

**CORPUS CHRISTI METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CORPUS CHRISTI MPO)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2024**

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND QUORUM DETERMINATION

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

TAC Members Present:

Brian DeLatte, P.E., City of Portland, Chairperson
Tom Yardley, San Patricio County
Liann Alfaro, Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Planning Authority (CCRTA)
Dan McGinn, AICP, City of Corpus Christi
Paula Sales-Evans, P.E., TxDOT – Corpus Christi District (CRP)
Emily Martinez, Coastal Bend Council of Governments

MPO Staff Present: Rob MacDonald, P.E., Craig Casper, AICP, Daniel Carrizales, Victor Mendieta, and Karla Carvajal, MBA

2. NON-AGENDA ITEMS PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None were made or offered.

3. APPROVAL OF THE TAC APRIL 18, 2024 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Yardley made a motion to approve the April 18, 2024 minutes. Ms. Alfaro seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

A. DRAFT FY 2025 and FY 2026 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is required to develop a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Key assumptions in this new two-year UPWP are:

- the total Transportation Planning Funding (TPF) amounts shown in the table and document are the same as from FY 2024 until the new amounts are received;
- that \$700,000 of carryover funds from the CRRSAA 100% federal grant for the completion of the Metropolitan Planning tools and products.

These items are proposed to be included as rollover into this proposed FY 2025 and FY 2026 UPWP. Additional changes may be made after the new funding allocations from FHWA and TxDOT are received. Also, TxDOT continues to request that the Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs) from FHWA are required to be incorporated into the upcoming planning and programming efforts.

While the final amount of planning funds from both the Federal Highway Administration PL-112 and FTA 5303 planning funds from the Federal Transit Administration have not yet been determined, much of the necessary (from federal requirements) and desired (from the 2045 MTP After-Action Report) work tasks are known and listed within the memo. The table in the memo shows funding amounts by Task that reflect both the level of effort and timing needed to complete the integrated subtasks. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), aka Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), became law on November 15, 2021. The BIL includes 11 factors that the metropolitan planning process must explicitly consider and analyze.

Discussion:

Mr. MacDonald presented the FY 2025 and FY 2026 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). He noted it had been about two years since they last adopted a new work program. He explained that on a typical cycle, MPOs update their scope of services with TxDOT and the federal government to manage federal transportation planning funds. The current request is for TAC members to provide comments and ultimately

recommend to the TPC to release the document for a one-month public comment period. TAC members had access to the document, while the public did not, to ensure the TAC's review before the public release.

Key highlights in the cover memo included the estimation of carryover COVID Relief funds estimated to be \$700,000, which rolls over to consultant contracts in FY 2025. This rollover is shown alongside typical planning funds in the document.

The format of the UPWP, agreed upon by TxDOT and all 23 MPOs in Texas, includes detailed breakdowns of tasks and subtasks. For convenience, an additional listing of funding by subtasks is included in the early sections of the document.

Mr. MacDonald highlighted that the focus on subtask 1.9 for consultant services in FY 2025 would involve long-range planning, with significant activity planned from October 2024 to February or March of 2025. Fiscal year FY 2026 would see a shift back to more traditional planning cycles and preparations for future short-range plans.

A key section of the document compiles all local planning activities from the local agencies regarding the transportation planning efforts they will undertake over the next two years. This serves as a comprehensive reference for transportation studies and projects. This ensures that the public and stakeholders are informed about the regional transportation planning activities.

Finally, Mr. MacDonald confirmed that the document is fiscally balanced based on anticipated revenue, with future adjustments possible if federal funding changes. TAC members' comments and recommendations for the TPC are requested so that the public comment period can start.

Recommendation:

The Corpus Christi MPO staff recommended that the TAC review, comment, and recommend the TPC release the DRAFT FY 2025 and FY 2026 Unified Planning Work Program.

Motion:

Mr. Yardley made a motion to recommend the TPC release the DRAFT FY 2025 and FY 2026 UPWP for the one-month public comment period. Mr. McGinn seconded; and the motion passed unanimously.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. DRAFT FY 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The DRAFT FY 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is being provided again to the TAC since the TPC meeting on Thursday, May 9, 2024, was cancelled due to lack of a quorum. The TPC is attempting to hold a special meeting later in May prior to their Regular Meeting on June 6th to release the document for a one-month public comment period. The TAC is being asked to provide additional comments on the DRAFT TIP document. One specific consideration is the proposed changes to the TIP projects identified by the TxDOT-CRP District on May 8th.

