

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Subcommittee Meeting**

Houston-Galveston Area Council

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday March 02, 2022

1:30 PM

AGENDA

1. Subcommittee Roll Call

2. Previous Meeting Summary

A Summary of the February 11, 2022 meeting is available online on the H-GAC Website.

3. 2023-2026 TIP Development Update

Staff will update the Subcommittee on the proposed projects slated for construction or implementation over the next four (4) years.

4. Transit Asset Management Performance Measures

Staff will highlight the proposed Transit Asset Management Plan performance measures targets.

5. Call for projects Update

Staff will continue the presentation from the February 11 TIP Subcommittee meeting and cover the proposed funding targets. Additionally, staff will highlight the schedule of call for projects workshops to be held through the month.

6. Announcements

- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # I – March 9, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TAC Meeting – March 16, 2022, 9:30 a.m., Teleconference (Zoom).
- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # II – March 17, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # III – March 24, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TPC Meeting – February 25, 2021, 9:30 a.m., Teleconference (Zoom).
- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # IV – March 31, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TIP Subcommittee Meeting – April 6, 2022, 1:30 p.m., Hybrid.

7. Adjourn

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

Wednesday, March 02, 2022 – 1:30 pm
Houston-Galveston Area Council
Hybrid Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT

Veronica Chapa-Gorczyński – East End District
Cory Taylor – Chambers County
David Douglas – Liberty County
Frank Simoneaux – City of Baytown
Lloyd Smith – Harris County
Monique Johnson – City of Sugarland
Robert Upton PE – City of Pearland
Shashi Kumar – City of Missouri City
Stacy Slawinski – Fort Bend County
Veronica Davis – City of Houston-PW
Yancy Scott – Waller County
Sherry Weesner – TIRZ 5/Memorial Heights
Bruce Mann – Port Houston
Mike Wilson – Port Freeport
Andy Mao – TxDOT-HOU
Scott Ayres – TxDOT-BMT
Ken Fickes – Harris County

ALTERNATES PRESENT

John Bowen – City of League City
Ricardo Villagrand – City of Mont Belvieu
Karen McKinnon – Brazoria County
David Wurdlow – City of Houston-PW
Alan Clark – METRO

Item 1: Subcommittee Roll Call

The meeting started with a roll call to determine the members and/or alternatives present.

Item 2: Previous Meeting Summary

Members were encouraged to review the February 11, 2022 meeting summary posted on the H-GAC Website, and to forward any changes to staff so the record could be updated.

Item 3: 2023-2026 TIP Development Update

Adam Beckom reminded Subcommittee members that staff had been working on developing the 2023-2026 TIP document and project listing for several months. He described the coordination that occurred with partner agencies and highlighted contents of the new TIP document. A period for public comment opened on March 4, 2022 and will continue through April 4, 2022. Two public meetings were held on March 22, 2022. An interactive webmap containing the proposed TIP projects is available on the H-GAC website.

Item 4: Transit Asset Management Performance Measures

Jamila Owens explained that every transit agency must have a transit asset management plan to ensure a state of good repair for these assets. Aligned with the TIP development cycle, the MPO sets regional targets every two years based on the targets set in the individual transit agency plans. The four categories of assets for which targets are set are:

- Rolling Stock (such as buses and trains);
- Equipment (including non-revenue vehicles);
- Facilities (including transit stations); and
- Infrastructure (primarily for rail).

The performance measure is the percentage of each asset category that has gone beyond their useful life. A lower number is a better number. Baseline numbers were recorded in 2018 and the targets subsequently set for 2020 and 2022 have been met or exceeded. Work is ongoing to set targets for 2024 and 2026.

Item 5: Call for Projects Development Update

PART I:

Craig Raborn opened the presentation with the comment that three things needed to be accomplished in the present call for projects:

- The assignment of unallocated funds to projects;
- Adherence to the selection guidance provided by the TPC; and
- The programming of projects on an appropriate schedule that averts the widespread slippage from assigned letting years.

Craig also encouraged lively discussion on the call for projects agenda items to follow, to give staff an idea of the leanings of the members on different planning issues, as a prelude to the workshops.

