

Meeting of the Rio Grande Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RGV MPO) Policy Committee

Thursday, December 10, 2020

At
1:30 pm

Microsoft Teams Meeting

MINUTES

Presiding: Chairman Ambrosio “Amos” Hernandez (Mayor City of Pharr)

I. Call to Order

Chairman Ambrosio “Amos” Hernandez called the meeting to order at 1:39 PM, a quorum was established. The Rio Grande Valley MPO Policy Committee Meeting was held as a Microsoft Teams Meeting with members present.

II. Roll Call

Roll call was taken, and present were representatives from each respective entity:

Members Present:	
Entity	Individual
City of Pharr	Mayor Ambrosio “Amos” Hernandez (Chairman)
Cameron County	Judge Eddie Treviño, Jr. (Vice Chairman) Com. David A. Garza (Alternate)
Hidalgo County	Com. Eddie Cantu
City of Brownsville	Mayor Trey Mendez Nurith Galonsky-Pinana (Alternate)
City of McAllen	Mayor Jim Darling
City of Edinburg	Mayor Richard Molina
City of Mission	Mayor Armando O’Caña (Absent)
City of Harlingen	Mayor Chris Boswell
City of San Benito	Manuel De La Rosa (Alternate)
Cameron County RMA	Frank Parker, Jr.
Hidalgo County RMA	S. David Deanda, Jr. /Ramon Navarro, V
Valley Metro	Tom Logan
TxDOT Pharr District	Pedro “Pete” Alvarez
GUEST	
Steve Taylor, Consultant	CoPlan
Jory Dille, PMP	Alliance Transportation Group (ATG)
Tim Simon, AICP	Alliance Transportation Group (ATG)
Ben Magallon, AICP	Alliance Transportation Group (ATG)
EX-OFFICIO	
RGV Partnership	Sergio Contreras
Others Present:	
RGVMPO	Andrew Canon

III. Public Comment

NONE

IV. Presentation, Discussion and Action Items:

A. Consideration and Action to Approve the Minutes From:

October 8, 2020

Chairman Hernandez asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of October 8, 2020. Mayor Darling (City of McAllen) made a motion to approve the minutes of October 8, 2020; as presented by staff. Mayor Molina (City of Edinburg) seconded the motion; and upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

B. Consideration and Discussion of Category 7 Workshop recommendation to Retain Category 7 Funding as is presently being used for ROW, PE and Construction.

Mr. Canon noted that staff held two (2) Workshops regarding Category 7 Projects with the TAC Committee. It was the consensus of the TAC Committee to recommend to the Policy Board to leave Category 7 Funding as it is presently being used for R.O.W., P.E. and Construction.

Chairman Hernandez noted that he had received a correspondence between TxDOT and Pct#4, requesting (\$1 Million) Category 7 Funding and TxDOT had agreed to place it in FY2023. Chairman asked, where is it being funded. Mr. Alvarez informed the Chairman, and the Board members present, that on previous approval Category 7 Funding (\$1Million) was available between Pct.4 and City of McAllen to utilize in FM676 Project and was requested that those funding (MPO Funding) be placed back. At the request and discussion between the Partners (City of McAllen, and Hidalgo County Pct.4).

Chairman Hernandez noted that there is no additional Category 7 Funding available, and the Policy board wants to assure no one is misled and reemphasized that Category 7 Funding have already been allocated.

Mr. Alvarez (TxDOT) informed Policy Members that this (\$1Million) is still being communicated with (TxDOT, City of McAllen and Hidalgo County Pct. 4). Funding is limited and it will be the Policy Board members final decision where this allocation, as far as moving funds; recommendation on how to proceed as far as shifting on the funding, delays of project. These funds (\$1Million) are to acquire Drainage Right-way.

Chairman Hernandez just wanted Policy Members to know that this effects Hidalgo County funding and was not aware of moving funds to supplement this project. Just wanted to make clear that this funding would have to come from existing (sponsoring cities/county) projects.

Commissioner Cantu asked for staff to investigate where these funds (\$1Million) are coming from or where it went to “what project” or is that project not moving forward.

Mr. Canon informed Policy Members that an internal audit is currently being done to determine where these funds are coming from, and once the audit is completed staff will be sending a memo explaining (\$1Million) to Policy members.

