

**MEETING OF THE RTP SUBCOMMITTEE  
HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL  
TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS  
August 11, 2021  
1:30PM  
Minutes**

**Member Attendance:**

<b>Primary-Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Alternate-Name</b>	<b>Present</b>
Morad Kabiri, Chair	Yes	Robert Upton	
Perri D'Armond, Vice Chair	Yes	Stacy Slawinski	
Monique Johnson	No	Krystal LaStrape	Yes
Bill Zrioka	Yes	Marcel Allen	
Andrea French	No	Nikki Knight	No
Elijah Williams	Yes	Elizabeth Whitton	Yes
Iris Gonzalez	No	Jonathan Brooks	Yes
Adam France	No	Chris Bogert	No
Christopher Sims	Yes	Hon. Chad Tressler	
Matt Hanks	No	Karen McKinnon	Yes
David Fields	Yes	Vacant	
Hon. Jay Knight	No	David Douglas	Yes
Loyd Smith	Yes	Bryan Brown	
Nick Woolery	Yes	Frank Simoneaux	
Yancy Scott	Yes	Jared Chen	No
Katherine Parker	No	Carol Lewis	No
Bruce Mann	Yes	Rohit Saxena	
Rodger Rees	Yes	Brett Milutin	No
Charles Airiohuodion	Yes	Jeffrey English	Yes
Lisa Collins	Yes	Scott Ayres	
Ken Fickes	Yes	Vernon Chambers	Yes
Kenneth Brown	Yes	Philip Brenner	
John Tyler	No	Dale Hilliard	No

**Others Present:** 713-469-2979 (GUEST), Alan Clark, Andrew Mao, Ayo Jibowu, Adam Beckom, Catherine McCreight, Andrew DeCandis, Jim Dickinson, Diane Domagas, Eliza Paul, Carrie Evans, David Fink, Stephan Gage, Shixin Gao, Brandy George, Thomas Gray, Harrison (GUEST), Allie Isbell, James Koch, Susan Jaworski, Sharon Ju, Catherine Kato, Megan Kennison, Sanford Klanfer, Justin Kuzila, Shirley Li, Vishu Lingala, Jim Mahood, Patrick Mandapaka, Karen Owen, Jamila Owens, Frank Pagliei, Craig Raborn, Ruthanne Haut, Christopher Sims, Chris Van Slyke, Veronica Waller, Gilbert Washington

**Staff Participating:**

Mike Burns

1. Call to Order  
Chair Morad K called the meeting to order at 1:30PM and conducted roll call to ensure a quorum. Morad K confirmed that a quorum was present.
2. Acceptance of Minutes  
Christopher S made a motion to approve, Bruce M seconded.

The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Discussion of the 2045 RTP Updating Strategy

a. Vision Statement – David Fields comments

Mike B described feedback received at the July monthly meeting on updating the vision statement and the subsequent comment received from David F.

David F discussed the comment he provided to staff saying it was a starting point to the conversation that is an example of short and easily remembered so it could be described to others. Morad K agree that it should be easily remembered and concise, and then asked for comments. Mike B noted that there will be a public outreach effort to gain additional feedback on the vision, and that it will ultimately need TAC and TPC approval.

Andrew M noted that the effort to decrease congestion is not in the example vision.

Bruce M noted that freight access as an element of the economy is not in the example vision.

Perri D agreed that freight should be referenced in the vision statement.

Morad K noted that congestion and freight can be addressed as part of the efficient transportation system and asked if it was better to mention freight as part of goals rather than specifically in the vision statement.

Stephan G suggested that the word commerce be added after all travelers.

Christopher S suggested adding multimodal before transportation system to cover all users, and agreed that the vision should be short and concise.

Perri D suggested added multimodal and removing all travelers.

Morad K restated that the vision should be short and that every member should easily recall the language and repeat it easily.

Charles A suggested adding air quality since the region is in nonattainment and that would contribute to the quality of life.

Andrew M agreed that the statement should be catchy and is important and that the committee take time to fully understand the language being used.

Morad K suggested adding multimodal and deleting all users for review at the next meeting.

b. 2040 RTP and 2045 RTP – Visioning Map and Regional Investment Corridors

Mike B described the 2040 future vision map used in a previous updating cycle and asked for feedback on preference of using a composite map of fiscally constrained and all other supported transportation investment ideas that may not be part of the fiscally constrained schedule of improvements.

Morad K mentioned that he preferred the conceptual composite map and appreciated those types of visuals in the regional plan.

Jonathan B agreed that the conceptual map was preferred to show the scale and variety and intersectionality of modes and asked if the map would be updated to reflect currently supported investment ideas.

Kenneth B asked if the map would be updated to reflect the METRONext vision plan.

Mike B responded that the map shown was developed for the 2040 plan and would be updated to show the investments for the 2050.

Morad K noted a comment was submitted from Jamila O suggesting that the high-capacity projects on the 2040 map reflect the METRONext vision plan.

Mike B asked if Bill Z would support the inclusion of Houston Airport System's Spaceport vision into a similar map.

Morad K noted that a Bill Z submitted a chat that it would be supported.

David F asked if there could be a land use component and if an online version could be provided.

Mike B mentioned that an online portal could be developed to provide the paperless functionality and analysis that David F suggested.

Mike B mentioned that staff would like guidance on the 2040 summary sheets, and if that would be something the committee would like in the next updated, specifically noting project status,

environmental impacts, and safety measures, and asked if Stephan G could elaborate on possible safety scoring features.

Stephan G mentioned that the Transportation Safety Subcommittee is working on secondary performance measures in addition to the federally required safety performance measures that are spatial and can be mapped. Those secondary safety measures and benchmarks will need approval by TAC and TPC and will be shared at a future meeting with a description of how those measures and benchmarks will be used for project evaluation.