Vishu Lingala followed with a discussion on planning factors criteria, continuing from where he left off in the February 11 meeting. Topics included the proposed funding allocations (by investment category), Rural and the Urban planning factors (by investment category), with sample scoring ledgers, and a benefit\cost calculation template.

Comments and Discussion (Part I)

- Small rural counties\communities do not have the personnel to break down the scoring information and be competitive. With so many categories and points it would take a lot of effort to take a simple project and be able to make it competitive. Further simplification of the process or providing some kind of assistance on how to get a project over the goal line would be necessary, so these communities have an opportunity to compete.
- Rural areas do not have the expertise or the assets to adequately compete in this process. H-GAC may want to provide some kind of fund that could assist these counties. Liberty county does not have half a million dollars to put into the development of a project, so we don't compete very well. All the rural counties have the same problem.
- It is difficult for the smaller governments to compete without the same resources and staff as some of the urbanized areas to be able to develop a project that can compete. H-GAC is to be commended for recognizing the need for a rural allocation.
- A freight set-aside would do the same thing as a rural set-aside and should be considered as even the urbanized areas have challenges for projects relating to the freight transport.
- Separating the urban versus the rural is appreciated but the transitioning areas are still at a disadvantage. Looking at the urban planning factors and how things are being weighted, one can imagine the city of Sugarland competing against the city of Houston and not scoring very high in a lot of the categories. It remains a concern as nothing seems to have addressed that issue.
- It may be worth asking colleagues who use CDBG funds if there an opportunity to use CDBG resources.
- It seems "off" that Environment\Ecological criteria is assigned only 5 out of 100 possible points while we are in nonattainment as a region, and emission is an issue.

Part II (After Break):

Vishu presented sample scoring sheets focused on planning factor criteria in the Expand category, using lists of projects submitted in the 2018 call. The examples showed the scoring templates for evacuation routes (featured by functional class), the freight network, railroad crossings, planning coordination, connectivity to jobs, transportation equity, ITS or other technology improvements, safety, congestion, and resilience.

Comments and Discussion (Part II)

- Functional classification is designated by FHWA using several criteria, but they will not change classification because there is a project that seeks to upgrade a facility's specifications.
- How, considering (truck) freight, do the port authorities prioritize what is important to them? Are total hours of delay a relevant consideration? How does the regional freight plan fit within this?
- Connectivity to jobs is good but there is space to consider connection to other land uses like parks or education. At the end of the day, this is all about connectivity. We may need to rethink accessibility to focus on "accessibility to life." Telework is changing how people connect to jobs.
- Given a list of projects with different proximity or interactions with areas with populations of need and vulnerability. Just saying that the characteristics of a surrounding area are a certain type does not indicate whether the project is a benefit or disbenefit and the people are being run

over by a freeway.

- What does LCNI look like in an NHHIP versus a bike-ped project?
- Measuring equity when it informs where projects go or do not go is challenging. It is applaudable to have a planning factor that requires a meaningful analysis rather than gives points to every project. The LCNI or some other index like it identifies where there are populations with certain socio-economic characteristics. The challenge is to understand how a project might impact that population. While adequate data is needed to inform the decision, it should perhaps not be the sole factor considered.
- There is still significant benefit in reducing the overall number of serious crashes even if one is at or below the regional safety target.
- Hot Spots on a low volume road may have a high crash rate as opposed to a high number (volume) of crashes.
- Why are non-injury crashes not considered in the safety calculation? What is the buffer distance to select crashes on the regional crash data reviewer?
- How do you ensure that the project is addressing the type of crashes that are occurring?
- Can H-GAC share links to the resources that have been referred to in the presentations?

Item 6: Announcements

- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # I – March 9, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TAC Meeting – March 16, 2022, 9:30 a.m., Teleconference (Zoom).
- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # II – March 17, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # III – March 24, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TPC Meeting – February 25, 2021, 9:30 a.m., Teleconference (Zoom).
- TIP Subcommittee Workshop # IV – March 31, 2022. 1:00 – 5:00 pm. H-GAC Offices.
- TIP Subcommittee Meeting – April 6, 2022, 1:30 p.m., Hybrid.

Item 7 Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.