MEETING OF THE RTP SUBCOMMITTEE
HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL
TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
July 12, 2023
1:30PM
Minutes

Member Attendance:

Primary-Name	Present	Alternate-Name	Present
Joe Cutrufo	NO	Nikki Knight	NO
Bill Zrioka	YES	Marcel Allen	NO
Elijah Williams	NO	Elizabeth Whitton	NO
Peter Eccles	YES	Dexter Handy	YES
Harrison Humphreys	YES	Amy Skicki	NO
Monique Johnson	YES	Marcus Snell	YES
David Fields	YES	Ian Hlavacek	NO
Kimberly Judge	NO	Shashi Kumar	YES
Timothy Smith	NO	Jay Knight	NO
Todd Stephens	YES	Ruthann Haut	NO
Morad Kabiri	YES	Jildardo Arias	NO
Cara Davis	NO	Christopher Sims	NO
Jameson Appel	YES	Yolci Ramirez	NO
Perri D'Armond	NO	Stacy Slawinski	NO
Katherine Parker	YES	Katherine Summerlin	YES
Bruce Mann	YES	Rohit Saxena	NO
Mike Wilson	YES	Jason Miura	NO
Charles Airiohuodion	YES	Jeffrey English	NO
Lisa Collins	NO	Arnold Vowles	YES
Ken Fickes	YES	Vernon Chambers	YES
Sean Middleton	NO	Vacant	
Albert Lyne	YES	Rachel Die	YES
Brian Alcott	YES	Vacant	

Others Present: Veronica Waller, Anita Hollman Matijcio, Carrie Evans, Megan Kennison, Catherine McCreight, Stephen Gage, Vishu Lingala, Allie Isbell, David Fink, Craig Raborn, Gloria Brown, Daniel Brassil, Tim (Guest), Karen Owen, Shixin Gao, Christopher Whaley, Adam Beckom, Sara Delroshan, Thomas Gray, Sharon Ju, Melanie Beaman, Alan Clark, Yancy Scott
Staff Participating:
Stephen Keen

1. Call to Order
    a. Vice-Chair David Fields calls the meeting to order at 1:30 PM
    b. Chair confirms quorum
2. Acceptance of Meeting Minutes from June 14, 2023.
    a. Stephen Keen says that meeting minutes will be sent out before the August meeting. Both the June and July meeting minutes will be up for acceptance by the Subcommittee during the August meeting.
3. RTP Project Evaluation Process

a. Stephen Keen presents on the RTP Project Evaluation Process continuing agenda item.
   a) H-GAC has a formalized Project Selection Process. Staff are charging the RTP Subcommittee with guiding the development of an RTP Specific Project Evaluation Process, that acts as complementary to the current Project Selection Process.
   b) How an RTP Project Evaluation is Beneficial for the Regional Transportation Plan
      1. Establish a second process to add projects to the RTP
      2. Maximize planning efforts
      3. Ask the question "Should this project be implemented?
         a. Does it align with the vision and goals of the RTP?
         b. What is the impact on the greater transportation network and does it help achieve the region's ideal network?
      4. Enables projects 20+ years out to be evaluated by Staff
   c) Staff addresses comments from previous RTP Meetings
      1. This task will not alter the current, established Project Selection Process
      2. Members want this process to align with the 2045 RTP Update
      3. The establishment of an RTP specific evaluation process would enhance the frequency of adding projects to the RTP
      4. Projects benefit from further planning activities as it cycles through the MPO planning process
      5. This process allows projects to continue planning activities before programming
      6. RTP scoring considerations include, but are not limited to, federal planning factors, regional planning factors, performance measures, and adherence to the RTP vision and goals.
      7.
   d) Questions and Comments
      1. Charles Airiohuodion asks how this process is going to complement the already existing process?
         a. Stephen Keen replies that this process will be another way to get projects into the RTP. While the current Project Selection Process will continue to intake RTP projects, the RTP specific Project Evaluation Process will serve RTP projects submissions only.
      2. Bruce Mann asks how do we put a placeholder that says there will be projects that are ready to let before the next RTP?
         a. Stephen Keen asks if enhancing the frequency of project evaluation to the RTP would address this.
         b. Bruce Mann responds that allowing a mechanism to update the RTP when we know there are major projects identified and there is significant time until the next RTP Update could be most beneficial.
   e) Staff met with four MPOs to discuss their RTP Project Evaluation Process
      1. Nantucket MPO
         a. One project evaluation process
         b. All ideas or needs identified via planning activities can be added to the RTP. Submissions can be conceptual.
         c. RTP inclusion benefits include the possibility of receiving federal planning funding, and being implemented sooner if

additional funding has become available and the project past the engineering stage.

