

Page	Comment	Submitted By
4	P 4 Under “How Does Congestion Impact the Houston Galveston Transportation Management Area?,” the sentence “Compared to 2007, the region has lost 56 hours per capita at a cost of \$2.25 billion,” it is unclear if this is referring to what 2007 congestion costs were OR what 2017 congestion costs were in 2007 terms.	METRO
6	P 6 Under the section heading of “History of the CMP Success”, it is noted there was a 5% faster clearance of incidents in 2019 when compared to the previous year. That savings (30.1 min versus 31.8 min) may not be perceived as a tangible benefit by most readers. Is there a similar type of data available by different corridor that can show more noticeable time reductions? Also, for 2045 RTP goals and objective goals, are they listed in order or importance?	METRO
8	P 8 The map on Page 8 should mention it is for the current year.	METRO
12	P 12, 22, 24 The commute to work rate could decrease due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and the rise of employees working from home/Telecommuting.	METRO
14	P 14 More explanation on how the 2022 targets for different CMP objectives were developed would be helpful, especially explaining how the impact of COVID-19 was accounted for in setting targets.	METRO
16	P 16 During the construction period of the NHHIP, how will the delay per mile affect the statewide congestion rankings?	METRO
16,19	P 16, 19 Recommend putting units for Annual Delay per mile. Is it minutes or hours?	METRO
17,20	P 17, 20 Same as above for Map on P-17.	METRO
25	P 25 In the near term, Public Transportation strategies will need to be reimagined due to the effects of COVID-19.	METRO
27	P 27 A concise explanation on how a particular strategy contributes to strengthening economy would be desirable. We are not sure why Bike/Ped facility near bus stop can contribute to strengthening economy while all other strategies in the table do not.	METRO

Page	Comment	Submitted By
28	P 28 Comment on the first table: Since new freeways & travel lanes improve travel times and mobility significantly, they can strengthen economy. Also, regional freight travel information system can improve efficiency and contribute to strengthening economy. This point should be noted.	METRO
42	P 42 In the Public Transportation Improvements section, the concept of First-Last Mile should be mentioned	METRO
46	P 46 Since peak period congestion is usually more pronounced in the peak direction, it is not clear why volumes in both directions are used to calculate the V/C ratios for the peak period. More explanation needed or change both directions to peak direction.	METRO
6	P 6 Comment on 3rd bullet point listing objective related to goals for the 2045 RTP "Recommend multimodal to be explicitly stated for Section 3 relevance. Suggested text includes... "and increase availability of multimodal travel options."	C&E
6	P 6 comment on definition of "free flow" conditions "Rail to be specified: Free flow conditions are applied to Transit service including bus and rail rail inclusive of both local and regional travel. "	C&E
6	P 6 Last paragraph time reliability should be specified to include truck and rail.	C&E
7	P 7 bullet point 1 describing tier 1 network Add Text: Multimodal and active transportation compliment this network and, at times, run directly adjacent or within the National Highway System.	C&E
7	P 7 bullet point 2 for tier 2 description Add Text: Multimodal and active transportation may serve as a prioritize mode for congestion relief along these corridors.	C&E
16	P 16 on the table of roads and segments ranked by level of congestion, Request: Table to identify Tier 1 vs. Tier 2 corridors. If intended just for Tier 1, where/when are Tier 2 corridors identified? Comment consistent for all tables in this section.	C&E

Page	Comment	Submitted By
22	P 22 - Recommend: Incorporate an Origin/Destinations Map to this section. Forecast Group to provide map example as a separate attachment.	C&E
22	P 22 Recommend: stronger connection to Appendix A: Multimodal consideration of CMP Process not adequately identified in the existing text. Recommend incorporation of H-GAC regional bikeways map, or reference to its existence. If Appendix A, stronger connection needed and stated in text.	C&E
22	<p>P 22 Map Edits and Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Breaks are not even (28-80, 81-90, 91-100). 28-80 covers the majority of the region and does not offer insight to change in patterns moving forward. - Share of SOV trips doesn't necessarily mean a high number of trips (e.g., Chambers, Liberty County tracts look like they would be high priorities than Katy or Cypress); if we're going to us tracts, might be better to use absolute values. - Text implies that people are working in or around Downtown Houston, but this is not Origin/Destination data. 	C&E
25	P 25 Land Use Strategies table, "Edits for consideration submitted to Ped-Bike Subcommittee."	C&E
25	P 25 Public Transportation Strategies table, Access Convenience, "Provide Transit Signal Priority."	C&E
25	P 25 Public Transportation Strategies table, Access Convenience, Add: 4.12 Intermodal Enhancements: Coordinating travel modes makes movement from one mode to the other easier. These enhancements typically include modifying transit schedules to reduce layover time or increase the opportunity for transfers, creation of multimodal facilities, informational kiosks, and improved amenities at transfer locations. These improvements can improve the freight and pedestrian experience	C&E
26	P 26 ITS / Operations Strategies table, Non-motorized signal installation	C&E

