

## Project Selection Process

July 12,2023


## Funding Instruction - Approved




## Readiness Questionnaire - "0-3 Year Projects"

- Approximately 200 Projects- Mid July 2023
- 3 Week Completion Time
- Completed Only Once for Each Project
- Same Questionnaire for Readiness Assessment Efforts After Results of Criterion Assessment
- 12 Questions with Sub-Questions
- Smart Form so the More Complex, the More Sub-Questions


## Realistic Considerations for "0-3 Year Projects"

## TIP

- Inclusion in Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) 8 Months


## Red Flags

- ROW - 18-24 months
- Utilities Relocations-8-12 months
- Railroad Agreements-8-12 months
- Public Hearing - 8-12 months
- USACE IP and/or USCG Permits 12-24 months


## Regional Goods Movement

- Projects Scoring


## Investment Categories: Purpose

## Investment Category

Description and Purpose ("Identify, develop, and fund...")

## Regional Goods Movement

Projects that most effectively enhance or improve safe and reliable freight mobility throughout the region.


Major Projects

High-Growth Area Needs

Resiliency \& State of Good Repair Transportation Policy Council or identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and exceed $\$ 100$ million in total estimated costs.
Projects that most effectively address mobility, accessibility, and congestion mitigation needs in areas experiencing rapid or significant growth in population or other demographic measures, economic development, travel demand, or other indicators identified by local agencies.
Projects that most effectively help the transportation system avoid or recover quickly from events that create delays, closures, or other impacts, and projects that provide maintenance of current transportation facilities and services.
Operational Improvements \& Projects that most effectively deliver traffic management and other operational Congestion Management

Transit
Active Transportation
improvements, as well as mitigate current congestion. Projects that most effectively provide, expand, or enhance transit infrastructure throughout the region.
Projects that most effectively enhance or improve walking and bicycling for essential trip-making in the region.
Projects that most effectively will reduce or eliminate crashes that result in fatalities and serious injuries.

## Eligible Activities Potential Spending

| Investment Category | Rehab/ Restoration | Added Capacity | New Road | Access Management | Intersection Improv. | ITS | Sidewalks/ Bike Lanes | Transit Facilities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regional Goods Movement | 12\%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operational Improvements | 13\%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High-Growth Area Needs | 25\%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active Transportation | 7.5\%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit | 7.5\%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Projects ( $\sim 25 \% *$ ) | 30\%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resiliency ** | 5\%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safety ** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential availability | 24.5\% | 80\% | 67\% | 80\% | 92.5\% | 92.5\% | 70\% | 75.5\% |

## Submitted RGM Projects

| Submitted | Sponsors | Projects |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 15 | 88 |
| > than $\$ 100 \mathrm{M}$ | 2 | 24 |
| $->$ <than $\$ 100 \mathrm{M}$ | 15 | 64 |
|  |  |  |

## Segmented Projects

| Projects not Scored | Segments/Projects | Scored | Cost (\$M) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM 529 | 3 | No | $\$ 181$ |
| US 90 | 3 | No | $\$ 141$ |
| SL 8 (already 10YP) | 1 | No | $\$ 60$ |


| Segments combined <br> for scoring | Segments/Projects | Scored | Cost (\$M) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 90 A | 2 | Yes | $\$ 77$ |
| IH 10 W FR | 2 | Yes | $\$ 54$ |
| FM 1405 | 2 | Yes | $\$ 32$ |

## Scored Projects

|  | \# of Projects | Cost (\$M) |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Projects Scored | $55^{*}$ | $\$ 1,968$ |
| $\geq 50$ Points (Moving to BCA) | 40 | $\$ 1,383$ |
| $<50$ Points | 11 | $\$ 326$ |
| Verifying Eligibility | 4 | $\$ 260$ |

[^0]
## IC Focused Criteria - Scoring

| Criteria | Scoring Methodology |
| :--- | :--- |
| Recommended in a freight plan <br> and priority (10 Pts) | 2-part question. Projects that referred to recommendations included in the draft H- <br> GAC RGMP were all considered as medium priority and scored 5 points. |
| Located on a freight Corridor and <br> percent daily truck volumes (10 <br> Pts) | Existing truck percentages were verified based on existing traffic counts data. |
| Connectivity to freight generators <br> (10 Pts) | H-GAC resiliency tool was reviewed for projects linkage to port or airport score. <br> Connectivity to scores for other freight generators are based on sponsor responses. |

Narrative explaining how project improves freight movement (5 Pts)

Based on narrative. All projects that included grade separations scored 5, all projects included ITS scored 4, rest of the project scored between 1-3. If projects connected to freight generators scored 2, projects that primarily serve daily commuters and projects that were just added capacity scored 1 point.
Promote off-peak/overnight
delivery (5 Pts)

Hurricane evacuation route (10 Pts)

Based on narrative.

