

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor  
632 W. 6th Avenue  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**November 17, 2022  
1:30 PM**

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

*Due to the expected absence of Chair Junge, John Linnell acted as Chair.*

**Policy Committee Members Present:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
John Linnell	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Adam Trombley	Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
Emma Pokon	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Forrest Dunbar	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Daniel Volland**	MOA/Municipal Assembly

**Also in attendance:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning Department
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning Department
Chelsea Ward-Waller	MOA/Planning Department
Jon Cecil	MOA/Planning Department
Joni Wilm	MOA/Planning Department
Brad Coy*	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Todd Vanhove*	DOT&PF
Luke Bowland*	DOT&PF
Christina Huber	DOT&PF
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Mark Butler	North Star Community Council
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
Randy Brown	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Emily Weiser	Bike Anchorage
Craig Lyon*	MOA/Planning Department
Samantha Shields	Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)
Chris Schutte	
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Adeyemi Alimi*	ADEC
Cheryl Richardson	
Cathy Gleason	
Graham Downey	
Jacob Powell	

Jeff Frkonja	RSG
Matthew Murphy	DOT&PF
Nancy Pease	
Joselyn Biloon	DOT&PF
Steve McKeever	
Martin Hansen	South Addition Community Council
Lindsey Hajduk	
Anna Bosin	DOT&PF
Carma Reed	
Bart Rudolph	MOA/PTD
Suzie Alexander	
Devora Barrera	Bike Anchorage Director

*\*AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Member*

*\*\*Designated Assembly Alternate*

## **1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

ACTING CHAIR LINNELL called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. Adam Trombley, Chief of Staff, represented Mayor Bronson. Assembly Member Volland acted as Designated Assembly Alternate for Assembly Member Zaletel. 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**

MS. POKON moved to approve the agenda. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.*

## **4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – October 20, 2022**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to approve the minutes. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.*

## **5. ACTION ITEMS**

**a. 92nd Avenue Undercrossing Update and Action**

MR. JONGENELEN provided a brief history of the direction requested of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) by this Committee at their August 22 meeting, which was to work with DOT&PF to evaluate the feasibility and impact of putting a non-motorized underpass at 92nd Avenue and Scooter Avenue and not include a vehicular underpass as part of the Seward Highway/Diamond to O'Malley project. That recommendation was drafted into a letter and forwarded to the TAC, which was reviewed and approved with some minor changes. DOT&PF attended the TAC meeting and provided information, as directed by the PC, with an analysis and cost estimate for non-motorized grade separated concepts to include at least one overpass and one underpass. At the November 3 TAC meeting and after hearing the presentation given by DOT&PF on the different options with cost estimates along with a discussion about the feasibility, the TAC approved recommending DOT&PF present this topic to the PC and supported the project as currently designed due to the infeasibility of implementing a non-motorized only design.

CHRISTINA HUBER with DOT&PF provided a PowerPoint presentation.

The Committee discussed why traffic signals would be built if cars will not be traveling under the highway, actual cost of improvements, purpose and need, what triggers NEPA to re-evaluate projects, right-of-way acquisitions, vehicle connectivity, having to pay back large sums of funding to FHWA should a project be eliminated, and redoing the environmental analysis.

ACTING CHAIR LINNELL opened the floor to public comments.

JACOB POWELL supported canceling the project and noted the following:

1. This project and the decisions around it are a huge opportunity for leadership from the PC to set the direction and tone of our city by canceling this project. There is a lot of inertia and money and canceling this project would be a difficult high-profile and risky choice to make as policymakers.
2. In terms of connectivity, one of the favorite things about Anchorage is that everything is 15 minutes away from everything else by car. The future of Anchorage and what connectivity means is so different than it was 10-20 years ago and this is a lot of money being spent to solve a problem that does not exist.
3. In terms of pedestrian access, the reason why being a pedestrian in Anchorage is such a miserable and unsafe experience is not due to lack of crossings, but is due to all the other infrastructure built up around these crossings. This is an incredible amount of expenditure on something that does not solve the problem.
4. If we have spent money on this issue, the money would have to be paid back by DOT&PF, but we should not have to feel that just because we spent development money on this that we have to go forward. This money comes from infinite sources and, even if it is coming from DOT&PF, it had to come from state or federal funds and commits us to a project that we have to maintain.
5. It is a piece of infrastructure that is a permanent part of our city that we are stuck with, even if the city changes around it. It is a fiscally irresponsible project that does not fit or make sense as drivers and cyclists, and he did not see how it benefits him.

