

Page	Comment	Submitted By	Staff Recommendation/Comment
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	<i>Sentence deleted.</i>
5	P 5 Gulf Coast Planning Region "We need to clarify and define this phrase/"	TxDOT	<i>Gulf Coast Planning Region and other similar phrases have been replaced with MPO region throughout the document . Houston-Galveston Transportation Management Area is still used where appropriate.</i>
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 of importance?	METRO	<i>The document has been edited to clarify the importance of faster clearance time on congestion. The goals are not listed in order of importance.</i>
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 inclusive of both local and regional travel. "	C&E	<i>This could be considered in the future. We are not measuring congestion in rail yet for this CMP. Original document retained. It is the term that is used by TTI to define Truck Time Reliability. We understand the concern, we are reluctant to depart from the standard term at this time, but can consider Gulf Coast has been deleted from the name of the program. The name of the program is simply Tow and Go.</i>
6	P 6 Last paragraph time reliability should be specified to include truck and rail.	C&E	<i>We understand the concern, we are reluctant to depart from the standard term at this time, but can consider Gulf Coast has been deleted from the name of the program. The name of the program is simply Tow and Go.</i>
6	P 6 Gulf Coast Regional Tow and Go™ "See above comments on page 6 as well"	TxDOT	<i>understandable and will be used throughout the document. Changes made.</i>
6	P 6 Houston-Galveston region "We need to be consistent"	TxDOT	<i>We will be adding safety as an objective into the next plan. Document retained.</i>
6	P 6 Vision Zero Strategies to be considered/incorporated.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>We will be adding safety as an objective into the next plan. Document retained.</i>
6	P 6 Vision Zero, recently adopted by H-GAC, should be included in this Objective List.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>We will be adding safety as an objective into the next plan. Document retained.</i>
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	<i>Tier 1 network has been combined with Tier 2 for one CMP Network.</i>
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	<i>Tier 1 network has been combined with Tier 2 for one CMP Network.</i>
7	P 7 Tier 2 bullet, regionally significant network "Need a list of RS Network Facilities/roadways by functional classification, limits, mileage, etc."	TxDOT	<i>We will create this list in the next iteration of the CMP. No changes made.</i>
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	<i>No it is not.</i>
8	P 8 The map on Page 8 should mention it is for the current year.	METRO	<i>Map year has been mentioned.</i>
8	P 8 Map, "Need Interactive map overage on RTP conformity network (Integrate data with RTP conformity network)"	TxDOT	<i>Interactive map will be created in the next version of the CMP. No changes made.</i>
8	P 8 Map "Consider 2020 Texas NHS Modification Review: Addition and Removal from NHS facilities.	TxDOT	
8	#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	<i>Interactive map will be created in the next version of the CMP.</i>
8	P 8 Multimodal not stated in objectives - why? -- From Objectives: "Develop Multimodal Performance Measures" Consider expanding the third bullet point to emphasize increasing multimodal options.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>No change. Compressed workweeks and other tactics/strategies are effective, but aren't technically modes. More inclusive to say reduce vehicle miles travelled.</i>

Page	Comment	Submitted By	Staff Recommendation/Comment
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	<i>For this update, we have combined Tier 1 and 2 into one CMP network. We may look more closely at reintroducing Tier 2 in the next CMP update.</i>
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	<i>For this update, we have combined Tier 1 and 2 into one CMP network. We may look more closely at reintroducing Tier 2 in the next CMP update.</i>
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	<i>It could. We briefly address COVID and its possible impact for this CMP in the introduction.</i>
12	P 12 Figure 3-1 (Reduce SOV Trips) - 1) % of HOV 1+ or 2+ ridership (Provided by Texas Toll Authority) 2) % of Bus Transit (Provided by Local Transit Authorities) 3) % of non-vehicular Multi-modal Facilities planned/programmed/built	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>These mitigation strategies will be monitored, but will not be listed as ways to measure reducing single occupancy vehicle travel in this CMP, because they are not all inclusive of strategies that lead to SOV reduction. Further study will be needed on these and additional strategies before we include them as possible metrics to identify progress towards SOV reduction in the next CMP.</i>
	In the future iterations/updates, use the work flow model to aid in data analysis.		<i>Transit is mentioned on page 15 as an alternative mode that can contribute to reducing SOV trips.</i>
12	P 12 Definitions - Transit highly recommended to be included.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>That term was a typographical error and has been deleted.</i>
13	P 13 Figure 4-1 (SOV) - How do you determine a transit desert?	Ped Bike Subcommittee	