Based on project location.

## 

$\left.$| Recommended in a Freight Plan and Priority/Ranking (10 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max Points |  |  |  | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | | \# of Proj |
| :---: |
| Scored | \right\rvert\,-| Scor |
| :--- |
| Recommended in a <br> Freight Plan and <br> Priority/Ranking (10 <br> Pts) |


| Freight Corridor \& Percent Daily Truck Volumes (10 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> Percent Daily Truck <br> Volumes (10 Pts) | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Averag <br> e | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Freight Corridor | 2 | 26 |  | - | - | - |
| Daily Truck Traffic | 8 | 17 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 11 |
| Total | 10 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 |


| First-Mile, Last-Mile Connectivity to Freight Generators (10 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First-Mile, Last-Mile <br> Connectivity to Freight <br> Generators (10 Pts) | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Averag <br> e | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Connectivity to <br> Port/Airport | 10 | 11 | 2 | 10 | 6 | - |
| Connectivity to Other <br> Freight Generators (10 <br> Pts) | 10 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | - |
| Total | 10 | 21 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 6 |


| Narrative - Improve Regional Goods Movement (5 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Averag <br> e | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Narrative - Improve <br> Regional Goods <br> Movement (5 Pts) | 5 | 12 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 20 |


| Promote Off-Peak/Overnight Delivery (5 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Averag <br> e | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Promote Off- <br> Peak/Overnight Delivery <br> (5 Pts) | 5 | 12 | - | - | - | - |


| Hurricane Evacuation Route (10 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hurricane Evacuation <br> Route (10 Pts) | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Averag <br> e | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Project Located on an <br> State Designated <br> Evacuation Route | 10 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 9 | - |
| Project Located on an <br> Facility Connected to <br> Hurricane Evacuation <br> Route | 5 | 20 | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 10 | 6 | 5 | 22 | 6 | - |



## Benefits to OIC Criteria - Scoring

| Criteria | Scoring Methodology |
| :--- | :--- |
| Improves daily traffic operations ( 6 <br> Pts) | Scored based on narrative and project scope. <br> Intersection improvement, Access management, turn lanes, median turn <br> lanes, ITS all received -3 points <br> Grade separations -6 points <br> New roads parallel to existing facilities - 2 points <br> Only added capacity - 1 point |
| Benefits high growth area (5 Pts) | Based on narrative. |
| Improves conditions for walking <br> and bicycling (2 Pts) | Based on narratives and project scope |
| Improves conditions for transit <br> users (3 Pts) | Based on narrative. |
| Reduces inoperability and improves <br> sate of good repair (4 Pts) | Based on narrative. |

## Summary of OlC Criteria Scores

| Improves Daily Traffic Operations (6 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |  |
| Improves Daily Traffic <br> Operations (6 Pts) | 6 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 31 |  |


| Improves Traffic Conditions for Transit (3 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Improves Traffic <br> Conditions for Transit <br> $(3$ Pts) | 3 | 15 | - | - | - | - |


| Benefits High Growth Areas (5 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |  |
| Benefits High Growth <br> Areas (5 Pts) | 5 | 49 | - | - | - | - |  |


| Improves Traffic Conditions for Walking and Bicycling (2 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min <br> Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Improves Traffic <br> Conditions for Walking <br> and Bicycling (2 Pts) | 2 | 38 | - | - | - | - |

## 

| Criteria | Scoring Methodology |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Scored based on existing conditions and improvement narratives. <br> Quantified the safety improvement types to calculate CRF of all <br> improvements |
| Resiliency | Existing conditions verified on regional resiliency tool. <br> Improvements scored based on narrative. |
| Access/Connectivity | Based on \# of low-income \& minority populations within $1 / 4 \mathrm{mile}$. <br> And connectivity based on project location. |
| EJ/Impacts on vulnerable <br> populations <br> Impacts on natural and cultural <br> resources | Based on narratives describing benefits to vulnerable populations. |

