

**CORPUS CHRISTI METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

November 20, 2025

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND QUORUM DETERMINATION

Mr. DeLatte called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

TAC Members Present:

Mr. Brian DeLatte, City of Portland, Chairperson

Mr. Daniel McGinn, AICP City of Corpus Christi

Ms. Paula Sales-Evans, P.E. Texas Department of Transportation-Corpus Christi District

Mr. Tom Yardley, San Patricio County

Ms. Liann Alfaro, Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority

Ms. Mary Afuso, Coastal Bend Council of Governments

MPO Staff Present:

Rob MacDonald, P.E., Jafet Flores, Harry Horak, Victor Mendieta, and Carissa Tamez

2. NON-AGENDA ITEMS PUBLIC COMMENTS

None were made or offered.

3. APPROVAL OF THE TAC OCTOBER 16, 2025, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Yardley made a motion to approve the TAC October 16, 2025, Regular Meeting minutes.

Mr. McGinn seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

A. TxDOT 2027 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (UTP) CALL FOR PROJECTS

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

TxDOT's Transportation Planning and Programming (TPP) Division has opened the 2027 UTP Mobility Project Call, officially kicking off the annual cycle to approve and program funding for UTP Categories 2, 4, and 12.

Discussion:

Mr. Yardley asked whether the projects highlighted in green indicate that there are no scheduled projects for the years 2027 and 2029.

- Ms. Sales-Evans explained that the gaps in 2027 and 2029 are partly intentional but mainly due to balancing funding across years. One major project is Gregory SPUI, which must remain in 2028 because of railroad coordination and right-of-way needs. Some 2029 work could be moved earlier depending on project scope, including the SH 357 safety project and items in the safety placeholder. However, Park Road 22 is unlikely to move because its scope is still unclear.

Mr. MacDonald noted that the information presented is helpful and emphasized the need for flexibility as the MPO prepares the next TIP covering FY 2027–2030. This will be the first opportunity to outline desired projects for the next ten years, and next year's update will include another assessment of funding and project readiness. Several items in the program are placeholders. The Operations and Safety placeholder was based on potential projects from the Safety Action Plan, including the Rodd Field Road project, which TxDOT has chosen to advance. Park Road 22 remains a placeholder with funding but no defined scope, making it vulnerable to being delayed. He encouraged TxDOT and the City to work together with the MPO's support to define the project, as undefined projects are difficult to plan, design, and deliver in the short timeframe and risk losing allocated funds.

- Mr. McGinn reported that the City of Corpus Christi's Island Mobility Plan is approximately 99% complete but has not yet been presented to City Council for adoption due to a crowded agenda in recent months. He explained that the plan is similar to the FM 624 project, featuring shared-use paths on both sides to accommodate bicycles, pedestrians, and golf carts. He estimated that the project cost could be roughly double the current \$17 million figure, aligning more closely with the overall cost of the FM 624 project when all categories are included.
- Ms. Sales-Evans stated that several ongoing efforts—such as the Regional Parkway study and planned upgrades to SH 361—will influence what improvements are appropriate for the corridor. Island traffic types (RVs, boats, etc.) and limited roadway width create challenges for a design similar to FM 624, especially regarding U-turn needs, a six-lane boulevard footprint, shared-use paths, and the lack of design standards for golf cart paths. She emphasized the need for continued coordination to ensure any project aligns with future plans, particularly near the SH 361/Park Road 22 intersection. She also noted future funding availability at the end of the 10-year window: about \$26M in Category 2, \$24M in Category 4U, and \$66M in Category 7, and asked whether the MPO would consider using Category 7 funds for UTP projects.

Mr. MacDonald stated that the slide shows potential funds for projects to enter the UTP process. No funding is being allocated yet; the purpose is to identify projects for scoring and ranking. The district's two proposed projects come from the long-range plan and are suitable for a 10-year timeframe. Local governments were encouraged to submit additional projects, which TxDOT will evaluate to inform next year's TIP and long-range plan discussions.