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	<i>We have included text in the document to explain how the targets are set. This is not a typo. The large disparity is due to unusual circumstances caused by the non-implementation of zero emissions vehicles in 2018. The anomaly should be rectified in coming years.</i>
15	P 15 Figure 5-1 (Moving Toward Meeting Federal Air Standards) - There appears to be a typo in the 2022 target.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>There will be a shift. We will continue monitoring rankings and adjust the CMP periodically.</i>
16	P 16 During the construction period of the NHHIP, how will the delay per mile affect the statewide congestion rankings?	METRO	
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	<i>Tier 1 and 2 have been blended into one CMP network. Our goal was to illustrate the severity of congestion in the region by pulling a sample of most severely congested roadways. For 2019, 36 of TTIs 100 most congested roadways are within our region. The full list has been added to the document and is available at <a href="https://mobility.tamu.edu/texas-most-congested-roadways/">https://mobility.tamu.edu/texas-most-congested-roadways/</a>. CMP is not updated annually, however we will pull a</i>
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	
16	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?	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>We have added the 2018 baseline to show trend.</i>
22	P 22 - Recommend: Incorporate an Origin/Destinations Map to this section. Forecast Group to provide map example as a separate attachment.	C&E	<i>We now have language on page 24 that points readers to the online versions of these interactive tools.</i>
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	<i>Here we are showing problems not strategies, however we do capture additional information on this connection under the strategies section of the CMP. No change.</i>
22	P 22 Map Edits and Concerns: - 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	<i>Map corrected.</i>

Page	Comment	Submitted By	Staff Recommendation/Comment
22	P 22 on NW part of map "Surprised about the rate?"	TxDOT	<b>Map corrected.</b>
22	P 22 on Ft Bend Cty. part "Same, thought it will be higher"	TxDOT	<b>Map corrected.</b>
25	P 25 In the near term, Public Transportation strategies will need to be reimagined due to the effects of COVID-19.	METRO	<b>Yes. COVID is now addressed in the opening of the document.</b>
25	P 25 Land Use Strategies table, "Edits for consideration submitted to Ped-Bike Subcommittee."	C&E	<b>Noted.</b>
25	P 25 Public Transportation Strategies table, Access Convenience, "Provide Transit Signal Priority."	C&E	<b>Added.</b>
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	<b>Added.</b>
26	P 26 ITS / Operations Strategies table, Non-motorized signal installation	C&E	<b>Added.</b>
26	P 26 Table - Mixed use, infill, TOD, POD all seem to also contribute to approach 3 (discourage SOV).	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>active way to discourage, not the more passive (but still effective) strategies that occur through design.</b>
26	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.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>Added.</b>
26	P 26 Table - All access Convenience and Service Operations strategies seem to also fit in the approach 3.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>Added.</b>
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	<b>We removed the column aligning strategies with goals and objectives, because all of the strategies align with all of the goals and objectives of the CMP.</b>
27	P 27 Bicycle and Pedestrian Strategies table, Edits for consideration submitted to Ped-Bike Subcommittee.	C&E	<b>Noted.</b>
27	P 27 Roadway / Mobility Strategies table, Roadway Diet, Right Sizing or Roadway Reallocation: Verbiage addition to better reflect AASHTO jargon.	C&E	<b>Changed to Roadway Diet/Re-Allocations</b>
27	P 27 ITS/Operations Table - Add Transit Signal Priority/Preemption	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>Added under Public Transit strategies</b>
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	<b>Adjusted.</b>
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	<b>We will not add these in document.</b>
28	P 28 Bike/Ped Strategies Table - New SW/BL and Safety/Access - This could also include Approach #2	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>Adjusted.</b>
28	P 28 Roadway/Mobility Table - Include: Road Safety improvements for all modes including pedestrian and bicyclist. Refuge pedestrian islands, intersection design for all-people abilities.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>Road safety improvements are added as a line item (ex: intersection improvements, pedestrian islands, etc.) Paragraph modified to add "especially when in alignment with the latest ASHTO standards and with TXDOT's new call for Vision Zero."</b>
29	P 29 Bike/Ped Narrative - Include reference to 2019 ASHTO Standards and 2020 Vision Zeros.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>We have inserted parentheses with additional description next to exclusive non-motorized rights of way.</b>
29	P 29 Bike/Ped Narrative - Include in the definitions section the definition for "exclusive non-motorized rights of way."	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>We have inserted parentheses with additional description next to exclusive non-motorized rights of way.</b>
