

MEETING OF THE RTP SUBCOMMITTEE  
**HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL**  
**TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**  
**June 14, 2023**  
**1:30PM**  
**Minutes**

**Member Attendance:**

<b>Primary-Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Alternate-Name</b>	<b>Present</b>
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	YES
Monique Johnson	YES	Marcus Snell	YES
David Fields	YES	Ian Hlavacek	NO
Kimberly Judge	NO	Shashi Kumar	NO
Timothy Smith	NO	Jay Knight	NO
Todd Stephens	YES	Ruthann Haut	YES
Morad Kabiri	YES	Jildardo Arias	NO
Cara Davis	YES	Christopher Sims	NO
Jameson Appel	YES	Yolci Ramirez	YES
Perri D'Armond	YES	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	YES
Lisa Collins	NO	Arnold Vowles	YES
Ken Fickes	YES	Vernon Chambers	YES
Sean Middleton	NO	Vacant	
Albert Lyne	YES	Rachel Die	NO
Brian Alcott	YES	Vacant	

**Others Present:** Cassandra Marshall, Catherine McCreight, Richard Cowart, Yancy Scott, Eduardo Perez, Melanie Beaman, Stephen Gage, Eliza Paul, Tim (Guest), Patrick Mandapaka, Shixin Gao, Megan Kennison, Sharon Ju, Joshua (Guest), David Fink

**Staff Participating:**

Anita Hollmann Matijcio, Stephen Keen, Karen Owen,

1. Call to Order
  - a. Chair Perri D'Armond calls the meeting to order at 1:30 PM
  - b. Chair confirms quorum
2. Acceptance of Meeting Minutes from May 10, 2023.
  - a. Chair Perri D'Armond calls for motion to approve
  - b. Morad Kabiri moves to approve, Mike Wilson seconds
3. Bridge and Pavement Performance Measures and Targets (Karen Owen)
  - a. Karen presents on Bridge and Pavement Performance Measures and Targets.

- a) Last month, this was presented as an informational item. In June, the RTP Subcommittee's endorsement is requested at the conclusion of this presentation.
  - b) The federal performance measures for pavement and bridge are focused on the National Highway System. H-GAC has the responsibility of setting targets in the 8-county region.
  - c) Based on International Roughness Index (IRI, Cracking, and Rutting or Faulting). Past targets (2022) and future targets (2024 and 2026). Bridge targets were narrowly missed. Inter-governmental coordination to address targets.
  - d) Questions/Comments
    - Chair Perri D'Armond asks if there's anything in the TIP or RTP that could affect the targets?
      - a. Karen Owen says that everybody addresses these performance measures in their submitted projects.
  - e) Chair Perri D'Armond motions for endorsement
    - Mike Wilson moves for approval, Morad Kabiri seconds.
4. RTP Project Selection Process (Stephen Keen)
- a. Stephen presents on the RTP Project Evaluation Process
    - a) The RTP Subcommittee is charged with guiding the development of an RTP Project Evaluation process. They will: determine how to add or amend projects, identify when the optimal timing is for the evaluation of projects, and determine what incentives, if needed, could be identified to submit projects to the RTP project list. H-GAC does not have an RTP Evaluation Process for project submittals. The RTP Subcommittee will guide this development.
    - b) What we heard from May's RTP Subcommittee meeting is that the process should align with RTP vision and goals outlined in the most recent RTP update, enhance the frequency of RTP project evaluation, define benefits of RTP inclusion, and refine project planning before programming. Stephen reminded RTP Subcommittee members that the 2045 RTP Update was adopted in April and concluded three phases of public outreach for the region. The vision statement, goals, and desired outcomes outlined in the 2045 RTP Update were reiterated as well.
      - Peter Eccles asked if the language in the vision statement, goals, and outcomes could be more specific.
        - a. Stephen Keen says that implementing a project evaluation process could allow for further defining of these words and close the possibility of misinterpretation.
    - c) Stephen Keen presents information gathered from peer reviews with the Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission, North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), and the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC).
      - Nantucket has one project evaluation process. Project readiness is evaluating via scoring formula. A project considered not ready will be sent for revision. Sponsor can ask staff for help in readying project for inclusion into the RTP and, ultimately, the TIP. This allows for initiation into MPO documents.
      - The NCTCOG have two separate project evaluation processes. Their RTP project evaluation process is more of an intake process, while their TIP process is more strategic. Their inclusion requirements include

demonstrating strong local support, known funding sources, and conveying the need. They also consider East-West project distribution. Federal planning factors are integral to the Plan. If the project scores low on RTP intake, staff will help groom project to get it into the TIP.

