

**CORPUS CHRISTI METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**  
**THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2024**

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

Mr. DeLatte called the meeting to order at 9:00 am

TAC Members Present:

Brian DeLatte, P.E., City of Portland, Chairperson

Tom Yardley, San Patricio County

Juan Pimentel, P.E., Nueces County

Liann Alfaro, Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority (CCRTA)

Paula Sales-Evans, P.E., TxDOT – Corpus Christi District (CRP)

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 offered or made.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE TAC SEPTEMBER 19, 2024 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Yardley made a motion to approve the September 19, 2024, TAC Regular Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Pimentel seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS**

**A. DRAFT Active Transportation, Complete Streets, and Micro-mobility Plan**

Mr. Casper presented the item.

The TAC was asked to review the DRAFT Active Transportation, Complete Streets, and Micro-mobility Plan and make a recommendation to release it for a one-month public comment period.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Yardley noted that a few names on the San Patricio County portion of the stakeholder list needed to be updated. He offered to send the updated names later for inclusion. Mrs. Alfaro also offered to submit updates for the RTA representation.

Ms. Sales-Evans asked about the stakeholder list, noting that it included many names. She wanted to know if everyone on the list had actively participated in the process.

Mr. Casper responded that he was unsure about the participation status of everyone on the list at that moment. He acknowledged that some individuals had not participated recently and could not recall if they had been active at the beginning but had since disengaged. He noted that as the process continued, the list of active attendees had become more refined and focused.

Ms. Sales-Evans noted that several ISD police representatives were on the list but had not attended meetings she was at. She emphasized the importance of school outreach for the plan's success.

Mr. MacDonald explained that while representatives received the information, there was no follow-up to ensure they reviewed it. They checked for bounced emails to confirm receipt. The consultant team also attempted to meet with stakeholders outside of TAC meetings, though not all efforts were successful. He assured everyone that all relevant information, including resource links, was shared with the stakeholders.

Ms. Sales-Evans asked if the consultant had documented their outreach efforts. She highlighted the importance of reaching minority and underserved populations for the Active Transportation Plan,

noting that their input is essential. She was unsure which representatives on the list covered these communities or if they were actively engaged.

Mr. MacDonald acknowledged the challenge of providing information versus achieving active engagement. He said the MPO used consultants and staff to connect with stakeholders. They distributed materials and invited people to access the Active Transportation Plan online. They also reached out to groups like the NAACP and the Black Chamber of Commerce, sharing information and requesting to join their meeting agendas.

Ms. Sales-Evans emphasized that some populations might struggle with digital platforms and stressed the need for in-person outreach, to ensure their needs are included in the plan.

Mr. MacDonald mentioned an upcoming opportunity for engagement with the Statewide Active Transportation Plan at a session the next day at the downtown library, from 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM.

**Motion:**

Ms. Sales-Evans moved to recommend that the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) release the DRAFT Active Transportation, Complete Streets, and Micro-mobility Plan for a one-month public comment period during their November 7, 2024, Regular Meeting, with the understanding that additional outreach to underserved communities is needed.

Mr. Yardley seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**B. Revised Small Area Forecast Employment Control Totals for the 2050 MTP**

Mr. Casper presented the item.

The Corpus Christi MPO staff is seeking to update the Control Totals for Jobs that are input into the Small Area Forecast for Years 2020 through 2050. The Corpus Christi MPO Transportation Policy Committee adopted the highest forecasts for both population and employment during their action in September 2023. The future level and location of population and jobs are vital components of transportation planning and a critical initial step in developing and analyzing the performance of projects desired for inclusion into the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Yardley noted that several TAC members attended the Small Area Task Force meeting on October 16, where they had in-depth discussions on the topic.

**Motion:**

Mr. Yardley made a motion that the TAC recommend the TPC approve the Adjusted Control totals for population and employment shown in Table 2 for use in developing the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Ms. Alfaro seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**C. Corpus Christi MPO Planning Area Boundary Update** 

Mr. Casper presented the item.

After discussion and approval at the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), the Corpus Christi MPO Metropolitan Planning Area will begin with the Option 1 concept and the boundary will be adjusted based on the contiguous urban areas and the areas that the Small Area Forecast (SAF) show will become urban within the timeframe of the 2050 MTP.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Yardley asked if the designation of the land around McCampbell-Porter Airport area, owned by the port and marked in blue, would change if it were developed for industrial use instead of a solar farm.

Mr. Casper responded that if the land is used for port activities instead of a solar farm, it should be included in the MPO's considerations.

Mr. Yardley added that while the current plan is for a solar farm, the port's concepts for the property have changed several times, so it may not be certain until development begins.

Mr. MacDonald noted that, while the stakeholder list was an action item for the meeting, they did not yet have a specific recommendation. He suggested that the Small Area Forecast Task Force should review the development areas, including potential changes to the port's plans for the land near Campbell Airport. He invited any information that could assist in defining boundaries within the next month or two. The TPC had previously recommended the adoption of Option 1 for boundaries, with possible adjustments based on discussions around development areas. Mr. MacDonald emphasized the need to finalize these boundaries, taking into account areas like the potential solar farm and developments near the London school area.

