

**CORPUS CHRISTI METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, May 16, 2019**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Quorum determination

Mr. Brian DeLatte called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

TAC Members Present:

Brian DeLatte, P.E., City of Portland

Sarah Munoz, P.E., City of Corpus Christi

Jeff Pollack, AICP, Port of Corpus Christi

Richard Bullock, Coastal Bend Council of Government

Paula Sales-Evans, P.E., TxDOT-CRP

MPO Staff Present: Rob MacDonald, MPA, P.E.; Daniel Carrizales; Victor Mendieta; and Yoshiko Boulan

2. Introduction of visiting agency officials

Mr. MacDonald welcomed and introduced Ms. Georgi Jasenovec representing the FHWA Freight Operations and International Border – Texas Division.

3. Public Comments for Items not on the agenda

Mr. DeLatte asked for public comments for items not on the agenda; no public comments were offered.

4. Discussion and Possible Action

A. 2020 – 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Project Prioritization Methodology and Performance Measures.

Mr. MacDonald briefed TAC members on the memorandum outlining the MPO's project prioritization methodology based on the federally required performance measures and criteria. The memo briefly explains the summary, recommendation, proposed motion by the TAC, financial impact, and background information to facilitate the understanding and discussion of the topic. Mr. MacDonald also requested the TAC members provide their thoughts and comments on the format of the memo for future application. Mr. MacDonald explained that the objectives today were to discuss and receive the TAC recommendations on this new methodology and project ranking based on this methodology. However, due to the complexity of the topic, the MPO is planning to hold a workshop on May 23, 2019 for further discussion.

Mr. Mendieta explained the new methodology with three attachments; (1) TxDOT Project Criteria, Weights, and Descriptions, (2) 2019 Project Performance Measures, Weights, and Descriptions, and (3) 2020 – 2045 MTP Project Prioritization Table. The MPO performance measure list has been refined since its initial development in 2017. The MPO's weighting was developed by mirroring TxDOT's weighting to the MPO's performance measures where possible and adjusting the remaining weights to reflect the MPO's assessment of regional priorities. Based on the MPO's weighting system, the projects in the MTP are ranked as shown in the 2020 – 2045 MTP Project Prioritization Table.

Ms. Sales-Evans asked about the context of one of the Performance Measures, Stewardship. The description of Stewardship is "Number of population groups that the project runs through," this sentence could be considered as the project negatively impacts the underserved population groups. It is a concern to give points for the projects that negatively impact the community. The weighting should reflect both positive and negative impacts, and positively impacted projects should get points, but not negatively impacted ones.

Mr. Pollack suggested to align the performance measure language to that of TxDOT's or FHWA's; for example, "points of interest" to "primary destination" for semantic consistency. Mr. Mendieta stated that the language remained the same for the majority of the measures with only a few minor deviations.

Ms. Sales-Evans pointed out the MPO's Stewardship performance measure is unique, and does not have comparable performance measures within Decision Lens' "Effects on the Environment" criteria. Decision

Lens measures projects such as landscaping and historical preservation but does not capture Environmental Justice nor Title VI.

Mr. DeLatte inquired how other MPOs measure an equity and accessibility. Mr. MacDonald answered that based on the research and literature, and few examples he is familiar with, projects positively affect the community get positive points, while projects with no affect or negative affect get either zero point or negative points. Mr. MacDonald stated that the next MTP scoring system is expected to implement the positive and negative impacts with further refinement of the overall scoring methodology through workshops. Additionally, we expect to revisit the performance measures and establish a process to score quantitative measures, apply professional judgement as well as use other qualitative measures. Mr. MacDonald also stated that detailed project descriptions aligned with performance measures is necessary for effective scoring in the future MTP process.

Mr. Pollack asked what is the process proposed to measure the positive/negative data range, and if there is a specific criteria to correlate the numeric value to the range. The MPO historically used straight scoring with no normalization on data on various scales, and as long as an aggregated data is used, the scoring should be consistent. But in the new process, the positive/negative determination seems more subjective. Mr. MacDonald answered that using quantitative measures with available data provides the numeric value by counting the number of populations in the subject demographic area and collecting the numerical data of the impact on the underserved population groups with the project. For example, if the project is a public transportation project, then collecting data on how many people in the area are served by the new project would lead to a positive impact and corresponding positive value assigned for this measure. If the project is building a freeway and requires an acquisition of properties that disperse the residents of a community, it is scored as a negative impact. The number of the affected population is the numerical value applicable for the scale. Mr. Pollack suggested to conduct an exercise to establish an increment of subjectivity with the all performance measures in the scoring process. Mr. MacDonald replied that the new MTP updates will include the revisiting and refining of the scoring methodology.