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	<b>Mention expanded. the strategy alone will not reduce vmt. it is how each strategy will be applied, where and in combination with which other strategies that would determine VMT reduction. It is actually the project that will reduce VMT, not a singular strategy out of context. We could</b>
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	<b>Mention expanded. the strategy alone will not reduce vmt. it is how each strategy will be applied, where and in combination with which other strategies that would determine VMT reduction. It is actually the project that will reduce VMT, not a singular strategy out of context. We could</b>

Page	Comment	Submitted By	Staff Recommendation/Comment
29	P 29 Bike/Ped Table - Separate "Sidewalks and Bike Lanes" and "Safety and accessibility" into two (2) separate categories.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>Edited.</b>
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	<b>Edited.</b>
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	<b>The way this section is organized, the bike and pedestrian and transit sections each have their own added capacity statements like new lanes or increased service.</b>
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	<b>In 2018, we suggested using mode share as a way to estimate users. You are correct that sponsors do not always have systematic counting processes. We can carry the mode share suggestion forward in this iteration of the CMP.</b>
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	<b>Correct. The Congestion management process (CMP) is not used for evaluating active transportation projects.</b>
35	P 35 major investments, Add text: Major investments shall incorporate multimodal investments including non-motorized investment within or adjacent to Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.	C&E	<b>Major Investments category is only defined by the total project cost. For this category, multimodal connectivity is a part of the planning factors evaluation criteria; however, for highways, mandating non-motorized accommodations may not always be safe/feasible.</b>
35	P 35 Other Investment Types, Add Text: Other Investment Types shall incorporate multimodal investments including non-motorized investment within or adjacent to Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.	C&E	<b>For this category, multimodal connectivity is a part of the planning factors evaluation criteria</b>
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	<b>For this category, multimodal connectivity is a part of the planning factors evaluation criteria</b>
36	P 36 Accelerated Projects, Add as exempt: Active Transportation	C&E	<b>The CMP process is currently only for roadway added capacity projects</b>
36	P 36 Major Investments Bullet - Include transit, pedestrian or bike projects.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>The CMP process is currently only for roadway added capacity projects</b>
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	<b>This CMP is not being used to evaluate projects. Staff is considering proposing a COMPAT analytical tool to be used to as part of the planning factors evaluation criteria for future proposed projects.</b>
37	P 37 TIP Narrative - 2nd Paragraph - Please define CMP threshold.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<b>We have added clarification in parentheses next to CMP threshold to define the threshold as ensuring the Level of Service and/or Volume to Capacity ratio remain level or improve.</b>
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	<b>In the call for projects process the proposed Major Investments investment category is only defined by the total project cost. Multimodal connectivity is a part of the planning factors evaluation criteria during project selection, prior to the Congestion Management analysis.</b>
40	P 40 "Recommend Multimodal and Active Transportation facility be added as a strategy and criteria consideration for Major Investments."	C&E	<b>For now the criteria for Major Investments will remain the same. This comment can be considered for the next CMP Update.</b>
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	<b>Qualitative Assessments are reviewed by staff.</b>
42	P 42 In the Public Transportation Improvements section, the concept of First-Last Mile should be mentioned	METRO	<b>First mile/last mile will be mentioned alongside added transit capacity.</b>
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	<b>2021 Call for Projects evaluation criteria is still under development. Barrier elimination was a part of the planning factor evaluation criteria for Active transportation investment category in 2018 CFP. In other roadways investment categories also projects were given 10 points in the proposed project eliminated or avoided an at grade railroad crossing.</b>
43	P 43 AASHTO bullet "Thank you for incorporating AASHTO design guidelines, 2020 Update. TxDOT 2020 design criteria are here: <a href="http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/rdw/rdw.pdf">http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/rdw/rdw.pdf</a> "	C&E	<b>Thank you for the link.</b>

Page	Comment	Submitted By	Staff Recommendation/Comment
43	P 43 CMP Analysis for Accelerated Projects, bullet 3 "Multimodal considerations"	C&E	<i>I am not sure that we should change this. I am not understanding why multimodal considerations would slow a project down.</i>