The current approval process is necessary to meet the TxDOT scheduled adoption of the FY 2025-2028 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The TxDOT HQ must receive the final approved TIPs from all MPOs no later than June 10th, 2024. This means that the Corpus Christi MPO must approve the Corpus Christi MPO DRAFT FY 2025-2028 TIP at the June 6th TPC meeting. TAC is likely to need a special meeting after the TPC Special Meeting in May and before the Regular TPC meeting in June.

Discussion:

Mr. Casper noted that despite the absence of a quorum for the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) meeting, there was an opportunity to discuss an update concerning the TxDOT projects. He emphasized the importance of approving the schedule by June 6th to ensure timely submission of Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) from Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to TxDOT headquarters by June 10th. In the event of insufficient attendance for a special meeting on May 24th to release the document for public comment, the approval would be deferred to the subsequent July 11th TPC meeting, potentially

causing delays in the TIP projects. Mr. Casper then outlined the modifications to various projects, including additions, funding updates, and corrections, spanning fiscal years 2025 to 2028. Following his remarks, Ms. Sales-Evans acknowledged the last-minute nature of the updates, attributing them to data complexities, and advocated for their inclusion in the standard format for public release. She offered to address any inquiries regarding the proposed changes, emphasizing the necessity of ensuring project progression and funding alignment with TxDOT's objectives.

Mr. MacDonald noted the agenda packet's status as an information item, but also its potential for action by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Despite last-minute changes, he assured attendees that these alterations would be included in the packet sent to the TPC for review. Stressing the significance of meeting deadlines, particularly the June 10th deadline set by TxDOT headquarters for the submission of Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs), Mr. MacDonald expressed concerns about potential delays if the deadline was missed, potentially necessitating TIP amendments. He emphasized the importance of ensuring all projects could move forward smoothly, aligning with TxDOT's objectives. Ms. Sales-Evans echoed these concerns, highlighting the jeopardy for upcoming projects if deadlines were not met, particularly those slated for the first quarter or first half of FY 2025. Mr. MacDonald then urged proactive engagement with TPC members to expedite the review process.

Following Mr. MacDonald's remarks, Mr. McGinn raised questions regarding specific project costs, particularly concerning the New Harbor Bridge Park improvements. Mr. Casper responded, explaining that while they had information on state and federal funding, they lacked the total estimated project cost, with contributions expected from both the state and the city. Ms. Sales-Evans elaborated on the collaboration between TxDOT and city staff to determine project costs accurately, highlighting the addition of a commitment of \$5.5 million towards the project. She attributed discrepancies to a lack of updates in the TxDOT Connect system and suggested consulting with city management for further clarification. Throughout the discussion, there was a clear emphasis on the importance of aligning with deadlines, accurately estimating project costs, and ensuring smooth coordination between stakeholders to facilitate project progression.

Mr. McGinn brought attention to the \$11.2 million discussed in previous meetings, identifying it as new funding. Ms. Sales-Evans clarified that this money had already been planned for allocation by the city, particularly towards various amenities. The discussion then shifted to the need for transparency regarding city-related projects, with Mr. McGinn questioning why these projects needed to be included on lists. Ms. Sales-Evans explained that such inclusion was necessary for consistency, especially concerning the Advanced Funding Agreement (AFA) and budget pages. Ms. Sales-Evans detailed the intention behind revising the funding and ensuring consistency between systems to avoid potential discrepancies.

Mr. MacDonald elaborated on the process of reconciling projects discussed over recent months and the significance of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in the context of the Unified Transportation Program (UTP). He highlighted the allocation of funds to avoid lapses and emphasized the need for projects to be ready for construction to prevent the reallocation of funds by TxDOT. Mr. MacDonald outlined the process of updating the TIP and UTP, highlighting the importance of aligning with the Texas Transportation Commission's new policy and TxDOT's financial tracking. He assured TAC members that the staff had worked diligently to ensure accuracy and transparency in the presented recommendations. Despite some delays in the process, Mr. MacDonald expressed confidence in the recommendations presented and their alignment with the TPC's objectives. He emphasized the ongoing nature of the process and the need for further discussion with city representatives if necessary. Overall, the discussion provided detailed insights into the complexities of project funding and coordination, underscoring the importance of transparency, consistency, and alignment with regulatory requirements.