- The ARC has two separate project evaluation processes. Their RTP is reserved for major projects and scoring is less stringent than TIP scoring. They use Comprehensive Transportation Plans at the county level that are the building block for the RTP. These plans have individual project lists that have gone through vetting and planning processes. Their RTP Project evaluation is consistent with goals outlined in their Policy Framework and their most recent RTP update.
  - Key observations include:
    - a. The RTP serves as the initiating document for projects
    - b. RTP project selection is consistent with the Plan
    - c. Many projects undergo planning efforts before RTP submission
    - d. Staff helps sponsors groom projects for the TIP
    - e. RTP evaluation process is not TIP evaluation process
- d) Questions or comments
- Charles Airiohuodian asks what the difference between what we are doing now and what staff is proposing regarding adding projects to the RTP.
    - a. Stephen Keen responds that while we have had call for projects, we do not have a formalized process. Staff wants a formalized process that can repeat in future call for projects.
  - Mike Wilson says that the three-year process is the vehicle to get into the RTP. This timeframe is what we should be focused on.
  - Monique Johnson says that the current process is the starting point to get into the RTP and then we branch it off. The projects then go into the TIP bucket or the RTP bucket. The question is at what point do we put these projects into their respective buckets. The work we have done should be used as a starting point.
  - Morad Kabiri says that the overarching goal is to funnel our projects from inception to construction. There is a need for a consistent process by which to vet our projects and further them forward.
  - Chair Perri D'Armond says that the RTP is more about the out years. Getting projects into the long-range plan should be desirable because of staff help grooming projects.
- e) Stephen Keen goes over next steps. Staff will meet with the Southern California Association of Governments and will report back during the July meeting. He asks members if there is more information that needs to be presented in the July meeting that could help start the development of the process.
- Katherine Summerlin asks if the RTP contains projects that have already attained conformity.
    - a. Stephen Keen says that the air quality conformity process is currently under federal review. While the process on H-GAC's side is complete, staff is waiting for federal approval.
  - Vice-Chair David Fields says identify which scoring considerations are prevalent among the peer reviews and lay them out for the

Subcommittee. This can give examples to members and could help build out the H-GAC process.

- f) Stephen Keen says that staff wants to define and coordinate nomenclature to ensure complete clarity between H-GAC and project sponsors.
- g) Stephen Keen asks the Subcommittee to keep an end date in mind. He also asks members if they need further information to start the development process.
  - Chair Perri D'Armond asks to add H-GAC to the summary table in the PowerPoint Presentation.
  - Monique Johnson asks to present an example to the RTP Subcommittee to allow members to respond and critique.
  - Eliza Paul asks how often can H-GAC update the RTP and how early does a project need to be included in the RTP?
    - a. Stephen Keen says the RTP is updated every planning cycle. There is no set timetable for amendment approval. A project should be submitted into the RTP as soon as possible so it can undergo evaluation.
    - b. Mike Wilson says that projects should be in as soon as possible, which means they need to go through the three-year process and then into the RTP.
    - c. Vice-Chair David Fields says that this is not an evaluation process, but it is a prep process.
    - d. Eliza Paul says we need to show the differences between the RTP and the TIP.

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: June 23, 2023, at 9:30 AM (Hybrid)
  - c. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Subcommittee
    - a) Next meeting: July 12, 2023, at 1:30 PM
6. Adjourn
- a. Chair Perri D'Armond calls for adjournment at 2:43 PM