Page	Comment	Submitted By
27	P 27 Bicycle and Pedestrian Strategies table, Edits for consideration submitted to Ped-Bike Subcommittee.	C&E
27	P 27 Roadway / Mobility Strategies table, Roadway Diet, Right Sizing or Roadway Reallocation: Verbiage addition to better reflect AASHTO jargon.	C&E
28	P 28 Roadway Capacity Expansion Strategies table, Hollmann Add Active Transportation facilities. Taebel: Aren't these covered in bicycle-pedestrian strategies? not sure they belong here	C&E
35	P 35 How Will Projects be Analyzed for Congestion Management Using the CMP? "Please confirm, Active Transportation Projects are not evaluated against the CMP. Is this correct? "	C&E
35	P 35 major investments, Add text: Major investments shall incorporate multimodal investments including non-motorized investment within or adjacent to Teir 1 and Tier 2 projects.	C&E
35	P 35 Other Investment Types, Add Text: Other Investment Types shall incorporate multimodal investments including non-motorized investment within or adjacent to Teir 1 and Tier 2 projects.	C&E
35	P 35 Accelerated Projects, Add Text: Accelerated Projects shall incorporate multimodal investments including non-motorized investment within or adjacent to Teir 1 and Tier 2 projects.	C&E
36	P 36 Accelerated Projects, Add as exempt: Active Transportation	C&E
38	P 38 Table 7.1: CMP Analysis Process, CMP Analysis Process "Major investments shall incorporate multimodal investments including non-motorized investment within or adjacent to Teir 1 and Tier 2 projects. "	C&E
40	P 40 "Recommend Multimodal and Active Transportation facility be added as a strategy and criteria consideration for Major Investments."	C&E

Page	Comment	Submitted By
41	P 41 Table 7.2: Qualitative Assessment for Other Investment Types, Land Use Improvements "How is evaluation committee established for the review and point distribution of Qualitative Criteria?"	C&E
42	P 42 Table 7.2: Qualitative Assessment for Other Investment Types, Bicycle/ Pedestrian Improvements "TIP criteria are currently in conflict with Barrier elimination. Points are removed for TIP applications which cross a railroad. It is recommended CMP Process be used to update TIP criteria."	C&E
43	P 43 AASHTO bullet "Thank you for incorporating AASHTO design guidelines, 2020 Update. TxDOT 2020 design criteria are here: http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/rdw/rdw.pdf "	C&E
43	P 43 CMP Analysis for Accelerated Projects, bullet 3 "Multimodal considerations"	C&E
44	P 44 #1: "Who does this consist of, and how are nominations received?"	C&E
44	P44 CMP Analysis Exemptions "Active Transportation is not specifically identified within the CMP, but an active TIP category. As such, it is recommended to be added as a CMP Analysis Exemption."	C&E
45	P 45 Safety Projects in existing ROW "Bicycle or Pedestrian Improvement"	C&E
45	P 45 Bottleneck projects, low cost improvements "including bicycle facilities. "	C&E
48	P 48 Appendix A "Please define purpose of Appendix. How does this intended to be used in the CMP?"	C&E
56	P 56 CMP Analysis for Other Investments, Item 14, Transportation Demand Management Strategies "Does the project provide for multimodal system improvements? Define prioritized mode other than single occupancy vehicles? Or define how improvements reduces SOV use."	C&E
5	P 5 Gulf Coast Planning Region "We need to clarify and define this phrase/"	TxDOT
6	P 6 Gulf Coast Regional Tow and Go™ "See above comments on page 6 as well"	TxDOT
6	P 6 Houston-Galveston region "We need to be consistent"	TxDOT

