

**MEETING OF THE RTP SUBCOMMITTEE
HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL
TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

January 20, 2021

9:30AM

Minutes

Member Attendance:

Primary Member	Present	Alternate	Present
Maureen Crocker, Chair	Yes	Jennifer Ostlind	Yes
Perri D'Armond, Vice Chair	Yes	Stacy Slawinski	No
Monique Johnson	No	Krystal Lastrape	Yes
Ruthanne Haut	No	John Powers	No
Clay Forister	Yes	Karen McKinnon	No
Adam France	Yes	Chris Bogert	No
Christopher Sims	No	Chad Tressler	No
Ricardo Villagrand	Yes	Francisco Carrillo	No
Loyd Smith	Yes	Bryan Brown	Yes
Nick Woolery	Yes	Frank Simoneaux	No
Yancy Scott	Yes	Bobby Pennington	No
Charles Airiohuodion	Yes	Jeffrey English	Yes
Lisa Collins	Yes	Scott Ayres	Yes
Alberto Lyne	No	Priya Zachariah	Yes
Ken Fickes	Yes	Vernon Chambers	Yes
Harrison Humphrey	Yes	Stephanie Thomas	Yes
Jonathan Brooks	Yes	Bakeyah Nelson	No
Elijah Williams	Yes	Irma Sanchez	No
Bruce Mann	Yes	Rohit Saxena	No
Roger Rees	No	Brett Milutin	No
Janis Scott	No	Paulette Wagner	No
John Tyler	Yes	VACANT	-
Bill Zrioka	Yes	David Leslie	No

Others Present:

Andrew Mao, Adam Beckom, Michelle Canton, David Balmos, Jim Dickinson, Elizabeth Whitton, David Fink, Carrie Evans, Ben Finley, Stephan Gage, Shixin Gao, Brandy George, Thomas Gray, Donte Green, Veronica Green, Sandra Holliday, Allie Isbell, James Koch, Susan Jaworski, Ayo Jibowu, Sharon Ju, Megan Kennison, Neely Kim, Justin Kuzila, Vishu Lingala, Patrick Mandapaka, Carlene Mullins, Michael Onuogu, Karen Owen, Jamila Owens, Frank Pagliei, Patrick Gant, Cameron Stawicki, Kathryn Vo, Chris Van Slyke, Veronica Waller, Christopher Whaley, William Lisska

Staff Participating:

Alan Rodenstein and Mike Burns

1. Call to Order
Maureen C called the meeting to order at 9:32AM

Mike B read a statement of how the meeting would be conducted via remote participation and the ground rules for any discussion.

Mike B conducted the roll call for attendance and confirmed a quorum was present.

Maureen C confirmed a quorum was present.

2. Approval of Minutes

Bruce M made a motion, seconded by Ken F, to accept the minutes.

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Congestion Management Process – Public Comment Period (Alan Rodenstein)

Alan R presented a summary of the background, purpose, and the over 115 public comments received to date on the draft CMP document. Comments were received from METRO, HGAC's Community and Environment Department, and HGAC's Pedestrian Bicycle Subcommittee. Comments were supportive and also suggested emphasis on active transportation and multi-modal facilities, which will be addressed in the finalized version of the CMP. Next steps include an end to the public comments period, addressing comments, and seeking approval by TAC and TPC in February with submission to TXDOT and FHWA in Spring. The next update of the CMP will begin later in 2021 to better address comments on project evaluation and prioritization.

Maureen C asked how the CMP will be applied, either project specific or for the RTP.

Alan R responded that the CMP will help in advancing projects from RTP to the TIP.

Maureen C asked if CMP criteria will be used in TIP scoring.

Alan R responded that it will be using for scoring in the future and will need input from a work group to help refine how to develop the scoring.

No action was taken.

4. Performance Measures – Transit Safety (Alan Rodenstein)

Alan R presented a summary of the Public Transit Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) and Transit Safety Performance Measures required by the Federal Transit Administration. Staff is preparing a report of crashes, fatalities, and vehicle breakdowns between 2015 and 2019, which will include developing rolling averages and projected targets. Initial findings will be ready in March 2021, with final reporting available to TxDOT and FHWA by June 2021.

No action was taken.

5. Discussion of Requested RTP Amendments:

a. Hempstead Highway – comments on summary of need and purpose

Mike B mentioned that a summary of the December 9th TxDOT presentation on the Hempstead Highway project is included in the meeting material and includes attributes of the project, including the proposed scope, cost, timeline, and alignment with regional goals for safety, condition, mobility, economy, and environment. Comments were requested on this project summary.

Maureen C asked if the Hempstead Highway project timeline was correct and if it will be pushed to an out year and the summary shows that portions of the project is included in 2040, and other segments in 2026 and 2028.

