

**RIO GRANDE VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING
ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

January 14, 2021

I) CALL TO ORDER

Pete Sepulveda, (Cameron County RMA) Chairman called the TAC Microsoft Teams Meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. Thursday, January 14, 2021. The RGV TAC Microsoft Teams Meeting was held remotely with the following TAC Members.

II) ROLL CALL

RGV TAC Representatives in attendance were as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT	
ENTITY	VOTING MEMBERS
Cameron County RMA	Pete Sepulveda, Chairman
City of Mission	JP Terrazas, Vice Chairman
City of Brownsville	Joel Garza
City of Edinburg	Tom Reyna
City of Harlingen	Carlos Sanchez
City of McAllen	Yvette Barrera
City of Pharr	Omar Anzaldua
City of San Benito	Bernard Rodriguez
Cameron County	Benjamin Worsham
Hidalgo County	Armando Garza, Jr.
TxDOT Pharr District	Melba Schaus
Valley Metro	Frank Jaramillo
Hidalgo County RMA	Eric Davila
Brownsville Metro	Antonio Zubieta
McAllen Metro	Jon Ray Bocanegra
Port of Brownsville	Ariel Chavez, III (ABSENT)
Port of Harlingen	ABSENT
Port Isabel-San Benito Navigation District	ABSENT
Cameron County Spaceport Dev. Corp.	Mark Yates
GUEST	
STAFF	
RGVMPO	Andrew A. Canon
RGVMPO	Luis Diaz
RGVMPO	Staff

**III) PUBLIC COMMENT
S NONE**

IV) PRESENTATION, ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Consideration and Action to Approve the Minutes of November 19, 2020

Pete Sepulveda (Cameron County RMA) Chairman asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of November 19, 2020. *No corrections were noted to the minutes of November 19, 2020, City of Brownsville made a motion to approve the minutes as presented by staff. The motion was seconded by the City of Edinburg; and upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously.*

B. Consideration and Concurrence on FY 2022 UTP Submittal

Andrew A. Canon noted that the following information was provided at the last months' TAC meeting and Tabled at the Policy Meeting. Staff provided the 2022 UTP (Cat. 2) as contained within T A C 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), This item was Tabled at the Policy Level at their last meeting, however TxDOT will be providing new information and tables regarding the FY2022 UTP (See Below Tables).

Melba updated everyone by providing the below revised tables, to TAC members present. The 2022 UTP are currently being develop and the attached tables contain the red markings, which include Category 2 Projects that were identify and prioritized for development within the UTP. TxDOT is working towards being able to plan for total project cost, therefore; the refinement to the cost estimating and programming to account for "base construction estimates, contingencies, change orders, and inflation", are being implemented for projects within the propose 2022 UTP. An email was sent out back on November 17, 2020 by Jessica Butler, TP&P Director, basically detailing all this information in preparation of the 2022 UTP Project Development. The Draft Category 2 Tables that were presented in November and December meetings for discussion and concurrence was concurred at the TAC level, but table at the Policy Meeting.

The revised tables included updated estimates to account for an increase in the change order percentage based on historical data that was updated December 22, 2020 by TP&P, after the TAC Meetings of November and December 2020. Projects removed from Develop Authority to Plan Authority due to the increase of estimates and not being able to meet physical constraints based on current allocation. Melba concluded by letting TAC Members present know that there is no additional capacity to add any new projects at this time, and TxDOT is asking for MPO concurrent on the Draft Category 2 Projects to be included to the 2022 UTP at this time.