Mr. McGinn addressed the inclusion of Park Road 22 in the project list, noting its significance and increased attention from various stakeholders, including the city council, the Island TIRZ, and tourism board. He emphasized the progress made in scoping the project through the Island Mobility Plan, indicating that discussions had largely concluded on the desired roadway cross-section. Mr. McGinn highlighted the city's readiness to recommend the project for construction, paralleling the process followed for Northwest

Boulevard. Ms. Sales-Evans interjected, pointing out the document's potential for quarterly amendments and the need for clarity regarding the estimated cost of the recommended work. She stressed the importance, from TxDOT's perspective, of aligning the estimated cost with the project's scope before inclusion in the four-year TIP commitment window. Mr. MacDonald further clarified the sequential process involved in project planning, emphasizing the lengthy timeline required for planning, feasibility studies, and environmental clearance, particularly when federal funds are involved. Mr. McGinn expressed confusion about Park Road 22's inclusion in the TIP list despite discussions with city officials about other proposed projects for the next three years.

Ms. Sales-Evans explained that the project's placement in the list was due to it being part of the current TIP, scheduled for FY 2028, and its appearance in the new list brought it forward to FY 2028. She suggested that the city's work on the Island Mobility Plan might touch upon planning and feasibility studies but emphasized the need for further assessment regarding environmental issues and property requirements, which could impact the project's development schedule. The discussion underscored the complexities involved in project planning, budgeting, and alignment with regulatory requirements, emphasizing the importance of clear communication and coordination between stakeholders to ensure project success and timely execution.

Mr. MacDonald highlighted the timeline for the FY 2025-2028 TIP, noting that Park Road 22 was slated for FY 2028, indicating it was still a considerable time away from implementation. Ms. Sales-Evans queried the TAC's stance on potentially moving Park Road 22 out of the four-year window, prompting Mr. McGinn to express the desire to retain it on the current 4-year TIP list.

Mr. MacDonald clarified that the current list of draft fiscally constrained projects was for the TIP discussion and was already in the public domain for comment and modification. Mr. McGinn referred to attachment nine, which detailed changes to the project list and noted its classification as a comment and clarifying information. He highlighted the need to offset the cost of Park Road 22 by reducing funding for another project, acknowledging the complexity of such adjustments.

Ms. Sales-Evans pointed out the funding allocations in attachment nine and discussed the progress of the Gregory Interchange project and the potential implications of reallocating funds from it.

The discussion shifted to the Holly Trestle project, with Ms. Sales-Evans clarifying its nature as a railroad trestle conversion to a bike trail project, distinct from a roadway project.

Mr. McGinn reiterated the desire to keep Park Road 22 on the 4-year TIP list while considering other projects. The conversation included the progress of the Rodd Field Road safety and operations and Crosstown extension projects, with Ms. Sales-Evans providing insight into their respective status and potential timelines. Mr. McGinn expressed a preference for prioritizing Park Road 22 over the Rodd Field Road project, citing similarities in funding and potential impact. Mr. MacDonald emphasized the flexibility of the TIP and the ease of amending it based on evolving circumstances. Mr. McGinn highlighted the public's anticipation of Park Road 22's acceleration due to its inclusion in the list, suggesting inserting it instead of the Rodd Field Road project to manage expectations.

Ms. Sales-Evans noted the funding allocation for the Rodd Field Road project and proposed reallocating the remaining funds to Park Road 22. Mr. McGinn expressed agreement with prioritizing the Rodd Field Road project and explored options for funding adjustments.

Mr. Casper provided clarification on the financial implications of reallocating funds, highlighting the potential surplus resulting from the removal of the Rodd Field Road project. The discussion underscored the complexities of project prioritization, funding allocation, and stakeholder expectations within the context of the TIP planning process.