Vishu L clarified that the prioritized segments involve the high-speed rail components and the segment between Beltway 8 and SH 99. The segment between IH 610 W and Beltway 8 is less developed and included in 2040. Loyd S mentioned that the segment limits are complicated by city limit boundaries and asked how they were selected. The outer Hempstead segment description from Beltway 8 and SH 99 is not well developed compared to the inner Hempstead segment.

Charles A confirmed the phasing of the project and mentioned that TxDOT will review comments and address any discrepancies.

Loyd S asked how the need and purpose will be used.

Vishu L clarified that the material in the summary is intended to provide all known project descriptions and subcommittee comments.

Maureen C asked if the Environmental Impact Statement would need to be updated since the project description is changing.

James K clarified that the reevaluation preserves some of the original scope and the impact of changes in right of way and limits of each segment is still being evaluated and on-going.

Maureen C mentioned concern with process to address City of Houston comments and to clarify the timeline after the RTP amendment.

James K responded that engineering services are currently being procured for the inner Hempstead segment as part of the reevaluation, which will include opportunities for public input and stakeholder coordination on design alternatives.

Jonathan B mentioned support for public outreach early and often.

Stephanie T mentioned additional support for public outreach and requested description of stakeholder identification.

James K mentioned that the inner Hempstead segment is within City of Houston and Harris County limits, METRO service area, and freight services and requested input on any other stakeholders that should be involved.

No action was taken.

b. IH 10 West (Inner Katy) – summary of project description and opportunity for input

James K summarized the scope of the project and the connection with the existing METRO BRT project in the same corridor. The design challenges included a railroad bridge, drainage issues, elevating IH 10 out of the White Oak Bayou flood zone, and incorporating the METRO BRT improvements. A February 25th public meeting is scheduled and organized by issue topic, such as drainage and transit accommodation. The current highway facility is depressed like a “canyon” with frontage roadways at the top of slope. Bridges and supports limit redesign options. The existing 10 lanes have capacity to process 19,000 vehicles per hour. The 2019 demand is 22,000 vehicles per hour with 31,000 projected in 2045. The proposed scope will connect the express lanes from the IH 45 (NHHIP) project with the managed lanes along IH 10 that end just west of IH 610W near the proposed Northwest Transit Center. This would provide a four-lane managed lane structure from IH 610W into downtown Houston. There are three concepts for accommodating both the BRT and managed lane structures. Concept C has

each facility on opposite sides of IH 10. Concept B consolidates the BRT and managed lane facilities into one structure over the eastbound IH 10, which would reduce user impacts during a phased construction. Concept A expands the “canyon” width and adds the managed lanes to the median of IH 10 with the BRT facility elevated on the southside of IH 10. The challenge of the BRT facility is the elevated crossing of IH 10 near IH 610W while preserving the ability to add the managed lane structure in the future.

Maureen C asked about the source of the traffic volume projections.

Will Lisska responded that the data is from the conformity model used by HGAC.

Maureen C asked if the data considered the anticipated public transportation improvements.

Will L responded that he believed the conformity model did include the BRT facility between the Northwest Transit Center and downtown Houston. TxDOT will coordinate with HGAC to verify that the projections from the on-going update of the conformity model are included in TxDOT’s traffic projections.

James K mentioned that the February 25th public meeting will provide another opportunity to comment on this project.

Maureen C asked if there were other HGAC meetings for the amendment.

Vishu L responded that there will be another meeting scheduled in March 2021.

Harrison H requested traffic trends from the past 10 years from 2010 to 2019.

Mike B responded that HGAC can share a response from modeling staff next month.

Jonathan B mentioned lane configuration should be designed to best serve transit users.

Priya Z responded that coordination with TxDOT on the design is on-going and added that the BRT alignment on the south side of IH 10 would work best to avoid bridge conflicts and would include an elevated station.

James K added that there are a number of engineering challenges with connecting the Northwest Transit Center with high speed rail, the BRT lanes, and the REAL concept.

Lloyd S asked about connectivity to the managed lanes within the project corridor.

James K responded that on-going coordination and public meetings will be used to give opportunity to clarify if that is needed.

Maureen C mentioned that the REAL concept is confusing since it seems to be included as part of current project scopes.

James K responded that the managed lanes could be flexibility for use as envisioned in the REAL concept for freight and carpooling.

Maureen C mentioned that the High Capacity Transit Task Force recommendations are being incorporated by considering transit accommodations. No action was taken.

6. Announcements

- Next TPC Meeting – January 22, 2021 at 9:30AM (Teleconference)
- Next RTP Subcommittee Meeting – February 10, 2021 at 1:30PM (Teleconference)
- Next TAC Meeting – February 17, 2021 at 9:30AM (Teleconference)

Maureen C mentioned the future meeting dates and times for TPC, TAC, and RTP Subcommittee

7. Adjourn

Maureen C declared the meeting adjourned at 10:41AM.

Minutes submitted by: Mike Burns