CSJ	PROP. FY	County	HWY	Limit From	Limit To		Estimate with Inflation (4,8,12% TO FY 2,3,4) 12/22/2020	Estimate with Inflation (4,8,12% TO FY 2,3,4) 12/3/2020
CONSTRUCT AUTHORITY (TIP 2021-2024)								
0039-07-257	2022	CAMERON	IH 69E	INDUSTRIAL BLVD.	LOOP 499 (PRIMERA RD.)	NB & SB RAMPS REVERSAL	\$3,019,971.04	\$2,980,016.15
1064-01-032	2022	HIDALGO	FM 676	SH 364, EAST	SH 107	WIDEN TO 4 LANE DIVIDED	\$17,680,048.91	\$17,315,078.96
0342-01-093	2023	HIDALGO	SH 107	BUS 281W	IH 69C	OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS & REHABILITATION	\$19,279,649.52	\$19,024,575.43
0528-01-118	2023	HIDALGO	SH 107	FM 1924	SH 495	WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH RAISED MEDIAN	\$21,656,019.84	\$21,208,973.76
0865-01-108	2023	HIDALGO	SH 495	VETERANS BLVD., FROM IH-2 (US 83)	LA HOMA RD.	CONSTRUCT 4 LANE DIVIDED_URBAN SECTION	\$16,491,146.94	\$16,150,719.54
0921-06-254	2023	CAMERON	CS	FM 509 ON NEW LOCATION, FROM FM 508	FM 1599	CONSTRUCT 2 LANE RURAL	\$7,953,400.00	\$7,880,600.00
0864-01-068	2024	HIDALGO	FM 494	SH 107	FM 676(MILE 5)	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 4 LANE	\$20,534,168.51	\$20,110,280.85
1803-01-092	2024	HIDALGO	FM 1925	10TH ST.	MCCOLL RD	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH RAISED MEDIAN	\$11,005,039.08	\$10,777,861.62
1803-02-035	2024	HIDALGO	FM 1925	FM 907 (ALAMO RD)	SHARP RD.	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 4 LANE DIVIDED	\$10,203,028.01	\$9,992,406.50
2094-01-063	2024	HIDALGO	FM 2220	FM 1925	SH 107	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH MEDIAN	\$22,198,130.43	\$21,739,893.53
CONSTRUCT AUTHORITY SUBTOTAL							\$150,020,602.28	\$147,180,406.35

CSJ	PROP. FY	County	HWY	Limit From	Limit To		Estimate with Inflation (4,8,12% TO FY 2,3,4) 12/22/2020	Estimate with Inflation (4,8,12% TO FY 2,3,4) 12/3/2020
DEVELOP AUTHORITY (2025-2031)								
1064-01-027	2025	HIDALGO	FM 676	SH 107	TAYLOR RD.	WIDEN TO 4 LANE WITH LEFT TURN LANE	\$25,321,532.51	\$24,798,819.10
1803-01-094	2025	HIDALGO	FM 1925	WALLACE RD.	10TH ST.	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH RAISED MEDIAN	\$29,391,438.72	\$28,784,710.08
0220-04-049	2026	CAMERON	US 281	.5 Miles West of FM 1577	FM 1421	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 4 LANE RURAL	\$15,327,200.00	\$15,010,800.00
0220-04-050	2026	CAMERON	US 281	FM 732	.5 Miles West of FM 1577	WIDEN TO 4 LANE RURAL	\$14,714,112.00	\$14,410,368.00
0327-08-098	2026	CAMERON	BU 77X	SS 206	COMMERCE ST.	CONSTRUCT RAISED MEDIAN	\$5,101,566.99	\$2,907,785.98
1228-03-041	2027	HIDALGO	FM 1015	MILE 12 RD.	SH 107	PROPOSED 4 LANE DIVIDED URBAN	\$38,404,328.92	\$37,611,546.83
1429-02-036	2027	HIDALGO	FM 1426	NOLANA LOOP	IH-2	WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH RAISED MEDIAN	\$20,010,939.73	\$19,597,853.11
2717-01-027	2027	CAMERON	FM 3248	IH-69E	FM 1847	WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH RAISED MEDIAN	\$19,710,634.46	\$19,303,747.05
3468-01-021	2027	HIDALGO	FM 3362	BUS 83S	SH 495	WIDEN AND RECONSTRUCT ROADWAY (4 TO 6 LANES)(DIVIDED)(URBAN)	\$11,244,033.92	\$11,011,922.88
0039-07-049	2028	CAMERON	IH 69E	@ IH-69E & FM 732 INTERSECTION	@ SHERER RD./BUS 77 INTERSECTION	PROPOSED CONTINUOUS FRONTAGE RDS. & INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	\$21,409,329.76	\$21,126,079.52
0039-12-254	2028	CAMERON	BU 77X	COMMERCE ST.	ARROYO BRIDGE	CONSTRUCT RAISED MEDIAN	\$708,435.00	\$286,589.80
0684-03-019	2028	CAMERON	FM 1732	US 281	IH-69E	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 4 LANE URBAN	\$27,662,530.56	\$27,091,491.84
0342-03-040	2029	CAMERON	SH 107	HIDALGO/CAMERON CL	LOUISIANA ST.	RECONSTRUCT & WIDEN TO 4 LANE RURAL_ ROADWAY	\$5,628,147.84	\$5,511,965.76