Mr. Yardley asked about the inclusion of the new Tesla facility and rail yard near Robstown within the boundaries, noting that he was unfamiliar with their exact locations.

Mr. Casper said he was uncertain and would verify the details. Mr. MacDonald stated that the facility appeared to be within the green-shaded area of Option 1 but asked for input from those with local knowledge to confirm its status.

Mr. Yardley mentioned that there had been a groundbreaking for the Tesla facility and that he considered it a definite project. He recommended taking such developments into account when setting the boundaries.

Mr. MacDonald explained that part of their work involved estimating job growth from developments like the rail yard and distributing those jobs between San Patricio and Nueces counties. Initial estimates shifted from a 70-30 to a 60-40 split after input from the Chamber of Commerce and EDC. He emphasized that knowing where the job and population growth would happen is crucial for adjusting the boundary.

Mr. Yardley added that the EDC might have more information about developments near Robstown and noted that while he was more familiar with projects in San Patricio County, he recognized that activities were underway in that area.

Ms. Sales-Evans asked for clarification on the criteria for defining boundaries. She questioned if the current green area shown on the map had a clear boundary and suggested Highway 35 as a potential marker. She inquired if the boundary should follow State Highway 361, the railroad, or other features, seeking more clarity on what was expected.

Mr. DeLatte noted that the boundary seems to follow the railroad, particularly in the southeast corner where the road and railroad align.

Ms. Sales-Evans had questions about defining clear boundaries. She mentioned that certain areas, like Highway 44, provide a clear, visible boundary, which could be useful for the planning process as changes approach Robstown. She sought clarification on how these boundaries are determined. She suggested that, even though it doesn't impact population density, such facilities might influence boundary decisions. She noted that some areas follow natural boundaries, which can change over time. She also questioned whether plans for a regional park in the London area might affect which areas are included in the MPO boundary. She stressed the need for clear boundaries.

Mr. MacDonald responded that these considerations would be discussed internally and with the task force, and any new information would be reviewed before making a recommendation on boundary changes at the November meeting.

Mr. Casper added that he prefers boundaries that align with census block groups to simplify data analysis.

Mr. DeLatte pointed out the growth on the west side of Portland, where new subdivisions are being built and additional plans are in progress. He noted that this area is shown on the screen, positioned between the existing green and white boundaries. He emphasized the need to include this growth in

the small area forecast to ensure it is reflected in future planning. Mr. DeLatte also mentioned ongoing work on Road 893, which is near the new boundary, and highlighted that the city is actively acquiring right-of-way for a future project north of Lane Road. He stressed that the boundary should not be reduced to account for these developments and wanted to ensure this information is officially noted in their discussions.

Mr. MacDonald mentioned that he and Mr. Casper had discussed the densities in the area and observed that growth seems to be driving the need to expand the boundary. They have been tracking the city's development plans through the plats submitted to the Portland City Council, which Craig effectively maps out. This mapping has revealed the potential for an additional 900 homes. Mr. MacDonald pointed out that the number of households built over the past four years indicates a steady demand for housing in the area, driven by factors such as the quality of schools, parks, and amenities, as well as competitive housing prices. He believes growth will continue in Portland, and they expect to propose a new boundary next month, with Option One being a solid starting point that requires only minor adjustments.

Mr. Yardley noted that during the previous small area task force meeting, they discussed the regions surrounding Portland. He expressed his belief that all current developments would likely be completed by 2050 and anticipated the emergence of new subdivisions that are not yet planned.

Mr. DeLatte indicated that the area around Fourth Avenue, near the school and ongoing construction, would be filled by 2030, extending to Midway Road. He also mentioned that Lane Road would see new homes completed within the next seven to eight years, with plans for an additional 700 to 800 houses on the north side of Lane Road.

Mr. MacDonald recognized the team's useful information, which would help the task force decide where to direct resources based on population growth. He mentioned ongoing talks about different areas, pointing out that the south side of Corpus Christi, including the London area, Yorktown, and Rodd Field, could see a lot of new residents over the next 25 years. He stressed the need to know how many people might move to Portland, the London area, and other parts of Corpus Christi. He thanked everyone for their insights and encouraged them to keep sharing important information for the task force's discussions.

Ms. Sales-Evans expressed concerns about the timeline for submitting candidate projects for the upcoming UTP. She noted that they were approaching the deadline and highlighted that some projects in the last approved UTP might no longer qualify for the funding previously assigned to them. This situation raises questions about the MPO's planning and what projects should be considered as potential replacements. She pointed out that the timing is particularly challenging since candidate projects are submitted while still operating under the existing MPO boundary. Ms. Sales-Evans asked when the boundary changes would be finalized, as this would affect the eligibility of certain projects for funding. She also suggested that a workshop might be needed to discuss these issues further, asking whether they should proceed with the current plan or wait another year before making any changes.