- Mr. McGinn asked whether the Rodd Field Road project at the Saratoga intersection includes a full redesign of the intersection to straighten the sweeping curves, which currently limit development at that corner. He noted that the existing sweeping curves at the intersection prevent development on both corners. Redesigning the intersection could improve safety and provide a higher return on investment by enabling significant commercial development on those corners.
- Ms. Sales-Evans stated that the intersection at Rodd Field Road and Saratoga is planned for evaluation to improve traffic flow and safety. She noted that any redesign may be constrained by existing right-of-way, which could limit how close development can occur to the roadway. Coordination with the City of Corpus Christi will be necessary to ensure the intersection design aligns with city plans and provides efficient, safe access while supporting potential development.
- Mr. McGinn described the current intersection as confusing and potentially unsafe, with lane shifts through the curves that require weaving. Squaring up the intersection would improve safety and could also create opportunities to utilize the right-of-way for development, potentially generating revenue.
- Mr. MacDonald noted that the intersection is unusual for traffic operations, partly due to gated neighborhood access on the southeast side. He suggested that any discussion about realigning the intersection could occur offline, as the current safety project does not include full realignment.
- Mr. McGinn mentioned that he hadn't discussed the project recently and was unsure whether it was included in the total funding, noting that the total span of three different categories.
- Ms. Sales-Evans stated that as the project design progresses and public involvement occurs, the estimated cost may need to be revisited, but it is not yet at that stage.
- Mr. MacDonald suggested defining the project further and considering it for the 2050 MTP rather than the UTP, noting that it likely won't be fully defined or ready for submission by December 5.
- Ms. Sales-Evans noted that some short-term operational improvements could still be made at the intersection as part of the existing Rod Field project in the 26 UTP. However, if a more

extensive redesign requiring additional right-of-way is needed, that would need to be addressed separately.

- Mr. MacDonald reiterated that the district selected a couple of projects for consideration in the UTP submission process by December 5. MPO members can provide feedback on these projects and recommend them to the policy committee, along with any other local projects that may be ready for submission.
- Ms. Sales-Evans noted that any large-scale mobility project should align with the Congestion Management Plan and be MTP-listed unless safety or operations-focused. Two eligible projects remain: (1) the I-37/SH 358 interchange, which has a higher crash rate and is expected to score well in TPP evaluations, and (2) improvements on 286 between Holly and 358, with a lower crash rate. Funding options include leveraging MPO Category 7, and state funds to fully fund improvements, or leaving Category 7 funds available for future projects, with approximately \$45 million remaining for other local initiatives.
- Mr. MacDonald highlighted that many Texas MPOs award their Category 7 funds for local projects. Historically, the district lacked local projects, but TxDOT-supported projects allowed federal and Category 7 funds to be allocated effectively, avoiding penalties for unspent funds. Texas has maximized federal funding, even receiving additional dollars from other states that couldn't spend theirs. Locally, this process has enabled the district to allocate Category 7 and other MPO-selected funds while keeping projects off the redistribution list. He emphasized that each TIP, long-range plan, or UTP cycle offers local governments an opportunity to propose projects for federal or locally-directed funds. Examples include Corpus Christi using bond funding for Rodd Field Road and Yorktown Boulevard projects to expedite delivery outside the federal system. Local governments can submit projects now or in future cycles.
- Ms. Afuso emphasized the importance of a multi-funding approach, rather than relying on a single funding source, to maintain a regional perspective and ensure flexibility in case one funding source becomes unavailable as a philosophy.
- Mr. MacDonald explained that available funds are distributed across multiple categories, and the MPO's approach is to combine restricted and flexible funds with fully funded priority projects. This method allows project costs and schedules to be adjusted within the TIP, long-range plan, and UTP. He noted that submission of new projects is optional unallocated funds can be addressed in future planning cycles but the two projects from the adopted plan are ready for submission, scoring, and potential advancement.

Mr. Yardley asked for clarification on leveraging available balances and requesting statewide funding.

