

**MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING  
CAPTIAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CITY OF CORPUS CHRISTI  
CITY HALL – 6<sup>TH</sup> FL  
1201 LEOPARD STREET  
September 08, 2022  
11:30 A.M.**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Moses Mostaghasi - Chairman  
George Laster  
Trey Summers  
John Holmgreen  
Jesus Jimenez  
Patricia Aitken

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Velda Tamez  
Ann Mahaffey  
Rudy Garza, Jr.  
Alex Harris  
Melody Nixon Bice  
Hailey Gonzalez  
Wendy Herman

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order and a quorum was established with Jesus Jimenez absent. Chairman Mostaghasi inquires if last vacancy has been filled, and Michael Dice advises it is Peter Zaroni's vacancy to fill and is in process.

**II. Approval of Minutes:** May 19, 2022 & July 28, 2022

Mr. Mostaghasi stated there was no agenda presented to approve minutes, so minutes will be approved at next meeting.

**III. Approval of Absences:** Melody Nixon-Bice – January 19, 2022, George Laster – May 19, 2022, & Jesus Jimenez September 9, 2022.

Mr. Mostaghasi stated there was no agenda presented for approval of absences for July 28, 2022, so approval of absences will be approved at next meeting.

**IV. Public Comment:** None.

**V. Discussion or Possible Action:** Presentation of Transportation Master Plan Study.

Justin Clark, Pape-Dawson Engineers, states the focus is to view the City's overall approved and accepted plan, how to accommodate the future growth on the City's roadways, and create a plan on how to fund these plans. First thing is to develop a Capital Improvement plan to identify projects on roadways based on the 10-year growth projections on those roadways and coming up with cost estimates. Specifically discussing the capital improvement plans and what elements are involved, which are service areas, land use assumptions, capital improvement plans and reviewing one zone to show and explain how these projects were assumed and identified and gather feedback.

Mr. Clark states the first method as part of the Roadway study was to gather an existing inventory of all the existing roadways within the City with a focus on collector and arterial roadways since these types are the only roadways that can be used to identify and recommend improvements as part of an impact fee study based on the local government code. The presentation reflects every street segment within the City of Corpus boundaries, viewing the number of lanes, geometry, right of way, and traffic volumes to identify what the roadways look like today and what they will look like in the future. The existing roadway traffic data sources were used from TxDOT 2016 Corpus Christi Urban Traffic Map, TxDOT Statewide Planning Map and Corpus Christi MPO model.

At this time, Mr. Mostaghasi asks if there was any current TIA information provided to them from the City of Corpus Christi and if a TIA would be more accurate than the MPO/TxDOT data. Mr. Clark responds that he does not have any TIA information but that he can request the information; however, on a TIA, the traffic count only gathers a single data point and the TxDOT data is averaged out for all months. Mr. Mostaghasi goes on to ask if data has been collected on how many miles of arterials and collectors there are in Corpus Christi. Mr. Clark states that data is unknown, but he can obtain information from GIS and the data can be broken up by service areas.

Mr. Clark discusses the Service Area breakdown. The 8 ADP areas were subdivided into six miles limit service areas and 21 total Service Areas were created within the existing ADP areas. Ms. Keefer defines a narrower breakdown of service areas, Mr. Mostaghasi adds that this will be a master plan for all major roadways in the city of Corpus, and Ms. Keefer agrees. Mr. Mostaghasi asks Traffic department (Renee Courture) how the City will utilize the plan. Mrs. Couture states that the City will use this information for future developments and future CIP projects.

Trey Summers questions where the service area was pulled from and when was it pulled, looking at the service area map. Justin responds that the service areas were created based on the ADP's. Mr. Summers states that the London area is not on the map and a right of way (ROW) for Staples that may not be in the city limits is showing on the map. Justin responds stating that a portion of the London ADP area is included in a south side service area. Mr. Summers states the ADP maps should be updated to ensure the city limits are correct before moving forward.

Mr. Clark presents Land Use Assumptions to discuss future growth, stating the MPO and the plat information were used to come up with the future growth trends, using historical and projected growth. Southside 3 was chosen to use and walk through from the presentation (slide 10 - 10-yr Growth by Service Areas) on how Pape is developing the projects because it had a mix of single family, multi family, and each one of the basic service or retail nonresidential uses, also this service area has the largest number of single family lots proposed over the next 10 years. Mr. Summers inquires if the Land Use Assumption chart provided was data used from the initial maps provided to committee members and recommendations received. Mr. Clark and Ms. Keefer confirm that it is.

Mr. Clark moves on to review and discuss nomenclature and the importance, to grasp a better understanding of how their calculations were formed. Mr. George Laster asks if there will be any growth around the military base. Mr. Clark states that there is some growth projected in the future. Mr. Laster adds he would like to see more housing near the naval installations. Michael Dice states increasing housing in that area is a bit complicated due to the new Military Compatibility Overlay Area District (MCOAD) that was recently adopted, which shifts residential growth away as the City is working with the military to protect the mission of the base, not to say a commercial / industrial use would not be welcome. Mr. Dice mentions if Mr. Laster would like to dive deeper into this issue, he would welcome to meet after the meeting to discuss.