NANCY PEASE noted the following:

1. DOT&PF had given references to several land use and transportation plans, but are not paying attention to key incompatibilities and data trends, such as the radical decline in traffic projections; and the municipal goals of reducing dependency on vehicles; and supporting neighborhood centers. This interchange would create a bypass of the Abbott Neighborhood Commercial Center and does not put safety first for either non-motorized or vehicle users.
2. DOT&PF seems to come back to one closing argument, which is that the design is 99% complete. The PC has a fiduciary responsibility to the public regarding this \$113 million highway project, plus the \$18 million for Academy and Vanguard.
3. The most practical and responsible move for the PC would be to delay or cancel the Dimond to O'Malley project for 2 to 4 years. During that interval, the municipality plans to create its own local Long-Range Transportation Plan. AMATS will be doing a Climate Action Plan and will be able to evaluate whether the Dimond to O'Malley Freeway project is a priority investment.

DEVORA BARRERA, Bike Anchorage Director, noted the following:

1. This is an outdated project that does not meet the current needs of that area.
2. There is no need to spend \$113 million to expand a highway. It has been proven around the world that expanding and building creates what is called induced demand, and will likely happen in this area.
3. When our city lacks connectivity with our maintenance and safe infrastructure for non-motorized users, we want to see these funds in other places and in projects that will change the city for the better.
4. We are asking the PC to cancel this project. It is clear there is no confidence in the ability of DOT&PF to plan and design urban infrastructure that meets the city's planning documents and what we want.

GRAHAM DOWNEY noted the following:

1. Strongly opposed to this project and would love to see the PC vote to get this back to the planning stage where we can have some democratic control over what our city looks like.
2. DOT&PF is saying that we cannot change the purpose and plans of how we design our city. The NEPA process was not designed to prevent participation in the planning process.
3. We have spent money pursuing a bad project, but how much is it going to cost to maintain it over the long-term? How much is it going to cost to take down this project, if we decide to do something else later?
4. This is an incredibly, fiscally irresponsible project of \$40 million for a highway interchange that the city does not want because we happened to start planning it 20 years ago and feels like a bad way to plan our city.

STEVE MCKEEVER noted the following:

1. The entire expansion of the Seward Highway to Dimond should not be approved by the PC.

2. The presentation by DOT&PF seemed to be hastily put together and is designed only to make sure the project goes through.
3. As a civil engineer, the project estimates he was involved in had gone through what were called “stage gates” where an initial estimate has a very wide range of costs. What was shown today were very precise costs for the pedestrian options with no range.
4. The comment was made that in order to put in a pedestrian tunnel, the Seward Highway would have to be raised to ensure the tunnel is above-grade elevation. There are many tunnels around town that are below water elevation, such as Campbell Creek and the railroad yards in Whittier.
5. If we do go forward with the pedestrian option and get rid of those roundabouts, why does the overall project cost not get reduced rather than increase with the pedestrian tunnels?

CATHY GLEASON noted the following:

1. This is not the part of town where she resides, but she has been an Anchorage resident for 40 years and is appalled at the direction the road projects are going with regard to scale, cost, and massive right-of-way takes. A lot of times taking place in wooded, natural areas.
2. With regard to aesthetics, every improvement that was made to the Seward Highway has been degraded, but is still a nice-looking entryway into our city at Dimond and O'Malley. She had never observed any traffic issues with the amount of lanes.
3. Agreed with all the previous speakers as to the reasons why this project should not move forward.
4. Public outreach showed that multiple community councils were contacted and interacted with during this process, but she was curious if any of those community councils took a position on this project.
5. Turnagain Street (off West Northern Lights) is in dire need of repair and has been close to the top of the CIP list for decades and still does not have funding, yet, we are looking at a massive amount of money for a project that does not need to move forward.