Ms. Sales-Evans commented on the measure: "Project on a Hurricane Evacuation Route", specifically if it should be a "project on a Hurricane Evacuation Route" or a "project serves as a Hurricane Evacuation Route." Since the state of Texas has an official evacuation route, the current description may limit the potential projects. For example, the Regional Parkway would serve as a Hurricane Evacuation Route, however; it is not currently an official evacuation route designated by TxDOT. Mr. MacDonald asked Ms. Sales-Evans if there is any point difference between a project on or serving as a Hurricane Evacuation Route. Ms. Sales-Evans answered that she was not certain if there would be any point difference, but she thought using "serving" would open up more opportunities on certain projects to add operational value.

Her next comment was on the "Efficiency and Economic Competitiveness" measure. She asked if the MPO staff considered adding more value on projects that serve as economic generators. Planning Time Index, Travel Time Index, and Truck Travel Time Index cannot capture the value of economic development or something that provides economic benefits for the area. Mr. MacDonald agreed to add Ms. Sales-Evans' suggestion into the "Efficiency and Economic Competitiveness" Performance Measures in the next MTP scoring process. Mr. MacDonald stated that scoring should be based on the degree of economic impact, for example, serving residential areas only, or serving major employment centers, or the future hub of an airport. This projected future development would come from the local governments' and agencies' land-use plans or development plans and it should be addressed in the MTP project/program descriptions.

Ms. Sales-Evans suggested discussing each project's detailed description in a workshop environment, so the TAC members could collectively understand what the scope and intention of these projects are, and at the same time, individually define the project with different perspectives.

Mr. MacDonald agreed that identifying the purpose and need of each project that explains the reason why the entity is putting forward these projects, and collectively establishing the process to set the agreed-upon values for prioritizing projects as a regional discussion are imperative.

Mr. Pollack asked to identify what the deviated categories are, and how much the deviations are in the MPO's performance measures, in terms of the correlation with TxDOT's Decision Lens. Mr. Mendieta answered that safety is the most closely correlated category, while Decision Lens gives 31.40% of weight for safety, the MPO gives 30%, but other categories diverged due to the MPO's performance measures combining some Decision Lens criteria into one category, "System Reliability." Ms. Sales-Evans pointed out the MPO's performance measures gives 40% on system reliability, 30% on safety, and another 30% on multimodal and stewardship, while Decision Lens gives more than 60% on system reliability, 30% on safety, and less than 10% on environmental effect.

Ms. Sales-Evans stated that the funding categories are an important factor to consider in the project selection process if the project fulfills the purpose of the funding category. While Category 2, Metro and Urban Area Corridor Projects and Category 4, Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects put emphasis on congestion reduction and system connectivity components, Category 7, Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation and Category 9, Transportation Alternatives are allowed to focus on regional priorities such as multi-modal projects and stewardship. Thus, it is difficult to measure the value of each project in terms of funding categories with a fixed set of criteria. Mr. MacDonald agreed that it is the difficulty of project scoring that requires prioritizing a list of diverse projects by not only a set of different criteria, but also quantitative/qualitative measures and professional judgement. Unlike Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects that allow for a separate project selection process, MTP projects need to be scored using all the criteria. Mr. MacDonald mentioned two options: (1) after the prioritization, review the eligibility of the project for a particular funding category, (2) prioritize projects based on the eligibility for certain funding categories. However, his interpretation of the Federal requirements is that all projects, regardless the potential funding categories, must be prioritized by the performance measures and other considerations in a competitive setting. Mr. MacDonald also pointed out that the project selection involves the funding eligibility. For example, a bicycle project may be given lower total points from the scoring system than a project that reduces congestion. However, the bicycle project is eligible for the Category 9, Transportation Alternative funding, while the congestion-relief project is not eligible. The bicycle project can therefore be funded earlier in the MTP years as an eligible project for Category 9 since it would be a highly ranked project for this particular funding source. One of the main goals of the prioritization process is to match the highest ranked projects with available funding.

Ms. Sales-Evans suggested that it is necessary to review the current MTP project list, remove the projects that are already under construction from the list, and revisiting the application of the anticipated funding categories. For example, the SH 358 Ramp Reversal project is identified with Category 7 funding, but considering SH 358 is a major State Highway, Category 2 and Category 4 are more suitable funding for this project. Since Category 7 funding is currently tied to the Harbor Bridge Voluntary Relocation Program and the uncertainty of the available Category 7 funding requires reexamining eligible funding sources for each project.

Mr. MacDonald stated that the MPO will provide a new MTP project list that removes projects under construction and includes estimated funding amounts. Based on available funding categories, each project is matched with anticipated dollars until the particular funds are exhausted. The process continues until all available funds are applied to the prioritized list of projects.

