

**MEETING OF THE RTP SUBCOMMITTEE
HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL
TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
June 9, 2021
1:30PM
Minutes**

Member Attendance:

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

Others Present: Alan Clark, Alberto Lyne, Andrew Mao, Ayo Jibowu, Adam Beckom, Catherine McCreight, Dale (guest), Jim Dickinson, Diane Domagas, David Fink, Ben Finley, Stephan Gage, Shixin Gao, Brandy George, Thomas Gray, Donte Green, Veronica Green, Harrison (guest), Sandra Holliday, James Koch, Susan Jaworski, Jay (Guest), Sharon Ju, Catherine Kato, Megan Kennison, Sanford Klanfer, Justin Kuzila, Shirley Li, Graciela Lubertino, Jim Mahood, Patrick Mandapaka, Lucinda Martinez, Carlene Mullins, Karen Owen, Frank Pagliei, Ruth Henshall, Ruthanne Haut, Chris Van Slyke, Veronica Waller, Gilbert Washington, Christopher Whaley

Staff Participating:

Mike Burns, Craig Raborn, Vishu Lingala

1. Call to Order
Chair Morad K called the meeting to order at 1:31PM and conducted roll call to ensure a quorum. Morad K confirmed that a quorum was present.
2. Acceptance of Minutes
Jonathan B made a motion to approve, Ken F seconded.

The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Discussion and Possible Recommendations on Requested RTP Amendments

Vishu L presented a summary of the requested RTP Amendments for highway and transit projects, and the associated public outreach. He noted that at the May TPC, TAC, and RTP Subcommittee meetings that staff received 141 comments during both rounds of public review and would be preparing a summary report of the comments received. The report will be posted on the 2045 RTP webpage and the Subcommittee will be notified once it is finalized.

Craig R summarized the review and evaluation criteria. He mentioned that the primary goal was to ensure that the current RTP vision is considered and not substantially altered, noting that approval is not automatic and that an evaluation is necessary to develop recommended actions. He noted that the criteria included consideration the level of urgency, alignment with recent MPO study or plan, demonstrated some jurisdictional support to the request, evaluation of previous reviews, consistency with current RTP, and consideration of any high-level Environmental Justice and Environmental Impact risks.

Vishu L summarized the draft staff recommendations for the 2045 RTP Amendments, which are categorized into three types of approval. The first type of recommendations are projects that are recommended for approval as requested. These included SH288, SH35, I-10E Bridge, I-610E Bridge, I-610S, SL8, SH6, SH99 Segment E and F-2 as requested. The second type of recommendation involves a conditional approval for both segments of SH36A and the I-45/I-10W interchange. The southern section of SH36A is recommended to be included in the RTP implementation schedule contingent upon completion of an expedited planning study to consider the corridor needs and alignment alternatives prior to proceeding to the Environmental phase of the design process. Similarly, the northern section of the SH36A is recommended to be included in the RTP implementation schedule contingent upon completion of a study of needs and alignment alternatives with a condition that the project does not adversely impact property owned or controlled through conservation easements by the Katy Prairie Conservancy. The I-45/I-10W interchange project is recommended contingent upon the completion of a Title VI complaint review by the Federal Highway Administration. The third type of recommendation involves an approval only to include in the RTP as expedited planning studies that evaluate the needs and recommend a scope for the requested projects prior to including them in the RTP implementation schedule. These projects include the SH35, Hempstead Road, I-10W Inner Katy, and I-610W. The type of recommendation requires TPC approval of study recommendations prior to including these projects into the RTP implementation schedule. He summarized the next steps, which include seeking approval of transit project amendments in July, and then, if staff recommendations regarding the amends are approved, start another conformity determination process from July to September with the conformity determination submitted to FHWA in November following TAC/TPC approval.

Craig R noted that the three type of recommendations are draft and for discussion with TxDOT and the Subcommittee. He also noted that the third type of recommendation related to expedited planning studies involves establishing a new Planning and Readiness Program to address issues with delivering projects in the fiscal years they are originally programmed, and to help build consensus and finish MPO planning for high-impact projects. This program would be funded with up to additional 1% of regional STBG suballocation.