- Ms. Sales-Evans explained that in the past, some MPOs requested 100% statewide or commission discretionary funding for projects without contributing local funds, which prompted questions from the Commission about local commitment. Leveraging local MPO funds alongside statewide funding demonstrates priority and helps bridge funding gaps. She noted that the Harbor Bridge project was previously funded this way. The I-37/SH 358 interchange could be a strong candidate for this approach due to high crash rates, connectivity significance, and its role as a key decision point for commuters and visitors. While additional statewide funding is not guaranteed, submitting the project increases the opportunity, and any remaining local funds could still be allocated to other projects in future planning cycles.
- Mr. MacDonald noted that staff provided attachments including detailed maps from the 2026 UTP and the district's project list, showing multi-county projects and investments outside the MPO area. He highlighted that some large projects, such as the Harbor Bridge and other major corridor improvements, rely on state- or Commission-directed funding due to their size. He emphasized that these examples illustrate the earlier discussion on leveraging multiple funding sources. Staff requested the TAC's recommendation to forward projects to the Policy Committee for submission consideration.

Mr. McGinn asked whether Park Road 22 will remain on the project list, noting it was on last year's list, and inquired about the approach to keeping the previous list while adding the two new projects.

- Ms. Sales-Evans confirmed that all projects currently on the list with UTP funding, including Park Road 22, would be retained. She explained that the discussion is about potentially adding new candidates for consideration. Based on available funding and leveraging opportunities, the I-37/SH 358 interchange is the stronger candidate due to higher crash history, connectivity, and freight corridor significance. The other new project, while a traffic concern, has fewer crashes and lower scoring potential for statewide funding.
- Mr. McGinn asked what would be required to add more funding for Park Road 22. He noted that the project's design and scope cannot currently be finalized because of uncertainty regarding a potential future Highway 361 connection to a second crossing, which could affect this section of the project.
 - Ms. Sales-Evans noted that additional funding for Park Road 22 is not currently recommended because the project lacks a well-defined scope and cost estimate. She highlighted that intersection improvements for potential Highway 361 connections and operational considerations need further analysis. Additional funding could be considered in the 2028 UTP cycle, once a clearer estimate and justification are available, but at this time, there is insufficient information to support increasing the allocation.
- Mr. McGinn acknowledged that Park Road 22 can remain on the list as is but emphasized that there is insufficient information to determine the actual funding need. While more funding will eventually be required, the current data does not support specifying an updated amount.
- Mr. MacDonald agreed that Park Road 22 should remain on the list for now. He noted that as more information becomes available such as funding targets and updated cost estimates in February there will be an opportunity to review all projects and ensure fiscal constraint within the 10-year period, adjusting as needed.
- Ms. Sales-Evans suggested that if the MPO chooses to move forward with the project, approximately \$45 million of Category 7 funds would remain available. These funds could potentially be leveraged to supplement the project's UTP allocation once a more accurate cost estimate is available, providing additional flexibility.
- Mr. MacDonald reiterated that the process is multi-step: the current step is to identify projects, followed by reviewing the fiscal elements in the coming months. A subsequent project submittal and update will occur in March or April.

Motion:

Ms. Sales-Evans made a motion to keep the existing list but added MPO-034 into the list.

Mr. Yardley seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Sales-Evans clarified that her motion included the potential use of \$20 million of Category 7 funds as part of the request for statewide funding, and she wanted to ensure that this aspect was understood as part of the motion.

B. SAFETY (PM1) PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

MPOs have two options when setting targets for each performance measure:

- 1) Establish our own Corpus Christi MPO numerical targets for each of the performance measures, or
- 2) formally agree to support the TxDOT targets

The Corpus Christi MPO sought a recommendation from the TAC to the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) to adopt all the TxDOT state targets for Safety (PM1) Performance Measures.

The proposed DRAFT Resolution 26-01 stated that the Corpus Christi MPO continues to formally support the TxDOT's targets for PM1 was attached to the cover memo.

The Safety (PM1) Performance Measures include the following targets for Calendar Year (CY) 2026 that were adopted as part of the TxDOT 2025 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP).

For the past several years the Corpus Christi MPO has supported the TxDOT performance measures and targets adopted by TxDOT. By supporting the TxDOT targets, the Corpus Christi MPO agrees to plan and program projects which contribute to achieving the TxDOT state targets and to report regional performance.