After some discussion on this item, RGV Policy Members present acknowledged Category 7 Funding as presently being used for R.O.W., P.E., and Construction for consideration and review. Report only, not action taken at this time.

C. Consideration and Concurrence on FY 2022 UTP Submittal

Mr. Canon noted that TxDOT has notified Staff on the consideration and concurrence of the 2022 UTP (Cat. 2) as contained within the packet. Because the UTP must be fiscally constrained by year so there is a need to balance the program statewide. The statewide methodology is to shift projects throughout the UTP to keep fiscal constraint Moved from year to year within Construct Authority (2021-2024), Construct Authority (2021-2024) to Develop Authority (2025-2031) and Develop Authority (2025- 2031) to PLAN (2035). The following is information on how the RGVMPPO region was impacted in comparison to a statewide need to balance projects. Board members will see that the requested shifts in projects is equitable to the statewide initiative and does not seem to be more burdensome to the RGVMPPO than other areas.

- 21 UTP Cat 2 PHR TOTAL = \$430,788,656 (\$43M/yr avg)
 - 2021 and 2022 were only about \$22.5M, which would be only half (50%) of the avg
 - 2023 total is about 1.5 times the avg, at \$66.9M
 - 2024-2031 tries to remain balanced throughout with 2030 dropping to only \$18M which would be less than half of the avg
- 21 UTP Cat 2 STATEWIDE TOTAL = \$9,762,261,100 (\$976M/yr avg)
 - 2021 and 2022 were only about \$515M, which would be only half (50%) of the avg
 - 2023 total is about 1.5 times the avg, at \$1.5B
 - 2024-2031 tries to remain balanced throughout with 2030 dropping to only \$424M which would be less than half of the avg

Chairman Hernandez made a comment regarding TxDOTs' Inflation Numbers: “Inflation has been added to base estimates as follows (Yr 1 - 0%, Yr 2 - 4%, Yr 3 – 8%, and Yrs 4-10- 12%)” are extremely high. Chairman Hernandez asked staff if they had contacted the other MPOs’ and what they were doing.

Mr. Canon noted that he did reach out to the following MPOs:

- Isidro Martinez, Executive Director for San Antonio had been notified, but currently not something that is on their immediate agenda and they are a non-attainment area.
- Ashby Johnson, Executive Director of Austin: (not aware of it); however, did note that they already set aside 4% annually on their projects; and
- Chris Evilla, Executive Director for both Waco and Tempo Statewide (Not aware and do not received Cat 7 Locally)

Mr. Alvarez (TxDOT) noted the following regarding 2022 UTP - CAT 2 Projects:

- Statewide MPOs' are having to balance their budget.
- Projects need to be physically constrained by year.
- Projects were moved based on where the projects are currently at (Status);
- Inflation has been added to base estimates as follows (Yr 1 - 0%, Yr 2 - 4%, Yr 3 - 8%, and Yrs 4-10- 12%)
- UTP Estimate includes Base Construction Estimate + Inflation + Contingencies (Safety and Change Order)

Mr. Sepulveda (Cameron County RMA) question was "what criteria was used to move or remove projects from the UTP", according to the listing currently 11 out of 14 projects in Cameron County on the UTP will be either moved or removed in the outer years. With (4) projects completely removed. Hidalgo County is also having the same as far as having projects being removed or moved.

Mr. Alvarez (TxDOT) noted that:

- UTP estimate shown does not represent authorized amounts. All projects have partial Cat 2 funding and a request for the funding gap will be made as part of the FY22 UTP;
- A deadline is set for January 28, 2021 to have TxDOT submit preliminary review documents; and
- Once final numbers are revealed, TxDOT would like to re-visit these projects again in February 2021.

After much discussion on this item Mayor Boswell (City of Harlingen) made a motion to table the FY 2022 UTP Submittal and hold a Special Meeting prior to the deadline. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garza (Cameron County); and upon a vote, the motion passed. Mr. Alvarez (TxDOT) opposed.