Bruce M asked if projects like the 610E Bridge Replacement would be subject to the Planning and Readiness Program, or if they can proceed.

Craig R clarified that the 610E Bridge Replacement was consistent with the regional and local plans and are recommended by staff to be amended as proposed.

Jonathan B thanked staff and noted that it seems like a reasonable approach that addresses comments in a manner that provides a path forward.

Alan C noted that METRO is in the process of hiring a firm for the I-10W Inner Katy BRT design and asked what impact the HGAC recommendation would have on METRO's project since addition study could create some delay.

Craig R responded that the study needs are recommended to be expedited to minimize delays to METRO and TxDOT projects.

Charles A noted that TxDOT has not seen HGAC staff recommendations yet and they appear to conflict with TxDOT plans and that any delay would impact both I-10W Inner Katy projects. A new air quality conformity due to changes will impact schedules for projects. Suggested waiting for TxDOT responses to amendment comments before making a recommendation. He noted that the 610W corridor has been critically congested and was included in the 2008 plan and removed due to funding.

Craig R responded that recommendations are draft and developed recently. RTP projects need to reflect the RTP vision. He noted that he will coordinate with TxDOT following the meeting.

Charles A responded that once TxDOT responses to comments will reflect alignment with the RTP.

Craig R noted that TxDOT has done well handling the volume of comments and looks forward to coordination to review the responses.

Jonathan B asked a question in the chat to clarify the Inner Katy expedited study only includes the TxDOT project or also includes the METRO project.

Craig R responded that since both are in the corridor that the study includes both projects.

Bruce M asked if this issue was informational or is action needed.

Craig R responded that TAC will be taking action next week since their recommendation is more critical for TPC review for the end of the month.

Bruce M asked for clarity if this would be an action for TAC

Craig R clarified that a recommendation will be provided to TAC for approval for TPC review.

James K asked if SH36A North isn't on the list and asked what it wouldn't be an expedited study.

Craig R responded that SH36A North is a 2040 project, so it does not need to be expedited.

James K noted a design challenge that the Inner Katy project conflicts with the METRO project and the project needs to cross a facility to be rebuilt and one project should not preclude another project.

Craig R responded that a design challenge is why an expedited study is recommended with a goal of resolving the challenge so the projects could advance.

David F thanked staff for the effort to find a path forward. He asked will responses to comments be provided to the TAC members.

Craig R responded that about 95% of the comments are done with the last 5% being the more complex comments that require a response.

Andrew M thanked staff for developing a process. He asked how projects get fairly evaluated if criteria is developed after projects are submitted.

Craig R responded that ideally the same process used for the 2018 call for projects. He reviewed the recommended considerations for reviewing the amendments and noted that they aligned with federal regulations and noted that the amendments also needed to align with the region's vision.

And noted that if a project has previously been included and then removed from the RTP indicates that there are consensus issues the MPO staff could help resolve.

Charles A asked if there was a checklist.

Craig R responded that the evaluation document is very rough to share and will share with TxDOT after the meeting to review.

Charles A asked if this is going to be the process going forward.

Craig R responded that the process could evolve going forward and that the TPC policy and prioritization work group established a process for project selection. The process and scoring were informal and informed the evaluation considerations for the amendments. TAC, TIP, and RTP committees need to develop a formal structure for amendments.

Charles A noted that his question related to the process for amendments and evaluating comments to the amendments.

Craig R anticipated that staff will be developing a full step by step process that aligns with TxDOT.

Morad K asked for a motion for a recommendation.

Jonathan Brook made a motion recommending concurrence with the process present by staff to move this process forward contingent on staff finalizing a recommendation for TAC. Seconded by Ken F. The vote was eighteen (18) in favor with Charles A abstaining until receiving more information on the staff recommendation.

4. Announcements

- a. Next TAC Meeting – June 16, 2021 at 9:30AM (Teleconference)
- b. Next TPC Meeting – June 25, 2021 at 9:30AM (Teleconference)
- c. Next RTP Subcommittee Meeting – July 14, 2021 at 1:30PM (Teleconference)

Morad K summarized the future meetings under the announcements.

5. Adjourn

Morad K asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by Bruce M and seconded by Loyd S to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40PM.

Minutes submitted by: Mike Burns