1803-01-095	2029	HIDALGO	FM 1925	FM 681	WALLACE ST.	PROPOSED 4 LANE C&G W/ SHOULDERS	\$30,016,788.48	\$29,397,150.72
2094-01-062	2029	HIDALGO	FM 2220	SH 107	MILE 5	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH MEDIAN	\$21,244,660.39	\$20,806,106.01
0528-01-113	2030	HIDALGO	SH 107	FM 1924 NORTH	FM 676	WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE DIVIDED RURAL	\$19,864,051.20	\$19,453,996.80
0220-05-076	2031	CAMERON	SH 48	SH 4	FM 511	WIDEN TO 6 LANE W/RAISED MEDIAN	\$34,385,653.57	\$33,675,829.15
DEVELOP AUTHORITY SUBTOTAL							\$340,145,384.05	\$330,786,762.63
UTP TOTAL							\$490,165,986.33	\$477,967,168.98

CSJ	PROP. FY	County	HWY	Limit From	Limit To		Estimate with Inflation (4,8,12% TO FY 2,3,4) 12/22/2020	Estimate with Inflation (4,8,12% TO FY 2,3,4) 12/3/2020
PLAN AUTHORITY (OUTSIDE OF UTP)								
0039-12-057	2035	CAMERON	BU 77X	ARROYO COLORADO BRIDGE	FM 510	WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH RAISED MEDIAN	\$40,317,113.31	\$39,484,845.55
0342-03-037	2035	CAMERON	SH 107	LOUISIANA ST.	HOOKS E. HODGES RD.	REHABILITATE EXISTING ROADWAY (CHANGED FROM WIDENING PROJECT)	\$8,345,680.00	\$13,209,504.00
0528-01-112	2035	HIDALGO	SH 107	FM 676	FM 681/FM 2993	WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE DIVIDED URBAN	\$22,377,712.00	\$21,915,768.00
0528-01-116	2035	HIDALGO	SH 107	FM 681	FM 2220	WIDEN TO 6 LANE_ W/RAISED MEDIAN	\$40,046,908.16	\$39,220,218.24
0863-01-048	2035	HIDALGO	FM 493	MILE 14	MILE 10	CONSTRUCT 4 LANE DIVIDED	\$36,785,280.00	\$10,003,197.12
1137-01-029	2035	CAMERON	SL 499	IH-69E	BUS 77X	CONSTRUCT RAISED MEDIAN	\$6,201,091.33	\$6,073,081.95
1137-02-038	2035	CAMERON	SL 499	BUS 77	SS 206	WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE WITH RAISED MEDIAN	\$15,379,927.32	\$15,062,438.85
1427-01-033	2035	HIDALGO	FM 1423	IH-2	BUS 83	PROPOSED 4 LANE C&G WITH SHOULDERS	\$3,182,550.69	\$3,116,853.17
1939-02-036	2035	HIDALGO	FM 2061	BUS 83 S	HALL ACRES RD.	PROPOSED 6 LANE W/ RAISED MEDIAN	\$23,260,558.72	\$22,780,390.08
2966-01-014	2035	HIDALGO	SH 364	FM 2221	FM 676	WIDEN FROM 2 LANE TO 5 LANE CURB & GUTTER	\$6,743,968.00	\$6,604,752.00
PLAN AUTHORITY SUBTOTAL							\$202,640,789.53	\$177,471,048.97

*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)

*UTP estimate shown does not represent authorized amounts.

*** Change Order Contingency percentage has been updated to reflect a combined default value for Change Orders and Contingency. The approved default values are based on Project Classification using historical information. Estimates updated on 12-22-2020.**

All projects have partial Cat 2 funding and a request for the funding gap will be made as part of the FY2022 UTP.

City of McAllen asked, did these projects get moved back because of those increase or are they still within what was originally presented. TxDOT reply was “there was some minors changes done and there was only one project that was moved back “FM 493”, moved from Develop Authority to Plan Authority due to increase of estimates and could not be contained in that current allocation.