## Summary of PF Criteria Scores

| Safety (7 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety (7 Pts) | Max Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |  |
| Existing Conditions | 3 | 16 | 2 | 14 | 3 | 16 |  |
| Improvement Narrative | 4 | 26 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 13 |  |
| Total | 7 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 |  |


| Resiliency (5 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resiliency (5 Pts) | Max Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |  |
| Vulnerability Score | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Criticality Score | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Improvement Narrative | 3 | 1 | 2 | 51 | 2 | 51 |  |
| Total | 4 | 32 | 2 | 51 | 3 | 15 |  |


| EJ/Impacts on Vulnerable Populations (5 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EJ Impacts on Vulnerable <br> Populations (5 Pts) | Max Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Benefits Vulnerable <br> Populations | 3 | 51 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 51 |
| Mitigation of Hazardus <br> Impacts | 2 | 48 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 48 |
| Total | 5 | 45 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 45 |


| Impacts on Natural and Cultural Resources (5 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Impacts on Natural and <br> Cultural Resources (5 Pts) | Max Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |
| Avoids/Mitigates Impacts <br> on Natural and Cultural <br> Resources | 3 | 53 | - | - | - | - |
| Emissions Reduction | 2 | 34 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 34 |
| Total | 5 | 33 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 |


| Innovation (3 Pts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Innovation (3 Pts) | Max Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Min Points | \# of Proj <br> Scored | Average | \# of Proj <br> Scored |  |
| Innovation (3 Pts) | 3 | 24 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 24 |  |

## Draft RGM Projects Ranking \& Next Steps

- Initial draft scores and ranking
- Sponsors will get an opportunity to challenge staff scores
- Final criteria scores and ranking will be determined after sponsors validate scoring
- Projects scoring 50 points or higher will move to BCA \& project readiness evaluation phase
- Final scores and ranking will be determined a fter BCA scores
- Sponsors will get an opportunity to cha llenge BCA scores
- Final final scores and ranking will be determined after sponsors valida te BCA scoring
- Final recommendation of project ranking will be presented to TAC and TPC

