

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Planning & Development Center
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor
4700 Elmore Road
Anchorage, Alaska**

**June 09, 2022
2:30 PM**

*This meeting is available for viewing at
[Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings \(muni.org\)](http://Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings (muni.org))*

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Brad Coy (Chair)	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Brian Lindamood	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning Department
Todd Vanhove	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region Planning
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Steve Ribuffo	MOA/Port of Alaska
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Matt Stichick	MOA/Anchorage Health Department (AHD)
Shaina Kilcoyne	MOA/Energy and Sustainability
Kent Kohlhas	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)

Also in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning
Jon Cecil	MOA/Planning
Joni Wilm	MOA/Planning
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Kathryn Wenger	Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)
Bart Rudolph	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Sean Holland	DOT&PF
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
Ben Coleman	R&M Consultants
Julia Hanson	DOT&PF
Robert Wertman	RSG, Inc.
Cheryl Richardson	
Wolfgang Junge*	DOT&PF
Joann Mitchell	Kinney Engineering
Nancy Pease	

**Policy Committee Member*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. Adeyemi Alimi represented ADEC on behalf of Cindy Heil. Jamie Acton was excused. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy Committee. He explained staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. KOHLHASE moved to approve the agenda. MR. RIBUFFO seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – May 19, 2022

MR. LINDAMOOD moved to approve the minutes. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2023 Safety Targets

MR. JONGENELEN explained that the Safety Performance Management (Safety PM) is part of the overall Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, which The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) defines as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decision to achieve national performance goals. The Safety PM Final Rule supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), as it establishes safety performance measure requirements for the purpose of carrying out the HSIP and to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

In response to Ms. Kilcoyne's question as to where the actuals from previous years can be found, MR. JONGENELEN noted that the actuals are slightly behind. Right now, the actual certified data is in 2018 with 2019 being worked on, so that information is not available for 2020 and 2021.

MR. VANHOVE clarified that they now have that data. The State Troopers are working on a new data collection system that should support their timelines and receiving data input.

There were no public comments.

MR. VANHOVE moved to approve. MR. ALIMI seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

b. Destination UMED Public Involvement Plan

JON CECIL noted that the Destination UMED (More Travel Choices, More Opportunities) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study is a recommended action of the UMED District Plan (2016). It will define a policy framework and craft an actionable toolkit to advance realistic implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in the UMED District to reduce traffic congestion, improve mobility choice and equitable access, and support economic development for the next decade. This study is guided by a 17-member advisory committee that will seek input from a diverse set of stakeholders to build community consensus and secure buy-in. Opportunities for community input will include a travel survey, stakeholder interview, community workshops, and public comment on project documents.

VAN LE with R&M Consultants was also present and assisted with presenting the plan.

The following questions and comments were made by the Committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

- (KK) This plan will inform what specific projects could be added to the TIP or is it more broadly just a transportation development plan for the area?
- (JC) *It will do both. What we want to see one year from now will be an actionable plan that we can start to achieve the goals identified in the study.*
- (KK) The outcome of the goals and objectives could involve various funding sources?
- (JC) *It could identify various funding sources. Projects usually require basic funding to get things done. We will have short-range, medium, and long-term goals.*
- (SK) In an earlier discussion, Mr. Jongenelen had explained to her that Alaska Regional Hospital was not involved because the Policy Committee (PC) had set the description as the UMED District. Does it make sense to have Regional involved? It was explained that some of the outer edges are involved to some extent. Is that good? Do we feel this is the district the PC can put forward and this is what we are doing? Maybe it could be a casual relationship?
- (JC) *Originally when he wrote the RFP (Request for Proposal) it was much more expansive. The PC wanted them to be what the boundaries are as indicated in the flyer. We have talked internally about Regional and there is still an opportunity to discuss any data they may have that could provide us further information, and it could also be a casual relationship.*