Mr. MacDonald proposed considering Rodd Field Road as a potential recipient of Category 10 CR (Carbon Reduction) funding, highlighting its eligibility for such funding due to its alignment with traffic operations and safety goals. Ms. Sales-Evans brought up the Carbon Reduction (CR) funding and whether operational improvements could count as eligible projects. Mr. MacDonald elaborated on the surplus funds available, suggesting that the \$6 million carryover could help bridge funding gaps for projects like Park Road 22.

Ms. Sales-Evans proposed a strategy of retaining a portion of Rodd Field Road funding in the TIP while also including Park Road 22 in the later years, thereby ensuring fiscal constraint compliance. Mr. MacDonald again emphasized the flexibility of the TIP amendment process, suggesting that adjustments could be made post-release based on evolving circumstances. Ms. Sales-Evans advocated for a strategic approach that considers both immediate needs and long-term funding availability. Mr. MacDonald highlighted the importance of allocating Category 10 CR funds in a timely manner, given the uncertainty surrounding future allocations and potential modifications to funding criteria.

Mr. MacDonald noted, with the consensus of TAC members, that this information item is changed into an action item. Mr. MacDonald ensured that this change would be reflected in the meeting minutes, underscoring the importance of proactive decision-making in the TIP planning process.

Motion:

Mr. McGinn made a motion to recommend the TPC release the DRAFT FY 2025-2028 TIP, with Park Road 22 (CSJ# 0617-02-073) to be included and additional funding options to be explored, for the one-month public comment period. Ms. Sales-Evans seconded; and the motion passed unanimously.

B. DRAFT FY 2023 and FY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) with Amendment 2

The DRAFT Amendment 2 to the FY 2023 and FY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was again provided to the TAC. UPWP Amendment 2 was requested by TxDOT as part of their April 8, 2024 Work Order Letter 2 for FY 2024 that specified the requirement for the Corpus Christi MPO to have specific language in the current UPWP related to the federal requirement to spend a minimum of 2.5% of the MPO's Federal Planning funds (PL) on safety planning activities.

Discussion:

Mr. MacDonald highlighted a new requirement from TxDOT to specifically use federal language related to the 2.5% set aside for safety within Complete Streets planning. This requirement necessitated an amendment to the current work program to explicitly identify this subtask. He explained that funds had been allocated to this subtask throughout the fiscal year and that tracking and reporting on this expenditure would be done through TxDOT to FHWA. Additionally, he mentioned a change made to ensure adequate funding for FY 2024, which involved reallocating funding from another subtask, TIP development (subtask 3.1) to subtask 3.3. Other than this Amendment 2, there were no other changes to the UPWP document since the last recommendation. Mr. MacDonald emphasized that while this item was presented as information, it could be turned into an action item if necessary. He assured the committee that thorough consideration had been given to potential cascading effects of changes in language throughout the UPWP, ensuring consistency across the document's various sections.

C. 2050 MTP Vision, Goals, and Objectives

The Corpus Christi 2050 MTP is scheduled for the 5-year update on February 6, 2025. There are several critical items that need adopting as soon as possible, including Vision, Goals, and Objectives. The three outcomes needed from this agenda item are: achieve consensus on a vision that can be brought to the TPC for discussion in June, determine if the 6 goals below are acceptable in number and subject so they can be recommended for public release during the June TAC meeting, and have a detailed discussion of the subject of the individual objectives that can also be recommended for public release during the June TAC meeting. A follow-on workshop, prior to the June TAC meeting, may be necessary. Additional information is available in Attachments 1, 2, and 3 from previous TAC meetings.

Discussion:

Mr. Casper emphasized the need to achieve consensus on a vision to present at the upcoming TPC meeting. He outlined the goals and objectives, highlighting the importance of covering the 11 areas of emphasis from

the current federal transportation bill. He presented a preliminary draft vision consolidating multiple ideas into one, which was well received but subject to feedback.

Ms. Sales-Evans suggested changing "catalyzes economic growth" to "supports economic growth" to clarify the MPO's role. There's a discussion about the implications of actively spurring economic development versus supporting initiatives that bring economic opportunities while considering environmental sensitivity.

Mr. MacDonald proposed circulating the document for feedback, which is agreed upon, and hard copies were distributed.