2. North Central Texas Council of Governments
   a. Two project evaluation processes
   b. Projects aimed to address RTP themes: Mobility, Quality of Life, System Sustainability, and Implementation.
   c. RTP Inclusion requirements
      i. Strong local support
      ii. Demonstrate known funding sources
      iii. Convey the Need
   d. Project trait considerations include East-West project distributions and social considerations, such as changing demographics or attitudes toward transportation.

3. Atlanta Regional Commission
   a. Two project evaluation processes
   b. RTP Project Evaluation Process is consistent with their Policy Framework and most updated RTP
   c. Prioritizes projects from GDOT and MARTA
      i. Entities have their own evaluation and community input processes
   d. Next, they prioritize projects from their county level Comprehensive Transportation Plans
      i. Not compulsory, but federal funding is available for developmental assistance.
      ii. Projects from these plans are the RTP building block
   e. Projects run through TDM to understand how a project performs individually and as a system

4. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
   a. Two project evaluation processes.
   b. Currently revamping RTP project evaluation processes
      i. Presently, the County Commissions submit projects to the RTP with little evaluation or ranking tools.
      ii. A question they are posing internally is: Should a project be added to the RTP before becoming TIP eligible?
   c. Staff aims to prioritize performance-based planning, adhering to: Federal planning factors, federal and regional performance measures, state greenhouse gas emissions law, and equity factors.
   d. Questions and comments
      i. Mike Wilson says that over the past two years, TAC members and staff have pre-evaluation that is fact driven for the RTP. The three years prior to getting into the RTP is good because there is time for thorough vetting in the project process. Mike encourages us to continue to allow this to be a major link between the RTP and the TIP.
      ii. Catherine McCreight finds the question "Should a project be added to the RTP before being TIP eligible?" troubling if we're trying to develop an RTP based on a constructed authority window. She says that theres seems to be a lack of understanding of what the long

range plan is. Projects should move through a project development pipeline towards construction of toward the TIP.

        1. Vice-Chair David Fields responds that this RTP process would be a much broader brush. As projects are submitted to the RTP, it funnels down from the 20 to 10 to 4 year window. Project information would be added and developed as it inched closer to construction authority.

           a. Catherine McCreight thanks Vice-Chair Fields for his clarification.

5. General key takeaways:
   a. Similarly sized MPOs have an RTP specific project evaluation process
   b. MPOs have multiple avenues for adding projects to the RTP
   c. Projects undergo planning activities throughout its MPO life cycle, which can include projects early on in development
   d. MPOs consider federal and regional factors in selecting projects

6. Next Steps
   a. Staff poses these questions to members:
      i. Does the RTP Subcommittee recommend the development of an RTP Specific Project Evaluation Process?
      ii. What needs to be further explained before an example RTP specific project evaluation process is presented?
      iii. What does the subcommittee want to see as part of an example?
   b. Questions and Comments
      i. Alan Clark says that the RTP needs to think about how the transportation network works as a system. He has concerns that we have not looked at the ability of the network to serve the traveler. Alan asks how do these various projects work together? What can we evaluate and what does that tell us. We need to think in terms of how projects fit together. For example, the 2040 RTP looked at how transit services and facilities served the whole region.
         1. Craig Raborn responds that this thought aligns with what we want the RTP to be. An RTP is two types of documents rolled into one: a project list and a statement of vision and policy. There is a middle ground between two of those: What the system should look like. The last RTP tries to convey this.
      ii. David Fields says how do we translate our vision statement, goals, and desired outcomes into our transportation system. David asks members to answer these three questions: Does the RTP Subcommittee recommend the development of an RTP Specific Project Evaluation Process? What needs to be further explained

before an example RTP specific project evaluation process is presented? What does the subcommittee want to see as part of an example?

    1. Katherine Summerlin looks at the peacock graphic seems like a regional project prioritization. To inform the process, it would need some data where the public stands on what they value most and categorize the projects accordingly.

        a. David Fields says let us hold off on priority.

    2. Monique Johnson says its hard to answer these questions without understanding what the network looks like at a big picture level. Understanding what the overarching network looks like is a big part of this.

        a. David Fields puts forward questions: How does this project help locally? How does it help regionally? How does this project advance the transportation network as a whole.

    3. David Fields asks if members agree to respond to several questions from staff in two weeks time.

        a. Members agree to do this.

4. Action Items
5. Announcements
   a. Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
      a) Next meeting: July 19, 2023, at 9:30 AM (Hybrid)
   b. Transportation Policy Council (TPC)
      a) Next meeting: July 28, 2023, at 9:30 AM (Hybrid)
   c. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Subcommittee
      a) Next meeting: August 9, 2023, at 1:30 PM
6. Adjourn
   a. Vice-Chair David Fields calls for adjournment at 2:38 PM