- (AJ) *The TIP description is limited to the UMED District, and we already had the RFP out and a consultant online, so it is hard to make last minute adjustments with limited funding. We are accounting for things outside of the district by including them in the study and their impacts on the district itself. Whatever results we get for the UMED area can also be applied to other areas and determine whether we do a study later on for Regional or something else, or other areas. What we gain here is universally beneficial to every other location within AMATS' boundaries.*
- (BC) With regard to the municipal and state partners that are affected, what opportunities will there be for the Traffic Department or others to be part of the decision and discussion process?
- (JC) *The State DOT is represented on the project management team, Transit, AMATS, and Long-Range Planning. The outreach we are doing will include DOT&PF and the Traffic Department. We contacted the Traffic Department because the first stage involves collecting traffic data.*
- (KK) The study area goes east to Baxter and includes subdivisions on the east and west side of Boniface that are primarily residential. Do you envision the study will look at the residential areas or is that included mainly for the traffic flow on the collectors and arterials?
- (JC) *It is included because those neighborhoods are part of the University Area Community Council, and the surrounding areas include Russian Jack and Campbell Park. Whatever traffic impacts there are do impact those neighborhoods immediately surrounding the UMED District. The four surrounding community council presidents are members of the advisory committee along with primary stakeholders within UMED, such as Providence and ANTHC (Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium).*

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

WOLFGANG JUNGE, DOT&PF Central Region Director, commented that we are all probably aware of the Northern UMED Access history to a certain extent. AMATS is going to do this TDM (Transportation Demand Management) study, which will ideally identify a reallocation of transportation needs, within that area, into different systems and reallocate those into transit or bike paths, or other pedestrian areas. We can reallocate up to ten percent of the traffic volumes to non-motorized activities. The question is (as this project is on and off again and whether it is in a State of Alaska GO (General Obligation) Bond or presented as a normal TIP project) will the study take into account (if we are able to realize the ten percent reallocation of traffic demands to a non-motorized type of methodologies) an assessment of whether or not there is still a need for motorized options like the Northern UMED Access? In other words, this study will be used as a source document to justify or not justify pushing forward on future Northern UMED Access options. Again, the ten percent reallocation of transportation requirements may or may not demonstrate a future need for that project. Will the TDM Study make that assessment?

MR. CECIL replied, no, it would not make an assessment on the Northern Access Road. It will take into account that it is a potential piece of infrastructure that could be implemented in the future. What the study is trying to get to is the ten percent reallocation and how that might be effective in strategies, policies, infrastructure, etcetera. The purpose is not to make an assessment for or the lack of the road, but does acknowledge it, which the district plan did as well.

MR. LYON moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the Destination UMED Public Involvement Plan. MS. KILCOYNE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

c. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Appointment

JONI WILM briefed the Committee on the appointment recommendation of Jessie Doherty adding that she is replacing Karol Fink.

MR. LYON commented that Ms. Fink was a spectacular member and also chaired the committee for a while and has an amazing skillset. Ms. Doherty's resumé displays the strength that will benefit this committee.

MR. KOHLHASE concurred that Ms. Doherty's resumé is spectacular and she will be a great addition to the committee.

There were no public comments.

MR. LYON moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of Jessie Doherty's appointment to BPAC. MR. LINDAMOOD seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

d. 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Program (MTP) Performance Measures - 2050 MTP Criteria – Comment/Response Summary - Charts Summary

MR. JONGENELEN informed the Committee that the 2050 MTP Performance Measures and Criteria recently went through a 30-day public comment period in which they received 199 comments from 12 individuals or entities; and updated based on the feedback. Performance measures aim to make all objectives measurable and allow progress and performance to be tracked over time. Specific targets for these performance measures will be determined following performance measure approval, and the determination of who, when, and how often applicable data will be collected and reported once these have been established.