MARTIN HANSEN, South Addition Community Council, noted the following:

1. Any money spent widening the Seward Highway is a waste of money. We have lots of places that really need money, such as the Downtown and Midtown areas to make traffic flow better, to make living easier, and to focus on bicycles and pedestrians.
2. If there was a way to hold public work sessions, he would enjoy participating.

ALICIA (did not state last name) lives in Fairview and noted the following:

1. Connectivity is not just for people on bicycles, but for people that have disabilities, such as the blind or are in wheelchairs and need accessibility as well.
2. She did not support the project.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR moved to change the order of the day to hear Agenda Item B because any action on Item A relies on the action taken on Item B. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

*Hearing no objections, this motion passed.*

**a. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment 1**

MR. JONGENELEN presented TIP Amendment #1 noting this is necessary to update Table 2 – Roadway, Table 3 – Non-motorized, Table 4 – Plans and Studies, Table 5 - Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, Table 7 - HSIP, Table 8 - NHS, and Table 10 - Other Federal, State and Local Funded projects within the AMATS area.

The Committee discussed an FTA grant known as the Persistent Poverty Grant and having non-motorized easement information publicly available.

ACTING CHAIR LINNELL opened the floor to public comments.

EMILY WEISER, Bike Anchorage, noted the following:

1. Easement information does need to be available for transportation planning purposes. These could be a key aspect of plugging some gaps that are problematic in our bike network.
2. With regard to HSP0020 and 21, those projects are described as channelization. When it comes to public process, we need to have these defined because that term is not clear, but that term was also used for the changes at the C Street intersections at Tudor and Dimond where there are now pedestrian islands and the real problematic change with the right turn lanes that are streamlined, so that cars can take them faster and move without slowing down or looking at the crosswalk. This design is widely known to be more dangerous for people using crosswalks, so putting those under safety improvements seems a bit disingenuous.
3. With regard to the public process, the memorandum provided today is really helpful with being able to directly compare what was in the TIP versus what is being proposed in the amendment. She suggested defining (at the top of the amendment) that changes are shown in red, but maybe not use red because a lot of people cannot distinguish red from black. It would also be helpful to provide a diagram showing what it actually means, what it would look like, and describing the reason for the proposed change.

NANCY PEASE noted the following:

1. Asked the PC to request AMATS staff to reformat the tables in the document so that the reader can easily see whether a project has lost or gained funding.
2. Asked the PC to hold firm to their August vote to require inventory and mapping of undeveloped easements and rights-of-way as part of the non-motorized inventory. Non-motorized easements are hidden in the fine print of hundreds of plat maps and are not readily accessible to the public.

3. Do not accept the claim that undeveloped rights-of-way would require field surveys before they are mapped and request a legal opinion on whether there is liability.
4. With regard to roadway and pathway repairs, this budget shows the repair programs will be cannibalized in order to fund new projects. The public should see what repairs are not going to happen.
5. If you were to cancel the Dimond to O'Malley project, you could fund all the road and pathway repairs, and some new projects.
6. She asked to put specifics in the Climate Action Plan first to ensure rapid results and minimize misinformation, and request an immediate report of best practices that have proven effective in transportation systems elsewhere.
7. Commit to specific greenhouse gas reduction targets in line with municipal and national goals.
8. Commit to measuring and reporting gas emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled.
9. Include resiliency measures. It is important to scope a project.
10. Specify in the MTP 2050 update happening in 2024 that the update incorporates the anticipated local LRTP and Climate Action Plan, so that it is a true reflective update.