Discussion:

Mr. Yardley noted that looking at fatalities over time, 2021 was the peak, and numbers have been gradually decreasing since. He feels the 2025 target seems overly optimistic based on this trend. For 2026, a new calculation method has been introduced, resulting in a target that is higher than the previous peak in 2021, and he's uncertain about how the new method works.

- Mr. MacDonald explained that the new methodology changed how the target was calculated, which seems counterintuitive because the new target is 1,500 lives higher than last year. Previously, federal rules imposed a "hard stop," preventing a target from exceeding the prior year's targets. Last year's target of 3,046 came from a five-year rolling average, but the calculation without the restriction would have produced an even higher number.

Mr. DeLatte asked why the number of serious injuries remains the same each year 14,669 in the third row and wondered how the methodology results in that consistent figure.

- Mr. MacDonald stated that it was a typo.

Ms. Afuso noted that 2024 had the highest number of fatalities on record.

- Mr. DeLatte asked why, over the past 12–15 years, fatalities appear to be increasing while serious injuries are decreasing, seeking an explanation for the trend.
- Ms. Afuso expressed concern that, while road design and traffic controls help, they can't fully address issues like impaired driving, and emphasized that being "number one" in fatalities is not acceptable.
- Mr. MacDonald acknowledged that the statewide numbers are very high and disheartening. He explained that the state's calculations and sources determine the reported numbers, and trend lines are drawn to set targets that meet federal requirements, which may differ from their own figures.
- Ms. Afuso said she sees no issue with supporting the state's recommendation, noting it's reasonable to focus on what is within their control rather than claiming they can save more lives than the target suggests.
- Mr. MacDonald explained that TxDOT adopted the Transportation Commission's recommendation, and while each MPO could do its own analysis, they chose not to.
- Ms. Afuso noted that there's no penalty if the actual number of fatalities ends up being lower than the target.

Motion:

Ms. Sales-Evans made a motion to recommend the TPC approve the resolution with 26-01 with understanding that the number of serious injuries will be corrected.

Ms. Alfaro seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

After Motion Discussion:

Mr. Yardley questioned why the 2026 county target, calculated using a five-year rolling average, is higher than all previous years, expressing uncertainty about how that result came about.

- Ms. Sales-Evans explained that the rolling average includes years not shown in the table 2008–2012, 2009–2013, so the numbers could be higher than they appear. She noted that this excerpt might be misleading but could be clarified in the full packet for the policy board.

- Mr. MacDonald said they included the full historical data to show the trend line, rather than just listing targets like some MPOs. He emphasized they will explain to the policy committee why certain numbers appear higher.

C. CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP)

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

Congestion management is the application of strategies to improve transportation system performance and reliability by reducing the adverse impacts of congestion on the movement of people and goods. A congestion management process (CMP) is a systematic and regionally accepted approach for managing recurring and non-recurring congestion. This includes providing accurate, up-to-date information on travel times, location of construction or crashes, and strategies for congestion reduction that meet state and local needs. The CMP is intended to move these congestion management strategies into the funding and implementation stages.

The CMP, as defined in federal regulation, is a systematic process that provides safe and effective management and operation of the multimodal transportation system. The process includes:

- Developing congestion management objectives
- Establishing measures of multimodal transportation system performance
- Collecting data and system performance monitoring to define the extent and duration of congestion and determine the causes of congestion
- Identifying congestion management strategies
- Implementing activities, including an implementation schedule and possible funding sources for each strategy, and
- Evaluating the effectiveness of implemented strategies

A CMP is required in metropolitan areas with population exceeding 200,000, known as Transportation Management Areas (TMAs). Federal requirements also state that in all TMAs, the CMP shall be developed and implemented as an integrated part of the metropolitan transportation planning process.

The flexibility in approaches to develop the CMP allows MPOs to design their own approaches and processes to fit their regional needs. The CMP is an on-going process, continuously progressing and adjusting over time as goals and objectives change, new congestion issues arise, new information sources become available, and new strategies are identified and evaluated.

Discussion:

Ms. Sales-Evans noted the document is lengthy and requires focused attention. She asked for clarification on whether the city and TxDOT are still discussing traffic signal maintenance, since her understanding is that the city maintains most signals. She also raised concerns about the clarity of maps and legends in the document, especially for printed versions, suggesting improvements for readability. Lastly, she requested a walkthrough of the appendix and roadway sections to better understand the information presented.