Bruce M mentioned that the data in the RTP at the time of approval will not accurately reflect the changes in on-going development and refinements of studies and projects.

Mike B responded that the RTP can reflect the status and impact of projects as they are understood at the time of approval with the understanding that the status or impact can change.

Catherine M agreed that the status of a project should be added, and mentioned that the scoring is a concern, and also that projects should not be considered for construction funding without prior inclusion in the RTP, noting that the RTP is a 20-year timeframe with plan authority occurring in the 10-20 year timeframe for planning, modeling, impact assessment, and public outreach prior to the development authority in years 4-10 of the RTP where environmental, right of way, and planning schematics. The final 4 years of the RTP should mirror the 4-year schedule in the TIP. Morad K agreed that the project should first be in the RTP before being programmed in the TIP and agreed that the 4-year updating schedule was an opportunity to revisit the status of projects. Christopher S also agreed with the need to revisit project prioritization and agreed with the project status and score being included and asked for flexibility to add project within the 4-year window to address any urgent needs that arise.

Catherine M responded that the document can be amended and is typically amended monthly.

Loyd S suggested that instead of project score that a project history could be used.

Mike B clarified that conceptual projects could be scored more simplistically rather than using what was described as a construction scoring system used for the Call for Projects and more well-developed projects to be programmed for the TIP.

Charles A suggested that the summary sheet should include the PEL studies, such as the Gulf Freeway PEL.

David F asked for clarification to verify that every study would not be included in a summary sheet, rather only the RTP's project major project.

Morad K and Charles A confirmed that studies will be noted in the RTP.

Alan C suggested via chat to include other projects that may be outside the region.

c. Stakeholder Outreach Strategy – Federally Required and Other Stakeholders

Mike B summarized the federally required stakeholders required to be consulted during development of an RTP.

Morad K suggested the committee review who may be the other interested parties by consulting with their local agencies.

#### 4. Announcements

a. Next TAC Meeting – August 18, 2021 at 9:30AM (Teleconference)

b. Next TPC Meeting – August 27, 2021 at 9:30AM (Teleconference)

c. Next RTP Subcommittee Meeting – September 15, 2021 at 1:30PM (Teleconference)

Morad K mentioned that the September 15, 2021 meeting has a conflict and suggested polling the members for a time on Tuesday September 14, 2021 meeting date.

Mike B agreed to prepare that for the next meeting.

#### 5. Adjourn

Morad K asked for any other comments. Hearing none, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 2:23PM.

Minutes submitted by: Mike Burns

## **RTP Meeting 8/11/21 – Chat History**

[1:51 PM] Owens, Jamila

Yes. The two are in alignment.

[1:51 PM] Owens, Jamila

The High Capacity and Metro Next that is.

(1 liked)

[1:52 PM] Jonathan Brooks

Continuing discussion about what to include is worthwhile...especially given if we might want to update also to reflect things like the [potential] Amtrak frequency improvements and other increased services and attendant capital investments.

[1:54 PM] Alan Clark

There are other statewide projects like I-12 which is just outside the 8 county region. So you might want to also have a "bigger" map showing more statewide context. HSR is another project like this.

[1:54 PM] Zrioka, Bill - HAS

Sorry, Mike. I got pulled out of the office temporarily. We can include Spaceport in some capacity. Let me check into it further with management.

[1:59 PM] Unknown User Nick Woolery (City of Baytown) (Guest) no longer has access to the chat.

[2:12 PM] Jonathan Brooks

I must log-off now, headed out to interview some bus riders in NE Houston. Y'all have a great day. Keep up the rich conversation.

(1 liked)

[2:12 PM] Catherine McCreight (Guest)

Good point Mike. Projects should first be screened based on their ability to meet the goals outlined in the RTP. The TIP should be concerned with project readiness.

(1 liked)

[2:13 PM] Catherine McCreight (Guest)

The TIP is not the time to determine whether a project brings value to the region since the funding is actually being programmed for construction (i.e., Construct Authority). Plan and Develop Authority are where the merits of the project are identified.

[2:21 PM] Unknown User Harrison (Guest) no longer has access to the chat.

[1:51 PM] Owens, Jamila

Yes. The two are in alignment.

[1:51 PM] Owens, Jamila

The High Capacity and Metro Next that is.

(1 liked)

[1:52 PM] Jonathan Brooks

Continuing discussion about what to include is worthwhile...especially given if we might want to update also to reflect things like the [potential] Amtrak frequency improvements and other increased services and attendant capital investments.

[1:54 PM] Alan Clark

There are other statewide projects like I-12 which is just outside the 8 county region. So you might want to also have a "bigger" map showing more statewide context. HSR is another project like this.

[1:54 PM] Zrioka, Bill - HAS

Sorry, Mike. I got pulled out of the office temporarily. We can include Spaceport in some capacity. Let me check into it further with management.

[1:59 PM] Unknown User Nick Woolery (City of Baytown) (Guest) no longer has access to the chat.

[2:12 PM] Jonathan Brooks

I must log-off now, headed out to interview some bus riders in NE Houston. Y'all have a great day. Keep up the rich conversation.

(1 liked)

[2:12 PM] Catherine McCreight (Guest)

Good point Mike. Projects should first be screened based on their ability to meet the goals outlined in the RTP. The TIP should be concerned with project readiness.

(1 liked)

[2:13 PM] Catherine McCreight (Guest)

The TIP is not the time to determine whether a project brings value to the region since the funding is actually being programmed for construction (i.e., Construct Authority). Plan and Develop Authority are where the merits of the project are identified.

[2:21 PM] Unknown User Harrison (Guest) no longer has access to the chat.