D. Consideration and Action to Adopt Transit Development Plan

Tim Simon, AICP, TDP Task Lead Representative provided a brief update on the Adoption of the Transit Development Plan (TDP), and its' contents. The Objectives for Transit Development Plan is to create a regional plan that would establish a shared vision for transit in the RGVMA and make service more connected, reliable, and accessible.

The TDP Components consist of 5 Chapters:

- Chapter 1: Transit Existing Conditions Analysis
- Chapter 2: Regional Service Standards
- Chapter 3: Recommendations and Alternatives
- Chapter 4: Implementation Plan; and
- Chapter 5: Transit Investment

Mr. Simon concluded his presentation by letting Policy Members know that TDP Components consist establishing an understanding of existing service and the regional transit market and Created service standards for a cohesive, reliable regional transit network.

After some discussion on this item, Mr. Parker (Cameron County RMA) made a motion to approve and Adopt the Transit Development Plan (TDP) as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Logan (Valley Metro); and upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

E. Consideration and Action to Adopt Active Transportation Plan

Mr. Jory Dille, PMP, ATP Task Lead Representative provided a brief update on the Adoption of the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and its' contents. The Objectives for the Active Transportation Plan is to deliver a regionally coordinated system for walking and bicycling designed to provide world class facilities for active transportation and to integrate active tourism to support economic opportunity in local communities.

The ATP Components consist of 4 Chapters:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Public Outreach
- Chapter 3: Recommendations and Network Development
- Chapter 4: Implementation Plan; and
- Appendix A, B, C

Mr. Dille concluded his presentation by letting Policy members know that ATP Components consist of Facility Selection: 1) Identify Community Needs and Route; 2) Understand Current Conditions, 3) Identify Solutions Based on Local Context and Traffic Speed/Volume to Design Guidelines – Side Path.

No discussion took place on this item, Commissioner Garza (Cameron County) made a motion to approve and Adopt the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) as presented. The motion was seconded by Mayor Mendez (City of Brownsville); and upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

F. Consideration and Action to Adopt 2045 MTP (Long Range Plan)

Mr. Ben Magallón, AICP, MTP Task Lead Representative provided a brief update on the Adoption of the 2045 MTP (Long Rang Plan) and its' contents. The Objectives for Metropolitan Transportation Plan is to forge a new regional vision for multimodal transportation in the Rio Grande Valley; Respect what makes each of its component communities unique; Comprehensively balance the relationship between the planning process and federal rules; and Apply that understanding toward achieving a plan that meets or exceeds the region's needs and federal compliance requirements.

The MTP Components consist of:

- Chapter 1: Introduction to Planning Processes
- Chapter 2: Vision, Goals, and Objectives
 - Safety Environmental Stewardship Inclusivity
 - Efficiency Sustainability Economic Growth
 - Connectivity Asset Management Security
- Chapter 3: Public Involvement Process
- Chapter 4: Multimodal Needs Analysis
- Chapter 5: Strategies for Regional Mobility
- Chapter 6: Staged Improvement Plan
- Chapter 7: Environmental Impact Considerations
- Chapter 8: Financial Plan
- Chapter 9: System Performance Report

Multimodal Needs Analysis and Stakeholder Feedback Integration:

- Active Transportation Analysis
- Bridge and Pavement Conditions Analysis
- Demographics Analysis
- Environmental Resources Analysis
- Equity Analysis
- Freight Analysis
- Roadway Analysis
- Safety Analysis
- Transit Analysis

Mr. Magallón noted on his presentation that MTP Components consist of Federal Compliance, Systems Performance and Project Scoring.

The final steps consist of:

- ❖ Delivery of Final Plans
- ❖ Demo with MPO Staff
- ❖ Public Involvement Memo
- ❖ Executive Summary
- ❖ Finalize delivery of data and project files.
- ❖ Transportation Policy Board Presentation and Plan Adoption (December 10, 2020)

Mr. Magallón concluded his presentation by encouraging Policy Members to reach out to all three gentlemen for any further questions.