Page	Comment	Submitted By
7	P 7 Tier 2 bullet, regionally significant network "Need a list of RS Network Facilities/roadways by functional classification, limits, mileage,etc."	TxDOT
7	P 7 Table 2.1 CMP Roadway Classifications, Selected Minor Arterials, SH 146 "Show the section of SH146 that is MA designation. Is FM 2100/Crosby Huffman Rd from Wolf rd to SH 99 part of Network?"	TxDOT
8	P 8 Map, "Need Interactive map overage on RTP conformity network (integrate data with RTP conformity network)"	TxDOT
8	P 8 Map "Consider 2020 Texas NHS Modification Review:Addition and Removal from NHS facilities. #2: Modify this map to include interacting layers showing or identifying "Regionally Significant Network" and associated data like Facility name, limits, FC, length, etc. Update this map accordingly (Discuss Karen Owen)"	TxDOT
16	P 16 Measures Explained, referring to top 10 most congested roadways "Why not 20?" & on the year 2019 in the table: "Do we update to 2020?"	TxDOT
P17	P17 on 10 most congested roadways "20"	TxDOT
22	P 22 on NW part of map "Surprised about the rate?"	TxDOT
22	P 22 on Ft Bend Cty part "Same , thought it will be higher"	TxDOT
48	P 48 Figure A-1: Regional Tow and Go Network "Add Legend"	TxDOT
53	P 53 Figure A-6 "Integrate map"	TxDOT
54	P 54 CMP Project Analysis Form "This Form needs to updated and streamlined based on past initiatives (talk with Stephan Gage) relevancy"	TxDOT

Page	Comment	Submitted By
N/A	<p>1. I believe one of the fundamental requirements of the HGAC planning process should be that every major employment center in the region (downtown, uptown/galleria, medical center, energy corridor, westchase, Pasadena/Harrisburg, NASA, etc) should be required to conduct a zip code survey of all their major employers (at least the 10 largest employers) to determine the home and work zip codes of the majority of employees in that employment center. Once this data is in hand, commuter bikeways could be planned to link the key residential zip codes to the employment zip codes (assuming the distance is reasonable, maybe 0-15 or 0-20 miles) to have a real impact on getting vehicles off the roads and securing more CMAQ funding for the region. Every HR department has this information and it is not necessary to provide any other employee identifying information other than home and work zip codes.</p>	gnady@sbcglobal.net
N/A	<p>2. I also wonder if it is possible to determine home and destinations on congested roadways via some other means such as aerial tracking of some kind. When I think about the Loop 610 from I-10 to Hwy 69 and Hwy 69 from 610 to 288, I suspect that many users of this road are not beginning or ending trips in that area, but are passing through. Maybe if it could be determined where the bulk of the vehicles are coming from and going to, it would help planners determine what might be congestion reduction options that would really make an impact.</p>	gnady@sbcglobal.net
N/A	<p>Question: what caused the additon of new projects to the 2045 RTP projectscope? Are air quality emissions the only thing considered?</p>	Tanya (via Zoom meeting chat)
N/A	<p>I think it is great you are evaluating multi modal transportation performance but I'm concerened that past efforts to widen roads and add more have made the roads less safe for everyone including bikes and pedestrians. What strategies are you considering to relieve congestion that does not invlove widening roads?</p>	Neal Ehardt (Spoken during meeting)

Page	Comment	Submitted By
N/A	Is transit also a tool to improve congestion? Based on the diagram shown, it seems like the solution for improving cogestion is widening. Is there documentation somewhere to show how these solutions were reached?	N/A (Chat message read by Patrick)
N/A	Are we also considering diverting truck traffic around the city?	Michael Morritz (Spoken during meeting)
N/A	Building HOV lanes really doesn't help I view them as very restrictive. We need to build more main lanes to keep up with population growth. I am not against other strategies, building more general purpose lanes will help with the current congestion in Houston	Edward
N/A	I appreciate the transparency and the work that H-GAC is doing on this topic.	Michel Maksou
6	P 6 Vision Zero Strategies to be considered/incorporated.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
6	P 6 Vision Zero, recently adopted by H-GAC, should be included in this Objective List.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
8	P 8 Multimodal not stated in objectives - why? -- From Objectives: "Develop Multi-modal Performance Measures" Consider expanding the third bullet point to emphasize increasing multimodal options.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
9	P 9 Tier 2 network is the backbone of multimodal modes of transportation. They are integral as part of congestion relief strategies. Multiple roads (corridors) that are not functionally classified as arterial routes perform and are used as principal arterial routes. These roads should not be excluded from the Tier 2 network since they have a vital impact to congestion management. The list should be expanded beyond the two listed as "selected minor arterials" in order to fully realize congestion relief.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
9	P 9 Table 2.1 - Minor Arterials are not part of the current Tier 2 Definition. Please assist. - Are categories specific to Highways only?	Ped Bike Subcommittee