CHAIR COY asked if the projects are like the TIP and get scored as submitted or are they different when it is incorporated.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that it is being done differently this time because we realized, during the TIP process, that the nominations we had were a barrier to involvement, so for this MTP we have allowed individuals to submit nominations more broadly either through an email or an interactive map to us. We just asked for a simple location and what the concern is. Staff will then develop a project based on that information creating significantly more work for staff to find the data. Additionally, staff is meeting tomorrow to look at the 2040 MTP projects and make recommendations on projects to nominate for the 2050 MTP. Projects are not automatically carried forward; we actually have to make recommendations.

MR. RIBUFFO realized the process requires us to look 28 years out into the future, but there is going to be a lot of change between what we are experiencing now and what will have been experienced in 28 years. How locked in to the specifics on this can you get with making a decision in 2022 on what you are going to do in 2050?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that there is a mechanism built into the federal process and we have to update this every four years. Although we look out to 2050 at this point, in two years we will be starting the next update. We are not locked into it to where it is unchangeable.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

NANCY PEASE recapped the following items she had submitted to staff:

1. The MTP performance measures should be strongly focused on outcomes, not inputs. Not the amounts spent on various programs or yes/no checklists; or whether the project includes an element of non-motorized spending; or whether it uses the Complete Streets method; or whether it lies within a justice area.
2. One overarching effort that this Committee could direct staff to do is to compare with other cutting edge innovative cities. The AMATS Non-Motorized Plan included a comparison from four cities. She is asking the Committee to ask staff to do research and adopt best practices from the cities that are leading the way on this, including Boulder and Minneapolis. What made Boulder's plan is that they had divided into internal transportation performance measures for residents that live within their jurisdiction and then they have a big commute factor, just the way we do. In addition, they managed to make it very publicly accountable with a one-page report card. She hoped staff would be directed to use best practices and not rely on the public to dredge these up...we are volunteers.
3. She was glad to see Greenhouse Gas Emissions as one of the performance measures. That is critical this time around because, as we all know, we do not have four years to twiddle our thumbs. We are supposed to meet certain targets by 2030.
4. She is not seeing VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) reductions, not just per capita, but overall. That is a really important umbrella measure for looking at not just vehicle mode balance but also the land use pattern. There are some mode shift performance measures and that is great.
5. She did not see SOV (Single Occupancy Vehicle) rate.
6. There are three more concepts that should be included in performance measures. One is the 15-minute walkable/bikeable radius concept, so that neighborhoods are designed to connect to common services and destinations. By neighborhoods design

she meant the transportation system design. The second one is the percent of the urban developable surface area that is used for roadways, driveways, and parking. That is a valuable tool for assessing walkability, equity, sustainability, and efficiency. Thirdly, the issue of speeds and separation. Other cities are starting to measure how many of their urban roads are 20 mph or less, which we know are the roads that pedestrians are able to survive accidents at those lower speeds. This is how AMATS can demonstrate the wisdom and the effectiveness of its spending and its policies.

CHERYL RICHARDSON added the following comments:

1. She is concerned with starting the modeling of this MTP process and the language in the TIP because the TIP still needs significant improvements, but may receive some at the Policy Committee level. She is also concerned about letting the MTP process follow it.
2. In speaking to Ms. Pease's comments, she noticed five different comment responses that dodged the issue of outcomes that are to be measured, not processes. Comment #165 was one of her lead comments in writing and then it got buried at the end of the whole document. Please look again at Comments 165, 101, 121, 137, and 158.
3. All of us are pleased that Greenhouse Gas finally made it on the list. We would like to have some kind of projection as to how long that will take to do with the understanding that things often slip. Will it be done in time to include in our next round of measurements?
4. Integrating land use and transportation Comments 106 and 113 continue to misconstrue who is responsible for what. Today, Anchorage is not doing a good job of integrating. What can the TAC recommend to the PC to professionally integrate over time land use and planning in this town? We are still getting comments that transportation is responsible for adjacent land uses. When looking at the A and C Street Couplet, it is very clear there is a symbiotic relationship and we need to do a better job bringing them together.

