

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee
Call for Projects Workshop II**
Houston-Galveston Area Council
Thursday March 17, 2022
1:00 PM

AGENDA

1. **Welcome**
2. **Workshop Notes** [*Public Comments*]
3. **Call for Project Development Update**
Staff will provide an overview of the elements of the call for projects; review the TPC guidance; and discuss specific questions related to planning factors.
4. **Comments and Discussion.**
Open comment and discussion from workshop participants.
5. **Announcements**
 - TIP Public Meeting – March 22, 2022, 2:00 pm. And 5:30pm (Virtual)
 - TIP Call for Projects Workshop III – March 24, 2022, 1:00 pm. In person
 - TPC Meeting – March 25, 2022, 9:30 a.m., Teleconference (Zoom)
 - Call for Projects Workshop IV – March 31, 2022, 1:00 pm. In person
 - TIP Subcommittee Meeting – April 6, 2022, 1:30 p.m., Teleconference (Zoom)
6. **Adjourn**

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SUBCOMMITTEE

CALL FOR PROJECTS WORKSHOP II

Thursday, March 17, 2022 – 1:00pm
Houston-Galveston Area Council
In-Person Meeting

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Veronica Chapa-Gorczyński – East End District	Jonathan Brooks – LINK Houston
Billy Combs – Chambers County	Natalie G. Lopez – Chambers County
Alan Clark – METRO	Ricardo Villagrand– City of Mont Belvieu
Loyd Smith – Harris County	Cory Taylor – Chambers County
Monique Johnson – City of Sugarland	James Koch – TXDOT-HOU
Andy Mao – TxDOT-HOU	Zachary Vogler – Chambers County
Veronica Davis – City of Houston-PW	David Wurdlow – City of Houston-PW
Bruce Mann – Port Houston	Marlisa Briggs – NHA
Catherine McCreight – TxDOT-HOU	James Koch – TXDOT-HOU
Scott Ayres – TxDOT-BMT	Pamela Lebrane – Fort Bend County
Jeffrey English – TXDOT HOU	Charles Airiohuodion – TXDOT-HOU

Item 1: Introductions

The workshop began with a welcome address and general instructions by the TIP Subcommittee Chair, Veronica Chapa-Gorczyński on procedures and expectations for workshop participants and the floor observers.

Item 2: Workshop Technical Notes [Public Comments]

There were no public comments.

Item 3: Call for Projects Update

In his opening statement to the workshop participants, Craig Raborn outlined the agenda for the day: (1) Overview of the elements of the call for projects; (2) Review of the TPC guidance; and as time permitted; (3) the further “workshopping” of the planning factors.

Craig noted that the objective of the Call for Projects is to select a list of projects for funding from which assignments would be made to the TIP, 10-year plan, and the RTP. He noted furthermore that the Call provides an opportunity for H-GAC to address the problems of project slippage and funding sweeps. In the meantime, following federal recommendations, the agency is laying the groundwork to transition from a priority-based project selection process to one that is tied to performance goals and targets.

Craig mentioned that, in a necessary fine-tuning of the process, staff was introducing qualitative scoring for certain planning factors because quantitative scores alone were sometimes unable to inform on important project characteristics or impact. The qualitative approach would require a narrative description of how the project supports or meets a particular call for projects goal or policy requirement. Workshop participants would be expected to express their thoughts on TPC guidelines they thought were important or most relevant for the scoring exercise. Staff envisaged the possibility of re-engaging with the TPC workgroup to verify that the substantive Call design was in keeping with their recommendations.

After Craig’s introduction, Vishu Lingala walked workshop participants through the table of Goals (G_x), Priorities (A_x), and Policies (P_x) which together constituted guidance provided by the TPC for executing the Call for Projects process. The table also listed relevant federal and state planning requirements (F_x).

Workshop proceedings were split into two stints to provide participants a short intermission at the halfway point. The workshop ended with a discussion of questions related to specific planning factors.

Item 4: Comments and Discussion

Part 1:

- When were the public comments referred to in item “G2 – Public Comments” offered? Were these comments incorporated into RTP goals? How do the RTP goals relate to the call for projects?
- Item “G1d”– (economic competitiveness), applying a quantitative measure is problematic as the reason a road needs improvement may not directly or indirectly relate to proximity to jobs.
- Item “G2b” – (management and maintenance). The 2018 CFP map appears to show only one project selected that touches on the maintain category. There is a hole in this category.
- Item “G3b” – (Infrastructure damage by collisions) the loss of use of a facility relates to resilience. Should the San Jacinto bridge repair be considered in the same light as resilience to flooding events?

- The bridge repair project is an example of a project that is best scored by a qualitative (narrative) assessment as opposed to a quantitative one.
- The frequency and length of closure of the San Jacinto river bridge has had such economic impact on the region that makes it a priority project. Is it appropriate to treat major investments the same way we are treat smaller projects?
- Item “G1d” talks about economic competitiveness. Item “A1d” and “A6b” also refer to general support for the economy. These three similar policies and goals together lend support to the argument that economic impact should be a significant factor in the process.
- Further discussion centered around how to define or distinguish between resiliency projects, how to assign scores to such projects, and how to fund mega projects that were beyond the scope of the call

Part 2:

- Items “G1d,” “A1b,” “A6b,” “F1” and “F10” (“P4”) all speak to economic output of project decisions. Staff may consider how these and other items that overlap them can be consolidated in the appropriate context.
- Item “A8” (Support by local communities and affected jurisdictions) – What happens when there are residents opposed to a particular project. How do you satisfy this requirement?
- Does Item “A8” portend to give veto power to a municipal jurisdiction of 5,000 residents over a corridor that serves 5 million? That is not very practical from an administrative perspective.
- An alternate action would be where the owner of the right of way has the larger decision-making authority. Without this, the IH 610 would never have been completed.
- Should projects score higher because they are ready? Because a project is ready does not mean it meets the goals of the region.

Item 5: Announcements

- TIP Public Meeting – March 22, 2022, 2:00 pm. And 5:30pm (Virtual)
- TIP Call for Projects Workshop III – March 24, 2022, 1:00 pm. In person
- TPC Meeting – March 25, 2022, 9:30 a.m., Teleconference (Zoom)
- Call for Projects Workshop IV – March 31, 2022, 1:00 pm. In person
- TIP Subcommittee Meeting – April 6, 2022, 1:30 p.m., Teleconference (Zoom)

Item 6 Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.