Page	Comment	Submitted By
12	<p>P 12 Figure 3-1 (Reduce SOV Trips) - 1) % of HOV 1+ or 2+ ridership (Provided by Texas Toll Authority)</p> <p>2) % of Bus Transit (Provided by Local Transit Authorities)</p> <p>3) % of non-vehicular Multi-modal Facilities planned/programmed/built</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
12	<p>In the future iterations/updates, use the work flow model to aid in data analysis.</p> <p>P 12 Definitions - Transit highly recommended to be included.</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
13	<p>P 13 Figure 4-1 (SOV) - How do you determine a transit desert?</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
15	<p>P 15 Figure 5-1 (Moving Toward Meeting Federal Air Standards) - There appears to be a typo in the 2022 target.</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
16	<p>P 16 Figure 5-1 (2020 Actual Numbers) - What baseline are we using to establish these numbers? For example, how do these percentages work towards?</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
26	<p>P 26 Table - Mixed use, infill, TOD, POD all seem to also contribute to approach 3 (discourage SOV).</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
26	<p>P 26 Table - Electronic fare collection and universal fare pass both contribute to moving people and goods efficiently. There are time savings associated boarding and transfers.</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
26	<p>P 26 Table - All access Convenience and Service Operations strategies seem to also fit in the approach 3.</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
27	<p>P 27 ITS/Operations Table - Add Transit Signal Priority/Preemption</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
28	<p>P 28 Bike/Ped Strategies Table - New SW/BL and Safety/Access - This could also include Approach #2</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
28	<p>P 28 Roadway/Mobility Table - Include: Road Safety Improvements for all modes including pedestrian and bicyclist. Refuge pedestrian islands, intersection design for all-people all-abilities.</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
29	<p>P 29 Bike/Ped Narrative - Include reference to 2019 ASSHTO Standarnds and 2020 Vision Zeros.</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee
29	<p>P 29 Bike/Ped Narrative - Include in the definitions section the definition for "exclusive non-motorized rights of way."</p>	Ped Bike Subcommittee

Page	Comment	Submitted By
29	P 29 2nd Sentence of Bike/Ped Narrative - Expand the mention of "decreasing single-occupancy trips" with "and increasing multi-modal travel options"	Ped Bike Subcommittee
29	P 29 Bike/Ped Narrative and Strategy Table - Are these defined? For each Strategy below, please indicate assumption as it pertain to VMT reduction and improved air quality.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
29	P 29 Bike/Ped Table - Separate "Sidewalks and Bike Lanes" and "Safety and accessibility" into two (2) separate categories.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
29	P 29 Bike/Ped Table - Safety and Accessibility - Add Vision Zero strategies including, but not limited to, "Context Appropriate Travel Speeds"	Ped Bike Subcommittee
29	P 29 Roadway Capacity Expansion Narrative - Roadway capacity expansion should be considered adding capacity for all modes: transit, bicycle and pedestrian.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
31	P 31 LOSPLAN - I think this methodology calls for using the existing users and projected users. For bike/ped projects these numbers are not available in most cases since we do not have a systematic counting process. Sometimes the facility (sidewalk, bike lane, connection does not exist).	Ped Bike Subcommittee
36	P 36 Major Investments Bullet - Include transit, pedestrian or bike projects.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
37	P 37 TIP Narrative - 2nd Paragraph - Confirm that CMP would not be used to evaluate/score TIP projects for next call.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
37	P 37 TIP Narrative - 2nd Paragraph - Please define CMP threshold.	Ped Bike Subcommittee
44	P 44 Roadway/Mobility Table - Does the project include ped and bike safety improvements at intersections?	Ped Bike Subcommittee
44	P 44 Table 7.2 Land Use - potential future or existing transit connection?	Ped Bike Subcommittee
44	P 44 Table 7.2 Land Use - How are counties without Transit being accommodated?	Ped Bike Subcommittee
44	P 44 Table 7.2 Land Use - Is the H-GAC Livable Centers study still relevant? Please note Vision Zero/AASHTO comments on previous pages	Ped Bike Subcommittee
45	P 45 Bike and Ped Improvements - Second Bullet - Remove the word "concept" from the bikeway map reference.	Ped Bike Subcommittee

Page	Comment	Submitted By
51	P 51 2020 Express/High Capacity Map - The Uptown-Silver Line BRT project was constructed in 2020 and should be shown as open/permanent.	Ped Bike Subcommittee