Ms. Sales-Evans asked what are those projects categorized as "not ranked" in 2020 – 2045 MTP Project Prioritization Table. Mr. Mendieta explained these projects were not scored due to various reasons such as the project limit is not specified or the facilities do not yet exist. She suggested to identify the projects that are approved or committed, either as Category 9 funding projects or as a feasibility study, separate from the prioritization list. Mr. MacDonald suggested to categorize these projects as "funded."

Mr. DeLatta inquired if the TAC recommendation is to approve the MPO's Performance Measures with weights and descriptions, but not necessarily the 2020 – 2045 MTP Project Prioritization Table. Mr. MacDonald explained that the 2020 – 2045 MTP needs to be submitted to TxDOT in December 2019 and should be ready within 6 months. Due to the tight MTP schedule, the MPO is working toward the TPC approval on both the methodology and project rankings in June. The MPO was planning a workshop on

May 23, 2019 for further discussion on this topic. If the TAC agrees to recommend the methodology with changes from TAC members’ comments and input, the ranking table can be discussed in the workshop.

Ms. Munoz stated that it is problematic to submit the current ranking table to the TPC and the public, since some project ranking and scores seem to be inconsistent. Mr. Pollack agreed and pointed out the FM 624 project in the 2020 – 2045 MTP Project Prioritization Table is ranked 78 in the previous MTP Rank, but it is ranked 6 in 2019 Rank and this considerable change may confuse the public and it should be addressed.

Mr. DeLatte clarified today’s discussion and suggested two options: (1) take an action to recommend the methodology that reflects TAC members’ input and (2) discuss the project ranking in the workshop setting and take action at the regular June TAC meeting.

Ms. Sales-Evans requested an overall 2020 – 2045 MTP time-schedule with milestones to meet the deadline, thus the TAC members can grasp and set up the necessary workshops accordingly. The MPO will provide the MTP schedule before the next TAC meeting.

Mr. Pollack made a motion to recommend the revised 2019 MPO Project Performance Measures, Weights, and Descriptions with TAC members’ input, and finalize the project ranking with further discussion in a workshop before June TAC meeting. Ms. Munoz seconded; motion passed unanimously.

Mr. MacDonald thanked TAC members for the in-depth discussion. The MPO will provide the draft minutes for TAC members’ review to ensure the minutes captures their input and discussion correctly. The suggested changes for the evaluation criteria are shown below.

Performance Measures	Original Text	Revised Text
Safety Hurricane Evacuation Route (HER)	Is the project <u>on</u> a HER?	Is the project <u>on or serving as</u> a HER?
Stewardship Equity/Accessibility (Title VI/Environmental Justice)	Number of <u>Impacted</u> Title VI/Environmental Justice population groups	Number of Title VI/Environmental Justice population groups <u>that the project affects</u>
	Number of population groups that the project <u>runs through</u>	Number of population groups that the project <u>affects</u>
Stewardship Equity/Accessibility (Destinations)	Direct access to <u>major point of interest</u>	Direct access to <u>destinations</u>
	<u>Number of major points of interest</u> that the project has direct access to. There are eight major points of interest: Schools, <u>Food Resources</u> , Medical Resources, Civic Institutions, Low Income Housing, Place of Worship, Recreation/Tourism, Retail	<u>Destinations</u> that the project has direct access to: Schools, <u>Groceries</u> , Medical Resources, Civic Institutions, Low Income Housing, Place of Worship, Recreation/Tourism and Retail

5. Freight Topics

A. The U. S. Department of Transportation (DOT) announced a \$900 Million Infrastructure Grant availability.

Mr. MacDonald informed the TAC members that the USDOT announced a \$900M grant funding opportunity identified as the Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD). The application deadline is July 15, 2019. Mr. Pollack stated that the Port of Corpus Christi Authority is planning to apply for this grant.

Mr. MacDonald informed the TAC that the freight section in the current 2015-2040 MTP will be discussed at the June TAC meeting.

6. Member Agency Project Updates

Mr. Mendieta provided the most current project list to TAC members and requested updates if the project status has changed.

Mr. MacDonald requested the TAC members use this agenda time to share the member agencies' current and future projects updates.

7. Upcoming Meetings:

A. TAC MTP Project Selection Workshop: May 23, 2019

This workshop will be rescheduled for a later date. The MPO staff will propose several potential dates and ask TAC members' availability before setting the date.

B. TPC Regular Meeting: June 6, 2019

C. TAC Regular Meeting: June 20, 2019

8. TAC Member Comments

None offered.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:07a.m.