| Project ID | Agency Name | Project Title | Facility/Street/ Highway | Limits | Description | Estimated Total <br> Cost | Total IC <br> Focused Score | Total OIC Score | Total PF Score | Total Scores | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1101 | TxDOT Houston District | SH 146 DC Ramps to Barbours Cut Port Terminal | SH 146 | AT BARBOURS CUT BLVD | CONSTRUCT 3 DCs (SB-EB, WB-NB [SH 146], WB-NB [SH 225]) | \$50,000,000 | 40 | 18 | 24 | 82 | 1 |
| 1103 | TxDOT Houston District | SH 225 at SL 8 <br> Three Remaining DC ramps | SH 225 | AT SL 8 | CONSTRUCT 3 DIRECT CONNECTOR RAMPS (EB-NB, EB-SB, WB-SB) | \$95,000,000 | 40 | 18 | 23 | 81 | 2 |
| 1252 | Harris County Engineering | East Richey Rd Improvement Project | E Richey Road | 145 NBFR to Grovedale Rdd | Safety improvements, access management, ddriveways, sidewalks and improved street geometry. | \$6,100,000 | 34 | 20 | 24 | 78 | 3 |
| 1117 | TxDOT Houston District | SH 332 Grade <br> Separation at FM 523 | SH 332 | From N of FM 523 to S of FM 523 | Construct grade separation at FM 523. | \$24,710,000 | 36 | 16 | 22 | 74 | 4 |
| 1087 | TxDOT Houston District | IH 610 E <br> Reconstruction and Widening to add Managed lanes | ${ }^{\text {IH }} 610 \mathrm{E}$ | From SH 225 to IH 45 S | RECONSTRUCT AND WIDEN FROM 8 TO 12 LANE (ADD 4 MANAGED LANES) - Safety, operational and mobility improvements to the IH 610 E mainlanes and frontage roads, based on results of the SH 225 PEL/IH 610 East PEL study | \$50,000,000 | 29 | 21 | 23 | 73 | 5 |
| 1102 | TxDOT Houston District | SH 146 Widening and other improvements | SH 146 | From Ferry Road to Chambers C/L (Cedar Bayou) | Reconstruct and widen from 4 to 6 lanes, median, bicycle/pedestrian facilities and intersection improvements. | \$90,000,000 | 33 | 15 | 25 | 73 | 6 |
|  | Harris County Engineering | Rankin Road <br> Access <br> Management <br> Project | Rankin Road | IH 45 NBFR to Ranch View Trail | Add center two-way left turn lane, signal modifications (leading pedestrian intervals, crosswalks, ADA ramps), and sidewalk improvements to mitigate serious injuries and fatalities on 1.5 mile Vision Zero High Injury Network corridor. | \$12,200,000 | 33 | 16 | 23 | 72 | 7 |
| 1058 | TxDOT Houston District | IH 10 W Frontage Roads | IH 10 W | From FM 359 to Fort Bend County Line | CONSTRUCT 2 TWO LANE FRONTAGE ROADS ON NEW LOCATION (EASTBOUND AND WESTBOUND). This project fills in the gap of the frontage road system in Fort Bend County on IH 10. | \$50,750,000 | 33 | 16 | 22 | 71 | 8 |
| 1059 | TxDOT Houston District | IH 10 W Frontage Roads | IH 10 W | From Waller County Line to Cane Island Parkway | CONSTRUCT 2 TWO LANE FRONTAGE ROADS ON NEW LOCATION (EASTBOUND AND WESTBOUND). This project fills in the gap of the frontage road system in Fort Rend Country on IH 10 | \$3,700,000 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project ID | Agency Name | Project Title | Facility/Stre et/Highway | Limits | Description | Estimated Total Cost | Total IC Focused Score | Total OIC Score | Total PF Score | Total Scores | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1180 | TxDOT Houston District | US 90 Grade Separation at Purple Sage | US 90 | From West of Purple Sage to East of Purple Sage | Construct grade separation (6 Main Lanes) in gap of US 90 mainlanes at Purple Sage intersection. | \$34,300,000 | 31 | 20 | 20 | 71 | 9 |
| $1211 \mathrm{~B}$ | East End District in Coordination with Buffalo Bayou Partnership and Harris County Precinct 2 | Navigation Boulevard Reconfiguration | Navigation Boulevard | Lockwood Drive to Mack Street | Reconfigure multimodal mobility corridor by converting unused lane capacity into a new dedicated commuter bike route, pedestrian amenities and additional greenspace. Project scope includes necessary work on public utilities. Project is a major component of the Buffalo Bayou East Master Plan. | \$17,250,000 | 31 | 15 | 25 | 71 | 10 |
|  | Harris County Engineering | Sheldon Road (North) Improvement Project | Sheldon Road | US90 to Sheldon Ridge | Reconstruct and widen, existing 2 lane concrete overlaid with asphalt to 4 lanes of reinforced 12" concrete roadway. Includes bridge section, 2 major throughfare intersections and multiple industrial/ commercial business entrances. drainage, sidewalks and landscaping and safety. Considering existing railroad at-grade crossing to be a separate line item. | \$22,800,000 | 31 | 13 | 22 | 66 | 12 |
| 1204C | City of Houston | Gellhorn Dr. | Gellhorn Dr. | Between I-10 on the south and $\mathrm{I}-610$ on the north | Project includes improvement of freight connectivity between $\mathrm{IH}-610$ \& $\mathrm{IH}-10$ as well as intersection operations. Improvements will also create safer pedestrian \& bicycle facilities and mitigate storm sewer deficiencies. | \$17,786,415 | 29 | 18 | 17 | 64 | 13 |
| 662 C | City of Dickinson | Dickinson Ave./FM 1266 <br> Safety Improvements | Dickinson <br> Avenue / FM <br> 1266 | FM 646 to FM 517 | The improvement will be a full reconstruction of the roadway including the addition of street lighting, sidewalk facilities, and upgrades to signalized intersection at Deats Road. To accommodate the addition of sidewalks, the existing open ditches will be replaced with culverts. | \$15,000,000 | 22 | 20 | $22$ | 64 | 14 |
| $\begin{array}{r} P \\ 941- \end{array}$ | PORT OF IHOUSTON AUTHORITY | Bayport Container Terminal Overpass. | PORT RD | FM 146 TO CRUISE ST | CONSTRUCTION OF RAILROAD OVERPASS ON PORT ROAD LEADING TO THE BAYPORT CONTAINER TERMINAL. | \$18,996,668 | 33 | 14 | 17 | 64 | 15 |
|  | City of Sugar Land | ITS Railroad Monitoring, Notification, \& Communication (CTR2203) | Cravens Road | Pitts Road | Install railroad notification DMS prior to RR crossings to reroute traffic; Add Lidar or other technology to the Rail Monitor System to detect trains on dual tracks. | \$2,100,000 | 27 | 14 | 22 | 63 | 16 |


