment types: Administrative, Level 1, and Level 2.
        - Level 2 amendments require conformity determination before addition to project list.
      - d) The RTP Subcommittee will determine the process for adding or revising projects, identify optimal timing for call for projects, and consider evaluation criteria to determine a project's inclusion.
      - e) Timeline Targets: Develop process > Launch call > Conformity determination
   b. Questions or comments
      - a) Monique Johnson asks how this aligns with the current project selection process?
        - Craig Raborn says that there are two ways a project can enter the RTP: projects that meet criteria but are not ready to advance to implementation in a timely manner or projects that do not score as high and therefore do not receive funding at that time. However, we want input on another process to add projects to the RTP project list. Staff wants to evaluate every option in ways to consider projects for the RTP.
        - Monique suggests one rolling project selection process, rather than multiple.
      - b) Chair Perri D'Armond says that she has thought of the RTP as the pipeline, to be prepared for inclusion to the TIP once the project is ready.
        - Craig says that vision is what makes sense. Some project needs are identified that need to be addressed sooner than 10 years out. This process should be ways to evaluate the bigger projects, which should start in the RTP first. How do we identify them, whether they should go into the RTP, should they be considered funded/unfunded, when should we add them to the list, etc. These are the questions that we want to ask the RTP Subcommittee.
      - c) Catherine McCreight says it seems like this is backwards. We are talking about programming projects that have yet to be planned. This is an opportunity in planning for projects in the long range plan by evaluating the projects at the conception level. We should have criteria to look at to determine how projects address the goals of the RTP and if it is determined to, it should be planned for with the understanding that the project will move through a project funnel at a granular level. We need to plan, not program.

d) David Fields asks should we take our guidance from the 2045 RTP Update.
- Stephen Keen responds that the project listing and the RTP update should be linked, and this is a way to do it.
- Craig Raborn says that staff is not asking for what the evaluation criteria should be. The criteria adopted in the Update should be translated into implementation. What should the evaluation process look like for the RTP? What does the timeline look like? What are the steps? A formalized process hasn't existed in the past.

e) Dexter Handy asks if a past project could be presented to the Subcommittee as an example.
- Craig Raborn says that is a good idea. We need a process formulated before an example can be presented. Staff could present several alternative processes before the Subcommittee.

f) Mike Wilson says that the evaluation criteria at TAC was some of the best work he has seen at H-GAC. He agrees that the criteria and scoring should be uniform through the 10-year cycle. Pre-grooming projects in the RTP at the 6- and 4-year window and programming them as efficiently as possible could help bring reality to the programming process.

g) Bruce Mann says we need to have a process that allows more frequent updating to the RTP and allows for corridor projects to be put into the RTP. Today, the RTP does not reflect projects that we know will be implemented (ex: PEL).

h) Chair Perri D'Armond says she agrees with Catherine McCreight by planning, then programming. We have to build in flexibility and have the RTP be a living document.
- Craig says that the Subcommittee could conclude that a conformity project added to the RTP is required to go through a planning process. It is up to this Subcommittee and TPC and could satisfy the need of when to add projects to the RTP.

i) Charles Airiohuodion says that TxDOT needs projects to be in the RTP to do environmental and preliminary work required. It would be better to identify the gap that needs to be addressed. Projects need to be in the RTP and TIP to be worked on by TxDOT.
- Craig says that TxDOT, the sponsor of these plans, have internal rules for when projects can or cannot go into project development.

j) Monique Johnson references a slide from Vishu that could help align the two project selection processes.
- Craig says the concept in this slide is why we want an RTP process as well.

c. Stephen Keen continues the RTP Project Selection Process presentation
a) Reiteration of the RTP Vision Statement, "A Safe, Resilient, Equitable, and Reliable Multimodal Transportation System that Contributes to a Livable Region."
b) How can we distinguish between the RTP project Selection Process and the other project selection Processes?
c) Should a peer review be conducted? (NCTCOG, ATC, and Nantucket).
d) Should the project selection process require projects go through a local public involvement process before RTP submission?

d. Questions or comments
a) Harrison Humphreys says that the vision statement conveys addressing climate mitigation and this process is an opportunity to address it going forward.

    b) Dexter Handy asks how we would grade the results in the public engagement process to inform which way we want to go in the future.

- Stephen Keen mentions that there were three public engagement phases. We had a survey with over 2000 responses and had in-person and virtual public meetings and attended events of regional importance at all eight counties within the MPO region.
- Anita Hollmann Matijcio says that the 2045 RTP Update addresses many of the comments by the Subcommittee. Most of the guiding questions were answered throughout the meeting. Subcommittee wants to tie the project selection process with the Update.

    c) Bruce Mann says that reliable and efficient are two different things; we need our transportation system to be efficient. The vision statement should mention efficiency.

    d) Chair Perri D'Armond says peer reviews could be informational.

- Peter Eccles wants to confirm what it means by peer review and suggests Seattle and Denver.
  a. Anita Hollmann Matijcio says staff would want to understand their process.
  b. Ken Fickes disagrees on those MPOs.
  c. Bruce Mann asks to look at LA, especially for freight.
- Amy Skicki asks about the freight and technology peer review
  a. The Atlanta Regional Commission was part of this review.

7. Announcements
    a. Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
        a) Next meeting: June 14, 2023, at 9:30 AM (Hybrid)
    b. Transportation Policy Council (TPC)
        a) Next meeting: May 19, 2023, at 9:30 AM (Hybrid)
    c. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Subcommittee
        a) Next meeting: June 14, 2023, at 1:30 PM
8. Adjourn
    a. Chair Perri D'Armond calls for adjournment at 3:00 PM