Mr. Casper mentioned that the boundary line would only become official once the governor signs the necessary documents. He noted that TPP provided a checklist of required submissions, which includes revising their bylaws. This process is extensive, and approval from the governor's office may take three to six months. Therefore, he suggested that they may need to wait until next year for any changes.

Ms. Sales-Evans then raised concerns about how this delay would impact the timeline for completing the new MTP, particularly since the boundary approval would come after the February 6 deadline for the MTP.

Mr. Casper responded that a new MTP cannot be developed until the boundary is updated, as required by legislation. He explained that they could update the 2045 MTP, as it still meets the federal requirement of being at least 20 years in the future. He suggested that they have until October 2025 to make a short-term update.

Ms. Sales-Evans expressed that it would be beneficial to evaluate the pros and cons of updating the 2045 MTP, especially given the challenges faced by other MPOs with expired MTPs. She emphasized that understanding the implications of the timing for updating the urban boundary would be crucial for planning.

Mr. MacDonald thanked everyone and encouraged them to email any additional information about ongoing developments. He stated that this information would help them prepare for the small area forecast in November.

**Motion:**

Mr. MacDonald stated that since the Small Area Forecast Task Force did not provide a recommendation, the item should be treated as an information item instead of requiring a motion.

**5. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**A. 2050 MTP DRAFT Financial Plan Overview**

Mr. MacDonald presented the item.

Excerpts from existing Corpus Christi MPO documents that contain the current estimates of funding for the 2050 MTP for highway and transit projects and programs were shown.

TAC members were asked to review these funding estimates and descriptions and provide updates where applicable.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Sales-Evans asked Mr. MacDonald for clarification on the \$320.9 million figure for Corpus in the 'FY 2025-2028 TIP' column, expressing concern that it seemed unusually high, especially with the first two items marked as TBD. She suggested that the number might also need to be marked as TBD until they could determine a more accurate estimate for maintenance and operations within the MPO, as it exceeded their typical allocation.

Mr. MacDonald agreed to mark it as TBD until the TxDOT district could provide a clearer estimate.

Mr. Yardley asked why there are two Category 4's, wondering if it is because one focuses on statewide regional connectivity corridors and the other on specific areas or projects.

Ms. Sales-Evans explained that there is a rural portion of Category 4. This category supports construction projects aimed at improving rural connectivity outside MPO boundaries. She noted that there is also an urban portion of Category 4, which serves as a connectivity corridor but allows the state to allocate additional funding to priority projects identified by the MPO. She emphasized that the rural Category 4 funding is based on competitive decisions made at the statewide level.

**B. 2050 MTP DRAFT Fiscally Constrained Project Lists** 

Mr. MacDonald presented the item.

Existing Corpus Christi MPO and TxDOT documents that contain the currently approved Fiscally Constrained Project Lists for highways and transit were shown.

TAC members were asked to review these projects and programs and provide updates where applicable.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Sales-Evans raised concerns about project prioritization, especially for projects already under construction and those included mainly for reporting. She stated the need to revisit long-range, unfunded projects and prioritize based on evolving regional needs.

Mr. MacDonald explained that the MPO plans to eventually issue a call for projects to identify regional needs. However, they want to first focus on reviewing the current MPO-approved list of projects, which is over-programmed, before considering new submissions. He mentioned that the existing list

from the 2045 MTP is the latest summary of project needs. The previous plan included an unfunded needs list. Mr. MacDonald stated that the goal is to identify projects that are no longer priorities and remove them to focus on upcoming funding opportunities, with the review process likely involving multiple iterations and a workshop next month.

Ms. Sales-Evans expressed challenges with the 361 project, noting that only a portion currently falls within the MPO boundary, but this may change with updated boundaries. She asked whether the data should be based on the proposed boundary or remain separated for both current and future scenarios. Additionally, she brought up uncertainties with the Regional Parkway project, as its scope and costs are still unclear, especially since much of it could fall outside the MPO boundary.

Mr. MacDonald noted that the SH 361 project would likely remain within the MPO boundary. He proposed that reviewing each project could help refine the existing list and inform future funding decisions, either through a detailed workshop or immediate discussion with the TAC.

Mr. DeLatta noted the absence of the City of Corpus Christi and suggested postponing the discussion until the following month.

Ms. Sales-Evans suggested that a workshop would be more informal, allowing for multiple discussions and helping to identify future needs or informal priorities before a formal meeting.

Mr. MacDonald agreed and asked participants to review and provide feedback on the spreadsheet.

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

Mrs. Alfaro announced that the RTA will offer free rides for early voting and on Election Day, as well as shuttle services to the upcoming jazz festival.

**7. UPCOMING MEETINGS/EVENTS**

- |  |                                 |                                |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>A. Transportation Policy Committee:</b> | <b>Regular Meeting</b>          | <b>November 7, 2024</b>        |
| <b>B. Small Area Forecast Task Force:</b>  |                                 | <b>November 13 or 14, 2024</b> |
| <b>C. Technical Advisory Committee:</b>    | <b>Regular Meeting/Workshop</b> | <b>November 21, 2024</b>       |

**8. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 10: 24 a.m.