STEVE MCKEEVER noted the following:

1. The proposed changes may be hidden somewhere in the documents and in part of the amendment that is being proposed right now because he could not find them, but it would be nice if the changes being presented were more legible and succinctly proposed.
2. In addition to the transportation plan, he would like to see a continuation of the bike path on the south side of Tudor Road (stops at Baxter Road) around the curves to Muldoon Road. As it is now, if you want to get to the east side of Muldoon Road on a bicycle, you have to cross at Baxter, take the bike path there to Patterson, then take Patterson (which has no bike path around the curve) up to, what he thinks is, 36th Avenue, then across the pedestrian bridge.

CATHY GLEASON noted the following:

1. With regard to the Fish Creek Trail connection project, the Turnagain Community Council passed a resolution at their November 3 meeting supporting the trail, but with certain conditions. Our first choice is to have the majority of that trail placed within the railroad right-of-way in combination with the AWWU access road. That was the footprint of the informal trail that was there for decades before it was fenced off. If that option can move forward, then the dollar amounts in the TIP document would be substantially less. If access to the AWWU road cannot be worked out, then the conditions the council had placed were supporting certain segments of alternatives that were provided by the trail project team, but there were other alternatives that we absolutely oppose. If the decision-makers choose to go forward with any of the other routes that we expressed opposition to, we are asking that a full environmental assessment be done. The council was told that it is not necessary and that there is a categorical exclusion for this project, which we strongly disagree with because it could impact neighbors and the Fish Creek Hatchery.

---

CHERYL RICHARDSON asked the following:

1. Is there more money available in these tables for adding projects and studies? For instance, there appears to be an unallocated \$2.7 million in the carbon reduction program in Summary Table 1.
2. How is aligning the Campbell track entrance (Table 10, Project 4) considered carbon reducing making it eligible for these funds?
3. What process will AMATS use to evaluate the projects and studies the public might nominate during this comment period?
4. What process was used to produce Amendment 1? It is not clear to many of us.
5. It would be helpful to show within each cell if that number has changed from the adopted TIP to this amendment and show how it was changed by providing that new number.

MR. TROMBLEY moved to approve the 2023-2026 TIP Amendment 1. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to change the project description of PLN00011 to read, “AMATS Minnesota Drive and I/L Street Corridor Plan (International Airport Road to 3rd Avenue) – Project will provide a comprehensive analysis of the Minnesota Drive and I/L Corridor’s current conditions, anticipated growth patterns and their impacts, likely outcomes and reasonable mitigation alternatives. It would include recommended improvements based on identified needs and community input, and a timeline for implementation. Project would include modeling analysis and engineering works as needed. The I/L Couplet should be evaluated for rehabilitation as a Complete Street, adhering to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy and the AMATS Complete Streets Plan.” Change the project phasing plan to 2024. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

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

- (AT) What was the reason why this was not included as a Complete Street in the original language?
- (JS) *He submitted this project for the 2023-2026 MTP consideration and it scored well and DOT&PF was able to find a source of funding for it. The Committee can add it and he suggested having it apply to the entire corridor from International to 3rd Avenue. The reason it is not explicitly saying Complete Streets is because, as a Planner, he thinks of Complete Streets as being part of the program.*
- (AT) Does that mean whether we change it to 2024 and add the language or not, it is going to be looked at as Complete Streets.
- (JS) *There has not yet been an RFP (Request for Proposals) released. The Complete Streets concepts are considered in transportation planning.*
- (DV) *The reason for the change to 2024 is because the AMATS Complete Streets Plan will not yet be completed.*

---

MS. POKON moved to extend the meeting to 4:00 p.m. MR. TROMBLEY seconded.

***Hearing no objections, this motion passed.***

ACTING CHAIR LINNELL clarified that the only action today was releasing TIP Amendment #1 for a 45-day public comment period. All of the discussion happening here could take place as part of that comment period.