Next topic to discuss is the Capital Improvement Plan, to review actual projects and using the land use data, existing condition roadway information, and identifying projects, identifying deficiencies and ultimately what is needed for the overall future conditions with all the growth that is projected. Mr. Clark states the basis of the Capital Improvement Plan is the Transportation Plan and includes projects identified as necessary to meet the needs of projected growth in the community. The existing City of Corpus Christi roadway capacities were compared to Top 7 cities in Texas. Mr. Clark pointed out when looking at the existing City of Corpus Christi UDC and comparing it to other cities, is that the collector roadways as they currently stand in the UDC do not allow very much volume on roadways, so the ADT volumes were very low compared to some of the other cities in Texas that have adopted a plan similar to this and have in their code. There are 3 collector type roadways. C1, C2 and C3 type roadways in Corpus Christi. Mr. Clark goes on to explain and describe a C1 style minor residential collector, adding that this style of collector recommendation is that no homes would be fronting. Mr. Mostaghasi asks if they are proposing C1 collectors not have homes fronting and what happens to C1 collectors in neighborhoods? Mr. Clark states that is correct, and that those would remain as is and the new C1 collectors would only be applied to new roadways that might get built as part of the study are their recommendations.

Mr. Mostaghasi reiterates the statement that Pape Dawson proposes that future C1 collectors inside neighborhoods not have houses on there, and if so, what would be on the left and right of the street? Mr. Clark states the back of the house, the backyards would back up to it. Mr. Mostaghasi states the City has a transportation plan that illustrates where their C1, C3, A1, A3's are and as a land developer, how do you design something based on what the City wants as far as the transportation plan inside your community if you cannot have any roadway frontage? Mr. Mostaghasi goes on to state, why would he follow the City transportation plan, why wouldn't he build more small 28ft back to back streets rather than want to have a 40ft back to back street if the limitations on that street change the whole design. He cannot think of how to design a neighborhood with a C1 collector not having a driveway off of it. Mr. Clark states, that is their recommendation in order to push up the proposed volumes.

Mr. Mostaghasi states that the UDC should be reviewed to see all streets and what changes need to be made. Mr. Clark continues to describe C2A, C2B, C3A, C3B, and P1 Parkway Collector style streets and states they will look at the local street section and see what they can do there and will get back to the group.

Next, Mr. Clark goes on describing the next part of the study is to look at one service area to demonstrate how the calculations and recommendations for the roadway improvements were configured, and if on the right track, they

will address any comments, and then apply the same process to the other 20 service areas that they have identified as part of the overall project. Reviewing the Southside 3 CIP Calculations map (slide 34), Mr. Summers asks about the widening project fees for the purpose of impact fees, are they eligible for impact fees or not? Mr. Clark states there must be a widening project and an improvement, this is to try and accommodate the future growth. Mr. Clark states all the projects that are being shown are widening projects/added capacity projects, so none that are shown are maintenance projects (which are not eligible under the impact fee study). Mr. Clark states that these projections will accommodate beyond the 10-year window that is being looked at and the recommendation will be the ultimate condition that will be needed for that roadway.

Mr. Clark states a project must be identified in this plan for the money to be collected and ultimately get built and that is the reason for recommending or identifying these projects early that will ultimately be needed.

At this time, Alex Harris states, if the dollar amount for the impact fee is given, the projected inflation should also be provided. Kara shares, escalators are added in for the duration of the plan time period. Angie Flores also shares State law does not allow to collect 100% of impact fees from development. Alex Harris is concerned with affordability with impact fees, using Portland and Port Aransas as examples on how much those water impact fees have increased. Michael Dice clarifies that as the discussions continue, the committee will discuss and propose the impact fee. Using Lubbock as reference on the impact fees, Mr. Dice states Lubbock adopted their transportation impact fee this year and adopted it at zero dollars, explaining that the purpose of that was to use the work that Pape Dawson had done to solidify it, adding, that way, if they decide to add an impact fee, they can do so without having to go through the entire process of master plans.

At this time, Mr. Clark goes on to review (slide 36) new roadways that are identified within the Southside 3 service area that are recommended as the ultimate growth. Similarly going into the intersection improvement list (slide 37), where the recommendation of two roadways that connect where traffic signal improvements or turn lanes at each one of these locations is anticipated within that service area leading to the cost estimation for each one of the locations. Mr. Summers asks if Pape Dawson, on the widening projects has taken into consideration existing right of way? Mr. Clark answers no, they have not looked at the existing right of way in detail and that would have to be reviewed as they are developing their cost estimates.

Mr. Mostaghasi asks they will we be going through every service area listed and discussed thoroughly? Mr. Clark replies yes, it would be best to do it by ADP areas. If there are comments within those service areas, then changes can be made as we move along the process. Mr. Clark states that if there were a BOND project where there was a recommended improvement, it would not be included in both, it would either be in the BOND or in the CIP program.

Mr. Clark concludes with next steps would be to apply a similar process to all other service areas to identify those projects and once the project list is identified, construction cost estimates will be developed for each project and ultimately that will be rolled into a Capital Improvement Plan report and then a public meeting process would be held to approve or adopt the plan.

## **VI. Future Agenda Items**

- Future meetings to be held at 11:30 a.m.

## **VII. Director's Report: None.**

## **VIII. Adjournment**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.