| Project ID | Agency Name | Project Title | Facility/Street /Highway | Limits | Description | Estimated <br> Total Cost | Total IC Focused Score | Total OIC Score | Total PF Score | Total <br> Scores | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1222$ | Gulfgate <br> Redevelopment <br> Authority | Telephone Rd Reconstruction | Telephone Rd | IH 610 Frontage Reveille St | Replace all public infrastructure and reconfigure roadway to enhance multimodal access and safety (roadway, utilities, access management, pedestrian realm, bike lane) | \$45,000,000 | 20 | 18 | 25 | 63 | 17 |
| 1012 | TxDOT Houston District | FM 359 Widening | FM 359 | From South IH 10 W to US 90 | Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lane urban divided roadway | \$7,750,000 | 24 | 15 | 23 | 62 | 18 |
| 1065 | TxDOT Houston District | IH 10 W (Inner Katy) Reconstruction and Managed Lanes | IH 10 W | From Voss Rd to IH 610 W | INNER KATY SEG 4: Reconstruct 10 mainlanes and two 3-lane frontage roads. Construct 4 new non-tolled managed lanes and drainage improvements | \$25,000,000 | 19 | 23 | 20 | 62 | 19 |
| $1115$ | TxDOT Houston District | SH 3 Intersection Improvements - SH 3 at S Richey St, Edgebrook Dr, El Dorado Blvd, and Bay Area Blvd | SH 3 | At South Richey, Edgebrook Dr, El Dorado Blvd, and Bay Area Blvd | Change signals to mast arms, replace RR arms, and gates, and lengthen railroad planking. The purpose of the project is to extend sidewalks across the RR tracks parallel to SH 3. | \$4,840,000 | 22 | 18 | 22 | 62 | 20 |
| 1168 | TxDOT Houston District | SS 10 Widening | SS 10 | From SH 36 West of Rosenberg to IH 69 S | WIDEN TO 4-LANE DIVIDED ROADWAY | \$53,870,000 | 24 | 17 | 21 | 62 | 21 |
| $1108$ | TxDOT Houston District | SH 288 Widening | SH 288 | From SH 99 (CR 60) to FM 1462 | Reconstruct and widen from 4-lanes to 6-lanes. The proposed project will widen to the inside, adding two additional lanes (one in each direction), along with turn lanes at select locations. It will provide drainage for stormwater to accommodate the additional pavement. Frontage roads are not included in this project. | \$56,300,000 | 26 | 15 | $20$ | $61$ | 22 |
| 1201 | City of Houston | Oates Rd | Oates Rd. | From Wallisville to Beaumont Highway | Improvements include full concrete reconstruction of the corridor to include two 11-ft lanes (with 1-ft offsets) with a 12ft center turn lane in the middle, as well as pedestrian improvements which include two 10-ft shared use paths on both sides of the road. | \$29,500,000 | 22 | 18 | $20$ | 60 | $23$ |
| $124$ | SW HOU Redev Auth (TIRZ 20) | Harwin Dr Reconstruction | Harwin Dr | S Gessner Rd - Fondren Rd | Replace all public infrastructure (road diet, utilities, traffic controls, pedestrian realm) | \$18,200,000 | 17 | 20 | 24 | 61 | 24 |
| 1010 | TxDOT Houston District | FM 3083 Widening | FM 3083 | From SH 105 W to IH 45 | Widen from 2-lane to a 4-lane divided roadway. | \$33,750,000 | 22 | 14 | 23 | 59 | 26 |
| $117$ | TxDOT Houston District | US 90 Greens Bayou Bridge | US 90 | From W of Greens Bayou to E of Greens Bayou | Construct bridge (6 Main Lanes) over Greens Bayou in gap of US 90 mainlanes. | \$29,100,000 | 28 | 11 | 20 | 59 | 27 |