- (EP) Are we talking about the same thing when we use the term Complete Streets? Assembly Member Volland's language included AMATS Complete Streets Policy and a Complete Streets Plan. She heard DOT&PF say they have Complete Streets in mind when planning.
- (DV) *He believed Complete Streets can have different meanings and that is why he would like it to adhere to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy and Complete Streets Plan.*
- (AJ) *The plan is not going to be done by 2024. This amendment will not be done until the end of the current federal fiscal year, which will be June or July, so midway through 2023. It takes approximately 6 months to get through the municipal purchasing process to get a consultant on board. It will start in calendar year 2024 and take approximately 2 years to complete with all the work that has to be done. His only recommendation is the culling out of the Complete Streets Plan because it will not be done in time unless we want to delay all of these projects to 2026. He also recommended not just doing the I/L Couplet, but include Minnesota Drive. Do the whole project as a Complete Street, not just one portion. Mr. Starzec had recommended doing the entire termini of the project, not just I/L Streets.*

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND accepted the friendly amendment to the fourth sentence to read, "The project should be evaluated for rehabilitation as a Complete Street, adhering to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy" removing the language, "...and the AMATS Complete Streets Plan, and remove the last sentence that reads, "Change the project phasing plan to 2024". ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

- (EP) Asked for clarification that the amendment is adhering to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy, which is the scope of what the amendment is speaking to specifically. She had not heard any objections from DOT&PF that this seems consistent with what their existing practices are and this language will not be problematic.
- (JS) *The only way he would see this as being problematic is that DOT&PF had not yet officially concurred with the AMATS Complete Streets Policy.*
- (EP) *Does the "evaluated for" language also apply to the adhering language? Is it evaluating the project for the possibility of adhering to the Complete Streets Policy? Is that the intent of the amendment?*
- (DV) *The evaluation of a project should adhere to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy.*

- (JS) *As a corridor plan of DOT facilities, the intent is to come up with a management way forward that both meets the needs of the DOT mission while complimenting the needs and goals of the community as best as possible. The entire point of the plan is to find where those two goals intersect and illustrate where they do not, and how that can be accommodated.*
- (AT) Asked for clarification that we are still going back to the fact that the AMATS Complete Streets Plan will not be done until 2026, which means the entire project is going to be put off until then.
- (AJ) *The policy is in place already so when the project is ready, it can look at the policy as it is being developed to ensure it is adhering to it.*
- (DV) DOT&PF does not have a finalized Complete Streets Policy. One of the handouts he provided was a letter dated May 2, 2022 from the South Addition Community Council that had, again, recommended studies of the I/L Couplet and the A/C Couplet specifically asking AMATS to immediately fund the first step of studying the A/C transition into Complete Streets. In his mind, that is identifying the needs of the community.
- (JS) *He pointed out that this is talking about DOT&PF facilities. There is conflict between what the DOT's mission is and what some members of the community believe those facilities should be used for. The point of doing these corridor plans is to be able to bring those two value sets together in a way that we can find compromise and ways to move forward where both mission and community values are met.*
- (DV) It makes him nervous that DOT does not have a Complete Streets Policy and this project is going to move forward. If we are going to evaluate the Complete Streets, we should adhere to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy.

### **AMENDMENT #1**

***Hearing no objections, the first amendment passed.***

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to change the project description to read, "A/C Couplet Complete Streets Study – Project would provide a comprehensive analysis of the A and C Streets Corridor current conditions, anticipated growth patterns and their impacts and likely outcomes, to consider the potential rehabilitation of A and C Streets into Complete Streets; adhering to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy. Complete Street improvements included would be based on community input and a timeline for implementation. The project would include modeling analysis and engineering work as needed. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND clarified that this amendment adds specific Complete Streets language and the portion about adhering to the AMATS Complete Streets Policy.

MS. POKON thought there might be additional changes in the language with regard to reasonable mitigation alternatives, such as lane reduction.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND felt the language, such as lane reduction, is already pushing the project in a specific direction, even more than Complete Streets, and he is comfortable with that. When the South Addition Community Council nominated this project, they were not asking for a lane reduction. They were asking for this to be studied as a Complete Street.