MS. KILCOYNE referred to best practices noting that it is always a great idea. Staff has limited capacity, and she did not know how much time would be spent looking at other plans, but she was hoping some. The question is if you are hoping for an official best practices study or something broader by staff going into these processes.

MS. RICHARDSON thinks a study of best practices would be wonderful, but she was not advocating that. She was just advocating that staff do its research on some of the cities that have effective performance measures and get clear accountabilities to the public. For example, her Comment #109 in which she asked the MTP to do a 15-minute walkable neighborhoods. Cities, such as Seattle and Minneapolis, measure which neighborhoods have 15-minute walkability and are accountable for that. The response from staff was that the MTP already accounts for walkability by incorporating transit-supportive development corridors, non-motorized priority corridors, and equity analysis. That is not the same. It is not measuring your effectiveness. You can put those items on the map, but we would like the performance measures to actually demonstrate that we are achieving the outcomes. Find out how to measure 15-minute walkable neighborhoods and put that in the performance measures.

MS. KILCOYNE noted that she and Mr. Jongenelen had been discussing Greenhouse Gas measures and what comes next especially considering that we are wrapping up a Greenhouse Gas inventory for the city. We hope to use that in the future to incorporate some sort of plan to take those inventories, which hopefully will be updated every five years, and develop a pathway to incorporate ways to reduce those emissions. That is in the future at some point, but based on limited staff capacity and as mentioned, we do not have the time. There is no silver bullet, and she did not know how to make it happen faster.

CHAIR COY noted that, in speaking to the comments, one of the things he racks his brain about is what his role is in the Municipal Traffic Department versus what is within AMATS' purview. The comments provided are in the direction of where he is wanting to go with what he is doing outside of AMATS, but recognized that what we can do within AMATS is focused on what AMATS' roles and duties are. While sometimes he gets the feeling that AMATS' staff is pushing off potential comments that, in his mind, are more applicable to say "city staff" or "state staff" or some of the members sitting at this dais.

MS. RICHARDSON further added that one issue not raised today was the need for 3C (Continuous, Comprehensive, and Cooperative) planning. Right now, the reply is that the state has full control over what happens in their own right-of-way. AMATS has no say. But, in fact, she had been informed that is not correct. We should be negotiating more strongly with ADOT, so that would be one thing the Traffic Department could help out with.

The Committee addressed the Comment/Response Summary page-by-page. The following questions and comments were made by the Committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

PAGE 1 - NONE

PAGE 2 – NONE

PAGES 3 through 11

- (SK) Referred to Comments 49, 51, and 52 noting that she liked staff's recommendations.
- (BC) Referred to Comment #45 that staff recommended adding the MOA and DOT&PF traffic engineers. He will be interested in seeing how that helps it out and what roll he has in providing feedback for all the projects.
- (AJ) *Regarding the TIP, Kris Langley provided feedback about the projects and, if Chair Coy would rather, we could limit it to read "MOA Traffic", which would allow more than Chair Coy being solely responsible.*
- (BC) Having it read "traffic engineers" does not specifically include his title and will involve all his staff. He thinks that sounds great.
- (BC) Referred to Comment #57 regarding the question of accessibility. This word is sometimes confused with access or it could have several different interpretations. The purpose of transportation is not just to be in motion but

to be able to get somewhere and measuring how close and accessible things are, so land use and transportation really do interplay. Is the MTP using scenario planning evaluation tools?