| Project ID | Agency Name | Project Title | Facility/Street /Highway | Limits | Description | Estimated <br> Total Cost | Total IC Focused Score | Total OIC Score | Total PF Score | Total <br> Scores | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 969 | TxDOT Beaumont District | SH 146 TURN LANES | SH 146 | AT IH10 | DUAL TURN LANES FOR NB | \$1,000,000 | 25 | 17 | 16 | 58 | 28 |
| 973 | TxDOT Beaumont District | Dayton Relief Route | US 90 | TBD | Construct relief route around Dayton | \$75,000,000 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 58 | 29 |
| 1020 | TxDOT Houston District | FM 518 Widening | FM 518 | From FM 865 to SH 35 | Widen from 4-lanes to 6-lanes. A raised median will be included and may vary between 14 and 18 feet. Convert the existing open ditch drainage system to a curb and gutter drainage system. In addition, outside pedestrian sidewalks and bikeways are proposed. | \$76,380,000 | 21 | 12 | 24 | 57 | 31 |
| 1181 | TxDOT Houston District | US 90 A Widening | US 90 A | From FM 359 to SH 99 | RECONSTRUCT AND WIDEN FROM 4 TO 6 LANES DIVIDED | \$48,200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1184 | TxDOT Houston District | US 90A Widening | US 90A | From FM 762 to FM 359 | Widen from 4-lanes to 6-lanes divided (phase 3 of 3) | \$28,570,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 968 | TxDOT Beaumont District | FM 1960 Widening | FM 1960 | From SH 321 to SH 99 | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes | \$27,500,000 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 55 | 33 |
| $1026$ | TxDOT Houston District | FM 521 Widening and Railroad grade separation | FM 521 | From CR 56 to SH 6 | Widen from 4-lanes to 6-lanes divided. The FM 521 project extends from State Highway 6 to County Road 56 in Fort Bend County. The project includes a railroad grade separation. The area is rapidly developing with new subdivisions and a new high school adjacent to the road. | \$53,600,000 | 17 | 14 | $24$ |  | 34 |
| $1235$ | Montrose TIRZ 27 <br> Redevelopment <br> Authority | Montrose <br> Boulevard <br> Reconstruction | Montrose <br> Boulevard | West Clay to US-59/IH-69 | Replace all public infrastructure (roadway, utilities, access management, pedestrian realm, transit, bike lane) | \$47,000,000 | 12 | 20 | 25 | 57 | 35 |
| 996 | TxDOT Houston District | FM 1495 Widening | FM 1495 | From FM 523 to North of Brazos River Bridge | Widen from 2-lane to 4 -lane roadway | \$17,000,000 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 54 | 36 |
|  | TxDOT Beaumont District | IH-10 Ramp Relocations | IH-10 | From SH 146 to FM 565 | Relocate entrance / exit ramps | \$35,000,000 | 25 | 15 | 15 | 55 | 37 |
| 1005 | TxDOT Houston District | FM 2855 Extension to IH 10 W | FM 2855 | From US 90 to IH 10 W | Reconstruct and Widen from 2 to 4 lanes and extend FM 2855 (currently known as Brookline Rd) to IH 10 W | \$35,000,000 | 20 | 13 | 20 | 53 | 38 |

$\operatorname{Pro}$ FM 1495 Widening FM 1495

Widen from 4-lanes to 6-lanes divided. The FM 521 project extends from State Highway 6 to County Road 56 in Fort Bend area is rapidly developing with new subdivisions and a new high school adjacent to the road.