MR. JONGENELEN expressed that when copying the Northern Lights project description that does talk about a lane reduction, it mistakenly carried over to this description.. He did not see an issue with changing it.

**AMENDMENT #2**

***Hearing no objections, the second amendment passed.***

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to delete Projects NHS0004 and RDY00013. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR commented that quite a lot of money had been spent on this project already and is a tremendously expensive project that was not a good spend of public funds. Ms. Huber had mentioned that there is a plan to go all the way to Minnesota with one of these roads. He urged DOT&PF to re-evaluate that plan. These large connector roads that had been planned for a long time fit a paradigm of this city that no longer exists for a variety of reasons. The city is not growing as fast as it used to. Our shortage is not in transportation infrastructure, but in buildable land for housing. Housing comes with some transportation infrastructure needs. Using evermore of our land for large-scale tens and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of transportation projects and actively taking out convenience stores or hotels or houses is a paradigm that he did not think the people of Anchorage support anymore. These decisions were made in 2007 that we are living with now. He supported removing this project and would appreciate the opportunity for all of us to work together with DOT&PF to make sure that whoever is serving on this Committee in 15 years are not looking at the same kind of decisions that no longer fits in the world in which they live.

Hearing objections, ACTING CHAIR LINNELL called for a roll call vote.

**AMENDMENT #3**

YAY

Assembly Member Volland

Assembly Member Dunbar

NAY

Mr. Trombley

Ms. Pokon

Acting Chair Linnell

***Amendment #3 failed, 2 to 3.***

**MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED**

YAY

Mr. Trombley

Ms. Pokon

Acting Chair Linnell

NAY

Assembly Member Volland

Assembly Member Dunbar

***The main motion, as amended, passed 3 to 2.***

The Committee agreed to remove Item 5.a. from the table to resume discussion at 3:53 p.m.

**b. 92nd Avenue Undercrossing Update and Action**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to request the project go back for an environmental analysis. ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR asked for clarification what formal language does DOT&PF require in the motion in order for something else to happen.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that a motion can be made requesting further analysis on the project and, since it is not a TIP funded project, it is up to DOT&PF to accept or deny that request.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND expressed that the Committee was just presented with the idea that having it re-evaluated would be a feasible option.

ACTING CHAIR LINNELL noted that what was presented, as he understood it, was if DOT&PF were to accept it, then that would mean the project would have to go back to FHWA requesting their participation to close out that project and start a new project. He thought the likelihood of that would be pretty slim, but the Policy Committee can certainly make that request.

MS. POKON pointed out that there were elements in the presentation that she would like to know more about and she is prepared to ask DOT&PF to redo the environmental assessment with a new purpose and need. For example, the public process held to date did not tell her what sort of public input had been received at that point. She did see that these projects are long-term and that is the nature of them and there is going to be time that passes from when first proposed and when they come to fruition and actually start building. If there were any public concerns raised, she would like to know if DOT&PF responded to those concerns. Mr. Vanhove spoke to a larger project possibly needing to be re-evaluated, but she did not know what the purpose of that larger project was. She did not want to ask DOT&PF to go back and do more work, she would just like to better understand some of those elements. Were the same public concerns raised previously and how were they responded to previously?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR moved to extend the meeting to 4:05 p.m. MS. POKON seconded.

*Hearing no objections, this motion passed.*

Hearing objections to the main motion, ACTING CHAIR LINNELL called for a roll call vote.

**MAIN MOTION**

YAY

Assembly Member Volland

Assembly Member Dunbar

NAY

Mr. Trombley

Ms. Pokon

Acting Chair Linnell

*The motion failed 2 to 3.*

**c. VisionEval Metrics and Direction**

*This item was tabled to the December 15, 2022 meeting.*

**6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES - None**

**7. GENERAL INFORMATION - None**

**8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER DUNBAR informed the Committee that he may or may not be on this Body in December but will no longer be serving come January and that it had been a pleasure.

**9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to adjourn. MS. POKON seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.*