City of McAllen also ask where there any other projects adjusted due to the scope. TxDOT replied no other projects were adjusted, this project was adjusted due to the cost, since it was not a realistic cost and need to be increased. All other projects remain the same.

City of McAllen had one final question, are all the other MPOs’ doing the same adjustments. TxDOT’s reply was this is a Statewide exercise for 2022 Development of the UTP and is part of the TxDOT Connect and all the Districts are being asked to develop project estimates to move forward with the FY2022 UTP.

City of Harlingen noted that at the Policy Level, one of the statements made by TxDOT was that construction cost estimates were going to be updated, and be reflected in these estimates, are they reflected. TxDOT reply was yes, to the best of TxDOT knowledge.

Hidalgo County noted that he was not present at the last TAC Meeting and ask for staff to provide a synopsis on why the Policy Board did not approve, FY 2022 UTP Submittal.

Between the Chairman and Andrew, a brief synopsis was provided why the Policy Board Tabled the FY2022 UTP Submittals at the Policy Meeting of December 2020 as follows:

The FY2022 UTP Submittals was tabled at the Policy Meeting because some of the officials wanted more time to digest the information being provided and the impact it was going to have and before moving forward on Concurrence. As well as the contingencies on a Statewide Level on any reduction funding received and wanted to assure the RGVMPPO were not the only once being impacted and that the impact were proportionate. Also, concerns on any inflation rates there were being presented, and staff was asked to reach out to other MPOs’ on how they will be impacted.

After much discussion on the FY2022 UTP Submittals, Cameron County RMA made a motion to recommend to the Policy Board to approve the FY2022 UTP discussed/presented. The motion was seconded by City of Harlingen; and upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

C. RGVMPPO Bike/Ped Program Presentation

Mr. Canon introduce Eva L. Garcia as the new Bike/Ped Program Specialist for RGVMPPO. Ms. Garcia provided a brief Bike/Ped Program Presentation on experience, as the newly Bike / Ped Program Specialist. Also shared with TAC members present were the key recommendations from the recently adopted RGVMPPO Active Transportation Plan (ATP), activities of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and other efforts to build a safe and seamless regional active transportation network. Ms. Garcia concluded her presentation by letting TAC members know that she is excited to be part of the RGVMPPO Team and to be able to share her knowledge to both the Cameron and Hidalgo Counties on connecting future trails within these communities.

No discussion took place on this item, City of McAllen made a motion to acknowledge the RGVMPPO Bike / Ped Program Presentation as presented by Ms. Garcia. The motion was seconded by Port of Brownsville; and upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

D. Discussion of Category 7 Targets Scoring Initiatives

Luis noted that staff is working to score CAT 7/Off-System Projects to fulfill performance measure requirements. Staff has diligently worked to apply available in-house data to each project scoring criteria. On December 29, 2020, and email was sent out to local governments who encompass CAT 7 / Off-System Projects to request additional supportive input for this scoring process. Staff concluded by letting TAC members know that three (3) TAC Workshops were held, along with TPB approval at their May 27, 2020 Meeting; with the Online Project Scoring Tool being utilized. Staff will continue to make initiative efforts to project accurate scores for each project. Staff concluded by informing TAC members, that a deadline was set for (January 7, 2021 to submit information from various entities) with a “10 Year Horizon on “Off-System Projects (Form Attached).

Andrew noted that two main things to remember regarding this project 1) Entities in yellow listed on the table provided please contact Staff, to update this information as soon as possible, due to this data will change as information is being received by the various entities; and 2) Keep in mind this is only a scoring process and not a ranking process, to keep an open conversation with TAC / Policy Members. Staff is requesting that all information be submitted by Friday, January 15, 2021 or before the Policy Meeting scheduled for January 27, 2021.

Cameron County requested from Staff to send over any scoring and importation information on the Old Alice Project.