Mr. McGinn suggested rephrasing to emphasize safety alongside efficiency in transportation. There's an agreement to limit the vision to a single statement and to further refine the goals and objectives.

Mr. Casper sought feedback on the number of goals, with Mr. DeLatte recommending no more than six to maintain clarity and focus.

Ms. Sales-Evans raised a question about the necessity of aligning goals specifically with the vision and whether technology-related goals are relevant. Mr. Casper explained that while visions aren't mandatory, they're a common practice for clarity and transparency. He suggested that the technology goal can be removed and incorporated into performance measures or asset management goals.

Ms. Sales-Evans expressed concerns about the specificity of safety goals, suggesting a broader approach to encompass various improvements beyond proven countermeasures. Mr. Casper explained the concept of proven countermeasures and the need for evaluations. He emphasized the importance of considering a holistic suite of improvements rather than limiting goals to specific lists.

Mr. McGinn highlighted technology and its role in efficiency, especially in transit services like bus rapid transit. He urged caution against overbuilding infrastructure, considering changing growth projections and the impact of tourism on the economy.

Mr. Casper noted that tourism is a mandated aspect stated by Congress in the federal law and will be addressed accordingly. Ms. Sales-Evans suggested incorporating tourism into the goals to support regional economic growth. It was emphasized that balancing specificity with flexibility in setting goals that align with the vision and address the region's diverse needs, including technological advancements and economic considerations such as tourism.

Mr. DeLatte expressed his reservations about treating technology as a separate goal, suggesting instead that it is a tool to achieve other goals. Mr. McGinn concurred, emphasizing that technology is already embedded within the other goals and doesn't necessitate needing its own goal. He emphasized that the primary focus should be on achieving the intended outcomes rather than setting technology as a standalone goal. Mr. DeLatte raised further concerns about losing the emphasis on technology if it's merged with other goals.

Mr. McGinn highlighted the role of technology in enhancing system performance and improving quality of life by increasing efficiency and safety. The consensus among the TAC leaned towards integrating technology into existing goals rather than isolating it as a distinct objective, recognizing its instrumental role in achieving broader outcomes related to transportation and quality of life.

Mr. Casper assured the TAC that removing technology as a goal and integrating it into the objectives of other goals will meet emphasis area requirements.

6. TAC MEMBER STATEMENTS ON LOCAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES OR ITEMS OF INTEREST

Mr. DeLatte provided an update on the drainage project on FM 893, indicating that significant progress has been made. The City of Portland recently opened bids for the project, with the city council set to award the contract soon. It was noted that the project is expected to remain under budget.

Mr. DeLatte expressed anticipation for the continuation of the drainage project, which will allow the FM 893 project to proceed smoothly. Ms. Sales-Evans inquired about the construction timeline specifically for the

portion under FM 893. Mr. DeLatte informed her that the total project should take 180 days, but the specifics of the schedule will depend on the engagement of the low bidder.

Mr. McGinn mentioned there are various meetings and briefings scheduled for the upcoming week regarding the city's proposed 2024 Bond program, sales tax renewal proposals, and impact fee adoption; inviting interested parties to attend these events listed on the city website.

Ms. Alfaro updated the TAC on changes being made to the CCRTA's long-range plan, which is nearing completion. Currently, there is ongoing public outreach efforts, including public meetings and outreach stations, where individuals can learn more about the proposed changes and provide feedback. These changes will be available on the CCRTA website for further review.

Mr. DeLatte reminded everyone about upcoming meetings, noting that some details may not be finalized by the next meeting.

Mr. MacDonald informed TAC members that a special TAC meeting on May 30th or the 31st may occur depending on whether or not the TPC can meet the week before. The potential end of May meeting would be to recommend approval of the DRAFT TIP document for the TPC's action in June.

Ms. Sales-Evans inquired about the possibility of holding virtual meetings, to which Mr. MacDonald explained that they now have the ability to do so under their updated public participation plan. However, he promised to double-check and confirm the feasibility of a virtual special meeting, promising to provide further information via email once details are finalized. The discussion ended with a tentative plan to hold the Special TAC meeting in the early morning on either Thursday (5/30) or Friday (5/31), with a final decision pending confirmation of virtual capabilities.

7 ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.