- Mr. MacDonald suggested addressing the questions in a future workshop, possibly in December or January, noting that adoption isn't required immediately but should happen sooner rather than later.
- Ms. Sales-Evans requested clarification on the map legend and data tables. She wants to understand how corridor tiers, transit stops, land use, traffic signals, levels of service, and metrics like hours of delay and truck volumes relate to the main function of the corridor. She suggested adding explanatory details to make the tables and maps easier to interpret, especially for key corridors of focus. She also emphasized that individual graphs in the appendix may be confusing when viewed out of context. She suggested adding brief

explanatory notes to each graphic clarifying that a metric represents “hours of delay per year” to make the data easier to understand.

- Mr. MacDonald wanted clarification on Ms. Sales-Evans from what was exhibited on screen, so the information be directly incorporated into the graphics or tables so that maps and data are clearly connected, eliminating the need to refer to other pages of the document.
- Ms. Sales-Evans noted that most people will only see excerpts rather than the full 250-page document, making it cumbersome to scroll back and forth. She emphasized the need to make corridor segment information easier to understand in those excerpts.
- Mr. MacDonald said the suggested changes could be added easily and proposed either releasing the document for a one-month public comment period now or holding a workshop first to review details.
- Ms. Sales-Evans noted that the timing should consider the schedule for completing the new MTP, upcoming holidays, and the need for sufficient review time, leaving the decision to the group’s majority.
- Mr. DeLatte asked if the 30-day public comment period could still occur while allowing adjustments to the tables to be made before final approval.
 - Mr. MacDonald explained that while they aim to approve the document as a standalone item, it will later be incorporated into the MTP with any changes from the public or others over the next 15 months, and commenters can address different elements, including the CMP.
 - Mr. DeLatte noted that skipping a December meeting would delay the process by about 60 days, emphasizing the importance of incorporating public comments.
- Ms. Sales-Evans clarified that the request is to recommend TPC to release the document for a 30-day public comment period.
- Mr. MacDonald explained that the earliest TPC could act would be their next meeting on December 4, but the one-month public comment period would likely start around January 8.
- Ms. Afuso questioned whether significant changes made to the document after the initial 30-day public comment period would require reopening of the comment period, or if the document would simply be pushed through without further public input.
 - Mr. MacDonald responded that if comments lead to substantial changes, the document could be revised and released for another one-month public comment period.
- Ms. Sales-Evans raised concerns about integrating transit strategies with safety goals. She described an example of a pedestrian crossing unsafely to catch a bus and questioned how to encourage transit use while ensuring pedestrian safety. She also noted challenges with corridor strategies like platooning, where small disruptions can affect the system, and suggested the plan could identify best practices, education, or signage to improve safe transit and pedestrian behaviors.
- Ms. Afuso emphasized that pedestrian and transit safety ultimately comes down to public education. She noted the importance of enforcing laws like no jaywalking, providing mid-block crossings where needed, and thoughtfully locating bus stops, but stressed that safe behavior is primarily the public’s responsibility, supported by coordinated efforts.
- Mr. MacDonald explained that the discussion intersects two plans: the adopted Regional Safety Action Plan (RSAP) and the developing Safe System Plan. Both address safety, education, engineering, and enforcement. He encouraged continued participation to bring ideas forward, noting that actionable items from these plans can tie into the CMP and congestion management strategies. He emphasized that the CMP follows federal guidance but is customized for the region, and workshops may be needed to clarify graphics and strategies. Approval is not urgent, and the timeline allows for review in December or January, with eventual standalone adoption and inclusion in the next long-range plan over the next 12–15 months.

- Mr. DeLatte outlined two options: either recommend that the TPC release the document now, adding context to Exhibit 3 and certain tables/maps, or delay until the January technical meeting to allow more time for revisions.
- Ms. Sales-Evans asked if the requested changes or additional context could potentially be made before the policy board meeting, acknowledging that the timing might be tight due to the holidays.
 - Mr. MacDonald verified that completing changes before the December 4 Policy Board meeting would be very tight. He recommended tabling the item and reviewing it in a workshop at the next meeting, allowing sufficient time to refine the document carefully, since it is a foundational document, rather than rushing revisions or risking multiple public comment periods.

