

Southeast Harris County Subregional Study
Public Meeting #2
Via ZOOM
March 28, 2022
6:00PM
Meeting Summary

Attendance – see attached attendance report.

The meeting started at 6:00PM

1. Project Team

Mike Burns provided a summary for the purpose of the meeting and the Project Team, Steering Committee members, and Stakeholder Groups that have been involved with the study.

2. Project Overview

Michael Feeny of Kimley Horn described the study area, primary corridors, and the TxDOT PEL studies abutting the study area.

3. Vision and Goals

Michael Feeny described the vision and goals for the study, including the measures used to evaluate recommendation alignment with study goals.

4. Study Area

Michael Feeny summarized the project schedule and the key findings in the first phase of the study, which included a summary of public comments from the first Public Meeting, safety and congestion issues within the study area, and summarized initial recommendations for addressing safety and mobility issues that were identified. This included intersection improvements to reduce delay, active transportation facilities, accessibility upgrades for pedestrians and transit users, and a recommendation for further feasibility study of potential transit services that could be provide within the study area.

5. Public Commenting Demonstration

Josie Ortiz provided instructions and demonstrated the online public engagement commenting tool for the public to review recommended improvements and to share location-specific comments.

6. Q&A – Audience Participation

Mike Burns initiated the question and answer portion of the meeting.

Question from Priscilla Argueta: will the study recommend smart intersections that included various infrastructure, such as traffic signals, that could be adjusted based on current conditions.

Answer from Michel F: those improvements could be included where appropriate, but there currently is no industry-standard available yet that provide guidance on incorporating specific smart intersection standards.

Question from Priscilla Argueta: requested that the shared use path proposed for Lawndale Drive be located along the north side of the roadway. Also, lighting and bike repair stations are also needed along some shared use paths and asked if these was part of the recommendations.

Answer from Michael F: there is no specific recommendation yet for that location, but the comment will be noted for the Steering Committee. Regarding the shared use path lighting and repair stations, those comments will be shared and will may subject to local municipal regulations.

Question from Trinidad (phone): asked if there was a recommendation for public transportation in the City of Pasadena.

Answer from Mike B: mentioned that, since a detailed transit study was beyond the scope of the study, that the current recommendation is for subsequent transit-specific study of service types, including micro transit, fixed route, or on-demand service, that may be more cost effective.

Question from Trinidad (phone): asked if the study would include the original transit proposal for Pasadena from 5 years ago.

Answer from Michael F: that could be included in the recommended subsequent study, including a deeper dive into the origins and destination to serve potential users.

Question from Pat Van Houte: will questions asked during the meeting be considered with the online commenting?

Answer from Michael F: yes, it will carry the same weight.

Question from Pat Van Houte: will reflective backplates be used for traffic signals? Also, at the intersection of Red Bluff Rd at Pasadena, could a left turn lane be provided instead of a right turn lane for the east-west traffic flow? Lastly, Southmore from Strawberry to Burke was repaved less than 10 years ago, so perhaps other projects could be prioritized.

Answer from Michael F: regarding the reflective backplates, some high crash locations could benefit from this type of treatment. Regarding the left turn lanes at Red Bluff Rd at Pasadena, the team will revisit the modeling to evaluate if a left turn lane is needed. Regarding the priority of Southmore Rd recommendation, the forecast year is 20 years out, so there may be other initial priorities implemented sooner.

Question from Linda (attendee): asked about a sidewalk along north side of Genoa Red Bluff Rd near Burke St. Also, regarding pavement marking at intersection of Genoa Red Bluff and Beltway 8, the signage and markings creates confusion for which lanes are for left turns only which creates a lot of near misses due to need to change lanes. Lastly, there is a path at Crenshaw Burke Park with a trail that is not connected to the existing facility along the roadway.

Answer from Michael F: will verify that a sidewalk along the north side is being recommended. Regarding Genoa Red Bluff at Beltway 8, that comment will be shared with the appropriate agency. Regarding the path in Crenshaw Burke Park, that need for a connection will be shared with the appropriate agency.

Questions from the Chat feature:

Lilly Cortez: Would you all ask TXDOT to improve the maintenance on the ramp of 610 N getting on from 225 by Milby HS?

Answer from Michael F: this will be shared with TxDOT.

Trinidad's iPhone: Is public transportation ever going to be place in Pasadena area to connect with other existing bus systems.

Answer from Mike B: that will be part of a recommendation for a subsequent transit-specific study.

linda: what's the web address to get to that mapping site

Answer from Priscilla Argueta: <https://maps.kimley-horn.com/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5febe60e7c534688ad071cd05d29c8bc>

Answer from Josie Ortiz: <https://engage.h-gac.com>

Priscilla Argueta: thanks

Lilly Cortez: Thanks

SD6 Pat Van Houte: Thanks.

The meeting ended at 6:55PM