44	P 44 #1: "Who does this consist of, and how are nominations received?"	C&E	<i>On page 37, How will projects be analyzed, we have provided a clarification on what we mean by the term project sponsors.</i>
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	<i>The CMP is only for roadway added capacity projects.</i>
44	P 44 Roadway/Mobility Table - Does the project include ped and bike safety improvements at intersections?	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>Added.</i>
44	P 44 Table 7.2 Land Use - potential future or existing transit connection?	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>This table has been adjusted so that the question, even if the project is a land-use project, will be answered under the transit section.</i>
44	P 44 Table 7.2 Land Use - How are counties without Transit being accommodated?	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>Counties without transit would answer no. That would be considered in the evaluation.</i>
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	<i>Yes. This would still be relevant.</i>
45	P 45 Safety Projects in existing ROW "Bicycle or Pedestrian Improvement"	C&E	<i>We did add "Bike and Pedestrian safety improvements" to this list. The safety committee is updating definitions for safety and bottleneck improvements. Once the update definitions are approved through the Transportation Policy Council, we will be able to adjust this area of the</i>
45	P 45 Bottleneck projects, low cost improvements "including bicycle facilities. "	C&E	
45	P 45 Bike and Ped Improvements - Second Bullet - Remove the word "concept" from the bikeway map reference.	Ped Bike Subcommittee	<i>This has been deleted.</i>
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	<i>On page 46, when we say directional, we are using directional vehicle/capacity ratio calculations which accommodate this request. We are in alignment with what is described.</i>
48	P 48 Appendix A "Please define purpose of Appendix. How does this intended to be used in the CMP?"	C&E	<i>appendix that states this section include maps related to strategies identified in the CMP and could be helpful in understanding how they can help with mitigation in the</i>
48	P 48 Figure A-1: Regional Tow and Go Network "Add Legend"	TxDOT	<i>Legend added.</i>
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	<i>It has been updated</i>
53	P 53 Figure A-6 "Integrate map"	TxDOT	<i>In interactive map is under consideration for the next version of the CMP</i>
54	P 54 CMP Project Analysis Form "This Form needs to updated and streamlined based on past initiatives (talk with Stephan Gage) relevancy"	TxDOT	<i>This form has been updated and will be added as an appendix to the document</i>
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	<i>This form has been updated and will be added as an appendix to the document</i>
16,19	P 16, 19 Recommend putting units for Annual Delay per mile. Is it minutes or hours?	METRO	<i>We will be also listing the 36 most congested segments (of the 100 statewide) in Houston</i>
17,20	P 17, 20 Same as above for Map on P-17.	METRO	<i>We will be also listing the 36 most congested segments (of the 100 statewide) in Houston</i>
N/A	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	<a href="mailto:gnady@sbcglobal.net">gnady@sbcglobal.net</a>	<i>Yes, Great idea. We do get this kind of data through Census, but we do plan to augment that with TDM planning work with major employers and management districts. It is one of the services we offer as part of the Commute Solutions program. This is a voluntary trip reduction program. It is not required.</i>

Page	Comment	Submitted By	Staff Recommendation/Comment
N/A	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 I think it is great you are evaluating multi modal transportation performance but I'm concerned 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 involve widening roads?	<a href="mailto:gnady@sbcglobal.net">gnady@sbcglobal.net</a>	<i>Using modeling we can get an idea of trips that begin outside our MPO service area. This is a good idea to expand the tool set included in our next CMP.</i>
N/A	Is transit also a tool to improve congestion?	Neal Ehardt (Spoken during meeting)	<i>There are many strategies in the CMP that do not add capacity to our roadways. This was answered at meeting using strategies section of CMP</i>
N/A	Based on the diagram shown, it seems like the solution for improving congestion is widening. Is there documentation somewhere to show how these solutions were reached?	N/A (Chat message read by Patrick)	<i>Yes we are. This was answered at meeting using strategies section of CMP.</i>
N/A	Are we also considering diverting truck traffic around the city?	Michael Morrirtz (Spoken during meeting)	<i>Widening is a last suggestion not a first suggestion. Multiple strategies are offered with widening as last resort. This was answered at meeting using the strategies section of CMP.</i>
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	Tanya (via Zoom meeting chat)	<i>Yes we are. This was answered at meeting using strategies section of CMP.</i>
N/A	I appreciate the transparency and the work that H-GAC is doing on this topic.	Edward	<i>Yes, building additional lanes is a strategy, but only one of many, many strategies, and ideally, not the first strategy.</i>
N/A		Michel Maksou	<i>Thank you.</i>
17	P17 on 10 most congested roadways "20"	TxDOT	<i>We have included all 36 roadway segments identified in the TTI's evaluation in the appendix of this document.</i>