Replace all public infrastructure (roadway, utilities, access management, pedestrian realm, transit, bike lane)

Widen from 2-lane to 4 -lane roadway

Relocate entrance / exit ramps
Reconstruct and Widen from 2 to 4 lanes and extend FM 2855

| Project <br> ID | Agency Name | Project Title | Facility/Street /Highway | Limits | Description | Estimated <br> Total Cost | Total IC <br> Focused <br> Score | Total OIC Score | Total PF Score | Total Scores | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TxDOT <br> Beaumont <br> District | FM 1405 Widening | FM 1405 | From SH 99 south to FM 2354 | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with center turn lane | \$16,000,000 | 21 | 12 | 19 | 52 | 39 |
|  | TxDOT <br> Beaumont <br> District | FM 1405 Widening | FM 1405 | From FM 565 south to SH 99 | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with center turn lane | \$16,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1128$ | TxDOT Houston District | SH 6 Intersection Improvements at FM 529 | SH 6 | At FM 529 | INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS | \$15,500,000 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 52 | 40 |
| 640 | Chambers County | Jonnie G Jennings Dr | Jonnie G <br> Jennings Dr | From FM 1405 East to FM 2354 | Construct 2 lane concrete freight roadway | \$10,000,000 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 51 | 41 |
| 733 | City of Mont Belvieu | Public Works \& Engineering Director | Eagle Dr. | From Fm 565 to SH 146 | Reconstruction of 2-lane open ditch to 4-lane Blvd with curb and gutter with sidewalks and bikeway. | \$36,000,000 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 50 | 42 |
| $1002$ | TxDOT Houston District | FM 2234 Intersection Improvements | FM 2234 | From North of US 90A to South of US 90A | Construct intersection improvements. | \$30,900,000 | 12 | 16 | 22 | 50 | 44 |
| $10031$ | TxDOT <br> Houston <br> District | FM 270 Widening | FM 270 | From FM 518 to FM 646 | Reconstruct and widen from 2-lane to 4-lane roadway and implement access management treatments including raised median and bike/ped facilities. | \$40,800,000 | 11 | 15 | 23 | 49 | 45 |
| 1256 | Montgomery County Precinct 4 | Gene Campbell Boulevard | Gene Campbell Boulevard | FM 1314 to FM 1485 | Reconstruct 2-lane asphalt roadway with open ditches to a 4-lane asphalt roadway with open ditches and a center turn lane. | \$35,712,720 | 16 | 13 | 20 | 49 | 46 |
| $990$ | TxDOT Houston District | FM 1488 Widening and Access Management | FM 1488 | From FM 2978 to IH 45 N | Widen from 4 to 6 Lanes | \$67,800,000 | 12 | 13 | 22 | 47 | 48 |
|  | Chambers County | Chambers Parkway | Chambers Parkway | Approx. 0.5 mi. south of 110 from S.H. 146 to F.M. 3180 | Reconstruction of existing 2 lane roadway. Along with construction of a new 4 lane roadway. | \$30,000,000 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 47 | 49 |
|  | TxDOT <br> Beaumont District | SH 105 Widening | SH 105 | From Montgomery County Line to BS 105T | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes divided | \$20,000,000 | 17 | 15 | 14 | 46 | 50 |
|  | City of Conroe | Airport Road Widening | Airport Road | FM 1314 / Porter Rd to FM 3083 | Widen existing two-lane road (no sidewalks) to four lane with sidewalks. Scope includes stormwater, water, and wastewater. | \$22,000,000 | 6 | 17 | 21 | 44 | 51 |
|  | City of Mont Belvieu | Public Works \& Engineering Director | FM 565 | From SH 99 to Canal St. | Reconstruction of 2-lane open ditch to 4-lane Blvd with curb and gutter with sidewalks and bikeway. | \$24,000,000 | 9 | 17 | 18 | 44 | 52 |