- (AJ) *We have done scenario planning before, but this will be done as part of the VisionEval, which will give it a much more robust approach than what had been done in the past by using more strategic planning modeling versus just transportation modeling.*
- (BC) *He reiterated that accessibility is the purpose in making it so that people can get where they are trying to go versus just measuring the road and seeing how many cars pass by. One of the questions was about average trip length and he was not sure if that meant distance? The last updates to the criteria looked at accessibility for environmental populations and he is seeing progress in that direction. He would not change anything in this table.*
- (BC) *With regard to Ms. Pease's comments, he viewed most all the scoring criteria as a tool for decision-makers to get as much information to make their decisions, rather than playing a game, so-to-speak, of choosing weights (having been on the other side making weighting decisions), which becomes problematic. Without the weights, it is not that we are trying to say everything is equal, we are just trying to provide information allowing the decision-makers to see that what they are looking at is because of a tool. We are not trying to make the tool replace the decision-makers.*
- (SK) *It is a tool to evaluate, but if you are trying to make this tool implement your priorities, then maybe weights are good. It was just curious that the public did weigh things equally and the TIP also had equal weights. She did not know what to think about that.*
- (LB) *In his experience using different scoring criteria, you are always going to have projects that should score higher, but do not, and other projects that score higher than they should. It is generality and you are never going to come up with something perfect. The weighting is a big discussion and we have put a lot of thought into this, and it is still not perfect.*
- (AJ) *We released the total in the TIP criteria and then broke it down by categories, so people could see if a project scored really high or low for safety and how they scored on something else. They are able to see how these projects fared in the end and what they are trying to help us achieve.*
- (SK) *Referred to Comment #77 regarding an annual report card. This is a great idea, but with all that staff has on their plate with the additional performance measures she would like to see someone else in the MOA be responsible for it. It might something she could do.*
- (SK) *Referred to Comment #78 noting that making it more transparent and more accessible seems to be an easy fix.*

- (AJ) *We are looking into software to help us with integrating our comment/response summary, public input, etcetera into one tool and have our websites based on it to make it a one-stop shop. It is expensive and would take some time to get set up, but we are moving forward in that direction.*

PAGES 11 through 17

- (SK) Referred to Comment #125 regarding the measurements of auto, transit, and bike travel times. She agreed that travel times negatively affect transit and asked if it was necessarily the same for bike and non-motorized.
- (AJ) *No, but we feel there are other measures that can do a better job of accounting for that, such as average trip length. We want to make sure more research is done because average trip length can also be used to help with large-scale roadway projects. Average trip length really should be related to land use. For example, how long is the distance between your house and the grocery store? It is part of what we do but it is not solely on us to make changes to that. We can look more into the bike and pedestrian travel times, but we are trying to treat them fair in our approach to performance measures.*

MR. KOHLHASE moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the 2050 MTP Performance Measures and Criteria as updated based on public feedback. MR. LYON seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. AMATS Transportation Network – Model Presentation

MR. CECIL briefed the Committee on the model.

ROBERT WERTMAN with RSG provided a PowerPoint Presentation. VAN LE with R&M Consultants assisted with responding to questions.

The following questions and comments were made by the Committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

- (SR) The Port has a model to help with finances, so he can appreciate the importance of models. Are we going to get a chance to see what it does when it is finished?
- (RW) *Yes. Travel Demand Models, as macroscopic models, will show how well the model is performing and we can visualize that with Kinetic maps. At the end of the project we will summarize the performance of the travel demand model in tabular format showing performance metrics, but also with Kinetic maps.*
- (BC) Will this new model allow select links?

