The purpose of the Southeast Houston Mobility Plan is to conduct a comprehensive mobility study in the area defined as the “Southeast Houston Sub-Area,” which is bound by Interstate 610 to the north, State Highway 288 to the west, State Highway Beltway 8 to the south, and Interstate 45 and Galveston Road to the east (“Area”). The Plan will be used to guide the City of Houston’s short, medium, and long-term multi-modal mobility planning efforts and to identify implementation projects that will improve mobility and access in the Area.

A multi-layered approach to public involvement requires varying levels of participation from community stakeholders and the general public. The engagement approach is designed to carry on in a continuum – from those wishing to be engaged in every step of the planning process, to those simply desiring to be informed of the Plan’s progress. Meaningful, two-way dialogue between the project team and the range of stakeholders is intended to cultivate ownership for the Plan’s vision, goals, recommendations and implementation.

The project team is utilizing tools and strategies to develop deep understanding of the mobility challenges and opportunities in the study area by engaging residents, technical experts, community leaders, and elected officials through a steering committee, technical committee, public meetings, and pop-up tabling opportunities at community events.

This document is a summary of the Plan’s first public meeting, held Saturday, September 8, 2018 between 9:00AM - 12:30PM at Greater St. Matthews Baptist Church within the study area in the South Park neighborhood. Over 40 people attended the meeting and provided input through a variety of stations. The meeting consisted of interactive presentations and activities that invited attendees to share transportation challenges and concerns in their community. Residents were also encouraged to visit various workstations where they contributed their thoughts and opinions on topics such as bike safety, roadway congestion, A.D.A. access, transit, walking, intersections, and overall mobility.

Over 1,000 flyers and points of contact in the weeks leading up to the event, including visits to area businesses, civic groups, and social media posts. Snacks and light refreshments were generously provided by the Houston Parks Board and the event space volunteered by church leaders at Greater St. Matthews Baptist Church.
WHAT WE HEARD

GOALS PYRAMID

Participants were provided an opportunity to provide input on the goals of the study. This activity contained a list of goals established by community leaders and technical experts from the Joint Steering and Technical Committee. Participants were asked to sort listed goals in a pyramid hierarchy that ranged from low, mid, high, and very high priorities. Each participant received a pyramid worksheet accompanied by a sticker sheet that contained the committee's seven goals and six blank dots to write in additional goals.

Responses were counted and scored with a composite score and aggregated in the following way:

- Low = 1 point
- Medium = 2 points
- High = 3 points
- Very high = 4 points

The highest ranked goals include neighborhood connections, safety, and health. People's additional write ins included recommendations to add a METRO shuttle to nearby transit centers, trash cleanup, more tree-lined streets, lighting, and sidewalk repairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTIONS</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESILIENCE</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICES</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL ACCESS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PICTURING TRIPS

This station attempts to better understand the public's interest in the transportation and land use nexus. Participants were asked to identify the type of places most frequented by selecting images at the workstation and combine them with the types of transportation facilities used to access these destinations. One half of the sheet demonstrates destinations (parks, schools, employment, medical, or retail). The opposite half displayed desirable transportation facilities for these uses (highways, major roadway, transit, bikeways, complete street, off-street trails, curb extensions, raised crosswalks, etc.). Participants then were asked to draw an arrow from left to right (i.e. travel mode to destination).

The concept is to get a glimpse for how people would prefer to travel to these destinations, all things being equal in the built environment, particularly if similar conditions persisted between modes pertaining to travel times, safety, and convenience.

SIDEWALKS

Participants selected sidewalks primarily to parks, school, work and shopping destinations. A couple of participants drew lines from sidewalks down to public transit, representing the reality of riding the bus or rail.

BIKEWAYS

Participants identified bikeways as a travel mode for each of the five destinations with parks and museums receiving the higher share of the distribution and proving the most versatile travel mode on this exercise. One participant made the bikeway to public transit connection, demonstrating how she frequents museums by starting out with a bike ride from home to public transit then getting off in the Museum District.

OFF-STREET TRAIL

Not surprisingly, off-street trails were linked more closely to park destinations. A few lines also were made to medical and museums though not as much as parks. This connection reinforces the preference of...
the community to use off-street trails for recreation or fitness activities rather than active commute to work or shopping trips.

**PUBLIC TRANSIT**

Participants connected public transportation to medical, museum, and work destinations in its overwhelming majority. A few minor lines demonstrated the preference for shopping destinations through most participants cited the need to carry large volumes of groceries as being inefficient for public transit.

**MAJOR ROADWAY**

Medical and shopping were the most prevalent choices for major roadway usage. People cited the preference to use a private automobile if they were in need of visiting a doctor while ill or the ability to shop more autonomously by not having to depend on a bus schedule or having to carry items onto a bus.

**HIGHWAY**

Selected the least in this exercise, highways were primarily identified for work, medical, and shopping trips. Most participants manifested minimal preference for using highways in all things being equal scenario though that is contrary to the mobility choices people make on a daily basis.

**RE-IMAGINING STREETS**

This activity provided an opportunity for people to creatively design their street. Sheets with a city block in perspective view were provided to color and draw what the public right of way should resemble. The sheet included an outline of a street and buildings, intended to give people a canvas to reflect their ideas onto.

**PUBLIC COMMENT MAP**

This activity is the analog version of the digital wikimap station that asked participants to include public comments pertaining to the five online categories (i.e. roadway, intersection, bicycle, pedestrian, or safety). Participants were able to identify mobility and access issues on the map by placing a numbered color dot on the map and list their comment on the side of the map where a number is listed to correspond with each dot placed on the map.

50 total comments were collected through this exercise and were added as input to the online wikimap by the project team.

**ROADWAYS**

A total of eighteen comments were captured for roadways. Comments here reflect the public’s desire for complete reconstruction of streets rather than patchwork repairs and repaving. Various east-west arterials were identified as needing repairs from Cullen to U.S. Highway 288, in addition to north and south arterials the entire study area (MLK, Cullen, and Scott). Participants also encouraged road reconstruction projects to better deal with ponding and flooding, with a preference away from open ditches.

**INTERSECTION**

Only four comments were made for intersections. Participants flagged the most dangerous and crash-prone areas here that include Cullen at Bellfort and Bellfort at Crestmont.

**BICYCLE**

Ten comments were captured for bicycles in this exercise. The predominant requests favored enhancing neighborhood connections to Sims Bayou off-street trails; providing protected bikeways or enhancing the separation on major arterials such as Belfort and Cullen; and, improving maintenance and overgrown landscaping near Sims Bayou trails.
PEDESTRIAN

Eight comments were made for pedestrian features. Comments overwhelmingly reflective of landscaping and maintenance issues on existing sidewalks throughout the study area. Participants also identified Cullen and Reed as the site of multiple hit and runs and expressed an interest in connecting neighborhoods on the edges of the study area to regional parks and destinations adjacent to the project study area (i.e. El Franco Lee Park and Robert Stuart Park).

SAFETY

Ten safety comments were captured in this exercise. Participants suggested more traffic calming measures are needed in neighborhood streets that connect to arterials (i.e. minor collectors). Cullen Blvd. was flagged for various accident-prone areas, particularly near Reed Rd. Participants also suggested enhancing lighting and visibility by better maintenance that could allow people to make more use of existing sidewalks.