| Project ID | Agency Name | Project Title | Facility/Street/H ighway | Limits | Description | Estimated Total Cost | Total IC <br> Focused Score | Total OIC Score | Total PF Score | Total Scores | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 735 | City of Mont Belvieu | Public Works \& Engineering Director | Traffic <br> Management Center | City Wide | Construction of a traffic management center for the City of Mont Belvieu | \$3,000,000 | 12 | 14 | 18 | 44 | 53 |
| 639 | Chambers County | NEEDLEPOINT RD | Needlepoint Rd | From IH-10 south to FM 565 | Reconstruction widen from 2 to 4 lanes | \$8,000,000 | 10 | 11 | 16 | 37 | 54 |
| $1000$ | TxDOT Houston District | FM 2004 Bridge Replacement | FM 2004 | At Chocolate Bayou | Replace existing bridge and approaches (NBI No. 12-020-0-2523-02-011) - Demolish the existing bridge and roadway approaches and replace with a new, 2-lane bridge and new bridge approaches and bring the bridge and approaches up to current standards. | \$75,000,000 | 5 | 14 | 12 | 31 | 55 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$1,708,965,803 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $9431$ | PORT OF HOUSTON AUTHORITY | Port Houston <br> Barbours Cut <br> Terminal Container <br> Yard 7 Upgrade | BARBOURS CUT CONTAINER YARD | AT BARBOURS CUT | RECONSTRUCT CONTAINER YARD 7 AT BAYPORT TO INCLUDE STRENGTHEN INFRASTRUCTURE. | \$53,300,000 | 38 | 7 | 14 | 59 | 25 |
| 942 | PORT OF HOUSTON AUTHORITY | Port Houston <br> Barbours Cut <br> Terminal Container Yard 6 Upgrade | BARBOURS CUT CONTAINER YARD | AT BARBOURS CUT | RECONSTRUCT CONTAINER YARD 6 AT BAYPORT TO INCLUDE STRENGTHEN INFRASTRUCTURE. | \$42,250,000 | 38 | 7 | 12 | 57 | 30 |
| 945 | PORT OF HOUSTON AUTHORITY | Keep the Supply Chain Moving with the Bayport Terminal Yard Expansion | BAYPORT CONTAINER YARD | AT BAYPORT | CONSTRUCT 46 ACRES OF CONTAINER YARD AT BAYPORT TERMINAL. | \$95,018,093 | 28 | 7 | 15 | 50 | 43 |
| 944 | PORT OF HOUSTON AUTHORITY | Barbours Cut <br> Container Terminal <br> Wharf <br> Rehabilitation | IBARBOURS CUT WHARF | AT BARBOURS CUT | RECONSTRUCT 1,337 LF OF WHARF AT BAYPORT TO INCLUDE STRENGTHEN INFRASTRUCTURE. | \$69,342,000 | 28 | 7 | 12 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$259,910,093 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 

- Staff Provided Crash, Delay and Emissions Reduction Calculators
- Sponsors may calculate and provide additional benefits
- Use FHWA BCA Guidance and provide full Documentation
- Total Benefits/Costs
- Benefits/Costs ratios in to points 0-100
- Review outliers
- Sta ff will provide excel budget templates


## RGM Next Steps/Timeline

|  | RGM Selection Process Steps | Schedule |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Staff | Sponsor meetings to debrief | $7 / 13-7 / 20$ |  |  |
| Staff | Provide Benefit Calculators | $7 / 18$ |  |  |
| Staff | Benefit Calculators Presentation | $7 / 17-7 / 21$ |  |  |
| Sponsors | Provide Benefit - Cost Information | $7 / 19-8 / 8$ |  |  |
| Sponsors | Provide Project Budget | $7 / 19-8 / 8$ |  |  |
| Sponsors | Provide Readiness Information | $7 / 19-8 / 8$ |  |  |
| Staff | Validation of Scores and BCAs | $8 / 9-8 / 22$ |  |  |
| Staff | Project Readiness Determined (for Sorting) | $8 / 9-8 / 22$ |  |  |
| Staff | Ranked list Developed | $8 / 23-9 / 8$ |  |  |
| TAC/TPC | Ranked List Preview Approval | September |  |  |
| Staff | TIP/RTP Amendments for AQ-Exempt Projects | TBD |  |  |
| Staff | TIP/RTP Amendments for AQ-Non-Exempt Projects | TBD |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Investment Całegories - Revised Timeline



Evaluate Requests Related to Existing Projects
ID Projects to Reduce Carryover Balances
ID Projects for Planning Studies

## Contacts

# Vishu Lingala <br> Principal Transportation Planner <br> Vishu.Lingala@,H-GAC.com <br> 713-993-4561 

## Callie Barnes

Principal Transportation Planner Callie.Barnes@,H-GAC.com 832-681-2615

Adam Beckom<br>Manager

Programming and Project Delivery
Adam.Beckom@H-GAC.com

$$
713-993-4567
$$


[^0]:    *Reduced from 64 to 55 for projects with adjoining segments