Mr. Canon did inform Policy Members that a 30-Day Public Involvement was held accordingly. No discussion took place on this item, Mayor Boswell (City of Harlingen) made a motion to approve and Adopt the 2045 MTP (Long Range Plan), as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Navarro (HCRMA); and upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

G. Consideration and Action to Approve Executive Summary of 2019 CMP

Mr. Canon introduce Mr. Steve Taylor with CoPlan, who would be providing a brief update on the Executive Summary of the 2019 CMP. Mr. Taylor noted that the Executive Summary was established for the RGVMPPO (CMP) to monitor the transportation network in Hidalgo and Cameron Counties. The goal of the monitoring system areas and related transportation deficiencies. Traffic studies are conducted each year, rotating among the seasons. In 2019/2020 update, the Winter season was studied in Hidalgo and Cameron Counties. Past CMP Studies in Hidalgo County include Spring 2001, Fall 2002, Summer 2003, Spring 2004, Winter 2005, Fall 2006, Spring 2007, Winter 2008/2009, Summer 2009, Fall 2010, Spring 2013 and Winter 2015. Past CMP studies were performed following the merger of the Hidalgo County, Harlingen, and Brownsville MPOs.

Staff concluded by noting that staff is seeking consideration and approval of the 2019 Congestion Management Process. This Plan originally began with the HCMPO and was part of the initiative that the Policy Board approved at the merger for the RGVMPPO to meet Federal Compliance. This updated integrated date from the previous Brownsville, Harlingen-San Benito, and Hidalgo County MPO's. Over 1,000 centerline miles and 80 high priority intersections were identified for this region wide approach. The executive summary provides guidance to address corridor efficiencies and possible intersection improvements.

After much discussion on this item, Mayor Mendez (City of Brownsville) made a motion to approve the Executive Summary 2019 CMP as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Alvarez (TxDOT); and upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

H. Consideration and Action to extend CMP Contract for Time Purposes Only (3 Months) from December to March 31, 2021

Mr. Canon noted that staff is seeking approval for "Time Extension" for the existing CMP Contract, for additional three (3) months, starting December 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021. Staff noted Mr. Taylor still has some cabinets and signals still pending for the City of Mission that need to be set up.

After some discussion on this item, Commissioner Garza (Cameron County) made a motion to approve the CMP Contract for Time Purposes Only (3) Three Months as recommended by staff. Mr. Alvarez (TxDOT) seconded the motion; and upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

V. RGVMPPO Executive Directors Reports and Updates

A. Directors Update

- STIP 21-24 Project Movement – No discussion took place on this item.

B. Update on Federal Certification Review

- Federal Certification Review - Andrew Canon was happy to announce that the RGVMPPO received high praises on the (3) three-day Certification Review by FHWA.
- Executive Director on Vacation – Mr. Canon noted that he is scheduled to be out of the office on vacation until January 4, 2021. If Policy Members need to contact him, he will be available by phone. Staff will also be available.

C. Financial Update

Mr. Canon also stated that the Financial Summary continue to be (98%) under budget. (Report filed with RGVTPB Packet)

D. Update on Category 7 Scoring – No discussion took place on this item.

V. Status Report

A. TxDOT Project Status Report (Action Taken as Required)

Jesus Garla and Gabriel Villarreal (TxDOT) provided an update on TxDOT's current projects and activities within the Hidalgo and Cameron Counties. All projects are continuing to move forward as scheduled. (Report filed with RGVTPB Packet)

B. Cameron County RMA

Mr. Sepulveda (Cameron County RMA) provided an updated presentation Via Teams on projects that are currently within the Cameron County RMA. (Report filed with RGVTPB Packet)

C. Hidalgo County RMA

Mr. Navarro provided an updated presentation Via Teams on projects that are currently within the Hidalgo County RMA. All projects are continuing to move forward. *(Report filed with RGVTPB Packet)*

D. Regional Transit (Metro)

Ms. Zamora provided a brief update report Via Teams that are currently within the Hidalgo/Cameron Region. Details values on ridership could be found within the RGVTPB Packet. *(Report filed with RGVTPB Packet)*

VI. New or Unfinished Business
NONE

VIII ADJOURNMENT

No further items were discussed, Chairman Hernandez called for a motion to adjourn at 3:21 PM. Mr. Parker (Cameron County RMA) made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Navarro (Hidalgo County RMA) seconded the motion; and upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

ATTEST:



RGVMPO POLICY COMMITTEE
(TPB) VICE CHAIRMAN