- (RW) *It is not explicitly scoped to do select link analysis or add that functionality, but we do have some flexibility in the scope to look at this. We are also wrapping up the Seward/Glenn PEL project with DOT&PF and did implement select link tools, so there is potential here we can look at in transferring that tool from the work that was completed for DOT&PF to AMATS. We will have to look at what we are contracted to provide under scope and if that will fit in.*
- (BC) When talking about the stakeholders, did they include some of the consultants that are assisting DOT&PF, AMATS, or any model users, such as Kittelson, R&M, or HDR that are using the model to assist the agencies?
- (RW) *No, we have not explicitly reached out to users of the travel demand model that are outside of DOT&PF. R&M Consultants is on the project team.*
- (JC) *We do have a process to provide that information upon request. Whichever firm provides that information is then responsible because it is no longer AMATS' data at that point.*
- (VL) *What we did during the last model update in 2014 was have household travel surveys that informed the model update. At that time, that was a really big, full model rebuild update for the AMATS region and included the Mat-Su Borough. This go-around we do not have that same scope. We did have a model users group scope at that previous model update, and worked with all the consulting firms asking them how they used the model. A lot of them used it at the project level. This AMATS model is being specifically updated to inform the MTP and that is a more regional context. The model will be available once it is done and ready to give to consultants. As Robert stated, the consultants will be responsible for using the model and the data they input for their purposes, typically, at project level. It is a great idea but it is a schedule and a budget thing this time around and a much more refined and focused scope for the MTP.*
- (RW) *Added that the users of regional travel demand models tend to be more focused on the project level. There is an issue with that because the travel demand model is initially built to inform at the regional level and is calibrated at the regional level, so a consultant that has been taking the model to do a project-specific analysis using the model, would have to have had a recalibration procedure done at that point. If it is a corridor that is five or ten miles of highway corridor or an intersection, at that point the travel demand model should be recalibrated before using it for that project (for a corridor or an intersection level analysis). At intersection levels, you would have to go to microsimulation and use some area analysis. There are limitations where the travel demand model can be used on project level specific things to accurately represent those projects if you are using the travel demand model below the regional level.*

There were no public comments.

b. AMATS Website

CHRISTINE SCHUETTE informed the Committee of the changes to the website.

MR. VANHOVE commented that he recently visited the website and found it very intuitive, and the information was easy to find. He complimented Ms. Schuette on the improvements.

CHAIR COY asked for public comments.

SEAN BASKI with DOT&PF noted that he found the links for AMATS' planning projects but asked how the public would find AMATS funded capital improvement projects? He added that the website looks spectacular and is much more user-friendly than DOT&PF's website.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that, using a construction project as an example, we could add a section that is specifically for that. We do have a planning project section and can add a construction or a design project page.

MS. PEASE was also looking at the website today and found that it was a lot easier, but she could not find the public response comment that she needed for today's meeting until right before the meeting when she was told to look at the agenda that was emailed to her one week ago. It is important to get the documents posted ahead of time for these meetings where people can find them on the website. She thanked staff for the changes that have been proposed to the scoring criteria and the performance measures. No one from Rabbit Creek was able to attend this meeting, but she knew they will be pretty excited with things like the scoring criteria now that there will be safety points at hazardous sites without a blood sacrifice, as well as the Greenhouse Gas. It is actually exciting for the responsiveness, so thank you for that.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that everything is posted to the AMATS website one week in advance. That is the reason for emailing the reminder notice with the links to enable the public to find and access the items.

There were no further comments.

7. GENERAL INFORMATION

MR. JONGENELEN announced that the Senior Planner position has been reposted nationwide for an additional two weeks.

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MS. KILCOYNE informed the Committee that an electric vehicle infrastructure deployment plan is being developed and has to be completed by August 8, and that is how we will deploy the roughly \$50M we are going to receive for fast chargers for our highway corridor in the next five years. There are virtual and in-person information sessions coming up that could be made available on the AMATS website.

MR. RIBUFFO announced that the Port has been attempting to fill the Modernization Program Engineering Manager position since March to cover all things on the engineering side with construction, planning, permitting, and design. It is open both outside and inside Anchorage, and he will be consulting with Mr. Jongenelelen to post it nationwide.

MR. VANHOVE noted that TIP Amendment #3 is headed back to FHWA and approval is expected any day.

MR. JONGENELEN mentioned that Cindy Heil is retiring and her last meeting with the Committee is in July. She has been on the Committee since 1992 and worked with AMATS prior to that. We will have cake and present her with a gift at the next TAC meeting.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MR. BASKI suggested having every Policy Committee member sign the card that had served since Ms. Heil originally started.

MR. JONGENELEN jokingly expressed that he only had a month and did not think that would be achievable.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, CHAIR COY adjourned the meeting at 4:22 p.m.