After much discussion on this item, City of McAllen acknowledged discussion of Category 7 Targets Scoring Initiatives as presented by staff. The motion was seconded by Cameron County; and upon a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

E. Consideration and Action of Public Involvement for TIP and MTP to Achieve Fiscal Constraint Targets

Andrew noted that the TIP and MTP will be available for public review and comment on the RGVMPPO Website’s New Section from December 23, 2020 to January 22, 2021, and a link was provided by staff for ease of documents. Staff concluded by letting TAC members know that the RGVMPPO News Section, members can find the following documents:

- Public Notice
- Highway TIP 2021-2024
- Summary of Changes
- MTP 2020 – 2045
- Transit 2021 – 2024
- 5307 Program of Projects

Staff concluded by letting TAC members know that staff is available for further assistance. *Report only, no action taken at this time.*

F. Discussion Regarding City Limit and ETJ Boundary GIS DATA Update

Luis noted that it is the beginning of the new year; and staff will be collecting and updating GIS DATA. Staff will be updating the current City Limits and ETJ Boundary Data. Staff will be requesting from all Planning Partners the most up to date DATA, preferably in GIS Format, but if that is not available a PDF Format will work as well. These vital data sets will allow the MPO to Plan for the RGV’s future Transportation needs. Staff have setup the online interactive mapping tool “RGVMPPO UMAP”. Staff concluded by letting TAC Members know that staff is available should members have any issues or need assistance with UMAP Tool. ***Report only, no action taken at this time.***

V) RGVMPPO STAFF REPORTS AND UPDATES

A. Director Update

- CMP – To be wrap up soon, pending Timing with the City of Mission, with CoPlan to provide an updated report to the TAC Committee members at the next upcoming Meeting.
- Cameron/Hidalgo County Offices – Staff looking into possible housing staff in Cameron County to assist those cities on that side of the county; as well having a new location in Hidalgo. More information to be provided in the next coming months.
- Logo – Staff is currently looking into proposing a Logo for RGVMPPO, similar to the rest of the logos within the LRGVDC.

B. Financial Update

Mr. Canon provide the financial update and noted that the current budget continues on a positive trend. No discussion took place regarding financial update. ***Report filed with the January 14, 2021 RGV TAC Packet.***

VI) STATUS REPORTS

A. TxDOT Project Status Report

Melba Schaus (TxDOT) provided an updated Via Microsoft Teams TxDOT Project Status Report within the RGVMPPO area. The following reports included TxDOT Monthly Letting Update (Nov. 2020 and Dec. 2020 Projects have Let); February thru August 2021, Project to be Let); and The Pharr District Master Letting Plan. *TxDOT Project Status Report is filed with the January 14, 2021 RGVTAC Packet. Report only, no action taken at this time.*

B. Cameron County RMA

Pete Sepulveda (Cameron County RMA) provided an updated presentation Via Microsoft Teams on projects that are currently within the Cameron County RMA. All projects are moving forward as scheduled. *Cameron County RMA report is filed with the January 14, 2021-RGVTAC Packet. Report only, no action taken at this time.*

C. Hidalgo County RMA

Eric Davila, PE, (Hidalgo County RMA) provided an updated presentation Via Microsoft Teams on projects that are currently within the Hidalgo County RMA; he discussed the major milestones of each project. *The Hidalgo County RMA monthly report is filed with the January 14, 2021-RGVTAC Packet. Report only, no action taken at this time.*

D. McAllen Metro

Jon Ray Bocanegra provided a brief update Via Microsoft Teams and noted a small passenger increase since the previous month. *The McAllen Metro report is filed with the January 14, 2021-RGVTAC Packet. Report only, no action taken at this time.*

E. Brownsville / Island Metros

Antonio Zubieta provided an updated report Via Microsoft Teams which included the Brownsville Metro and Island Metro. These reports include on-going connecting community projects and combined ridership. *The reports are filed with January 14, 2021 RGVTAC Packet. Report only, no action taken at this time.*

F. Valley Metro

Frank Jaramillo provided an updated presentation Via Microsoft Teams for both the Rural and Urban area for the Year-To-Date Report. COVID-19 continues to impact services, however, there is a steadily increase. *The reports are filed with the January 14, 2021 RGVTAC Packet. Report only, no action taken at this time.*

VII) NEW OR UNFINISHED BUSINESS

TxDOT – Continue to work with entities and encourages cities to reach out to their TxDOT Project Managers on “Ready Steady Project”. TxDOT meeting with Project Managers are still being held virtual.

VIII) ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the TAC Members, Chairman Sepulveda, (Cameron County RMA) called for a motion to adjourn. The City of Harlingen made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:34 AM. The motion was seconded by City of McAllen; and upon a vote, the motion carried unanimously.