Motion:

Mr. Yardley made a motion to table the CMP.

Mr. Alfaro seconded; and the motion passed unanimously.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. CORPUS CHRSITI MPO 2023 PROGRAM FOR ADDRESSING DISCRIMINATION (PAD) WITH DRAFT 2025 HIGHLIGHTS AND MAP CHANGES

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

As discussed earlier this year, the Corpus Christi MPO Title VI policy document is due for an update. The TPC and TAC received an earlier version of this document in prior meetings. As reported by FHWA, and discussed in previous meetings, several federal executive actions have impacted environmental justice (EJ) considerations within metropolitan transportation planning regulations. The actions collectively reduced the emphasis on environmental justice and equity considerations in Metropolitan transportation planning and related federal infrastructure initiatives. The current Title VI policy was approved by the MPO Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) on August 2, 2018. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that transportation planning and programming be nondiscriminatory based on race, color, or national origin. The federal statute was further clarified and supplemented by the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) stipulates involving the community, particularly those with disabilities, in the development and improvement of services.

Discussion:

None.

B. 2050 MTP ACTIVITIES

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

Mr. MacDonald reported that outreach for the 2050 MTP is increasing, with presentations to San Patricio County Commissioners, the Port Commission, City of Corpus Christi, City of Portland, and the RTA. He highlighted the Regional Safety Action Plan and noted that safety resonates with the public. Website traffic and survey participation are rising due to media coverage. The 2050 MTP is targeted for adoption in April 2027, with some transit plans and safety plans not updated prior to adoption. Future media stories are expected to focus on safety and active transportation (bike/pedestrian plans), continuing the MPO's public engagement efforts.

Discussion:

None.

6. TAC MEMBER STATEMENTS ON LOCAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES OR ITEMS OF INTEREST

Ms. Sales-Evans announced that FM 893 has been set for construction. On November 21, 2025, there will be a preconstruction meeting.

- Mr. DeLatte noted that the project has been a long time in the making and is a strong example of collaboration among the city, TxDOT, the General Land Office (for drainage), and the county (for right-of-way acquisition along Cemetery Road). He said the meeting was moved to Monday and expressed enthusiasm for the project, calling it fantastic.

Ms. Afuso announced that the COG has received its mitigation funding from the GLO. Part of the funding will support a housing study, which will include transportation considerations related to fair housing. She expressed excitement about beginning the work.

Ms. Alfaro reported that the RTA is very busy with upcoming holiday activities. There will be no service on Thanksgiving Day, with normal service resuming Friday. Route 60 will be temporarily extended for the Islander Lights event, and on December 6 the RTA will provide service to the H-E-B Christmas tree lighting. From December 12–24, on Fridays and Saturdays, the “Downtown Dasher” bus will be decorated with lights and will run from 5–10 p.m. for free. Additionally, RTA will offer the Holiday Express Candy Cane Lane experience for the disabled community via Bline, with more details coming soon.

Mr. DeLatte shared that the City of Portland held a ribbon-cutting for its Fifth and Elm revitalization project, transforming the community’s original downtown—once lacking walkability—into a pedestrian-friendly, town-square-like environment. The event attracted about 5,000 people over two and a half days and will host upcoming concerts. He highlighted the project’s connection to past MPO-supported active mobility investments, including nearby hike-and-bike trails, and noted that it will play a key role in Portland’s long-term plan to create a citywide hike-and-bike circuit with connecting spokes. He expressed excitement about the strong public response and the future of enhanced mobility and walkability in the area.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS/EVENTS

A. Transportation Policy Committee:	Rescheduled Regular Meeting	November 17, 2025
B. Regional Traffic Safety Task Force:	Regular Virtual Meeting	November 19, 2025
C. Transportation Policy Committee:	Regular Meeting	December 4, 2025
D. Technical Advisory Committee:	Regular Meeting	December 18, 2025

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 10:36 a.m.