

Measure C Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes – August 14, 2025

1. Welcome & Introductions

Fresno COG Executive Director, Robert Phipps

- Opened the meeting and introduced the following special guests:
 - Alma Beltran, Mayor of Parlier and Fresno COG Chair
 - Victor Martinez, Mayor of Mendota and Fresno COG Vice Chair
 - Jerry Dyer, Mayor of Fresno
 - Lynne Ashbeck, Clovis Councilmember

Mayor Jerry Dyer

- Thanked members for their participation in difficult and sometimes controversial work.
- Emphasized the importance of setting Fresno County's future.
- Noted a change in facilitation: the previous facilitator, Kendall, had stepped away. Explained this was a mutual decision, as Kendall did not have the local knowledge needed for the process.
- Nominated Mark Keppler for the role of facilitator.
- Invited steering committee members to express their thoughts. Emphasized that *"all opinions/statements are valued."*

Nayamin Martinez (Steering Committee Member)

- Stated that while she did not know Mark Keppler well, she valued the comments he has made and trusted them. Emphasized the importance of ensuring all members have an equal opportunity to participate and express their opinions.

Simon Biasell (Steering Committee Member)

- Emphasized that facilitation should be intentional, not only giving members a chance to speak but also building trust, breaking down misconceptions, and uniting diverse perspectives.
- Stated that success depends on developing a measure everyone can support, since unity within the group is essential to gaining broader voter approval.
- Expressed confidence that if Mark can guide the group in this way, the process will be successful.

Councilmember Lynne Ashbeck

- Agreed with what has been said.
- Acknowledged that the work being done is difficult but meaningful.
- Noted that the facilitation team approached the process with confidence in their ability to succeed.
- Extended thanks to members for their participation and continued support of the common good.
- Emphasized that while the process does not mean everyone gets exactly what they want, the work remains important and impactful.

Mayor Victor Martinez

- Expressed appreciation to all participants and encouraged collaboration to address areas that need improvement.
- Highlighted Mendota roads as an issue and noted the goal of bringing them back up to standard.
- Thanked members for their work and their presence at the meeting.

Mayor Alma Beltran

- Thanked participants for their understanding and emphasized the importance of working together to achieve the county's future needs.
 - Expressed appreciation to the committee for their time and contributions.
-

2. Facilitation Appointment

- Proposal: Mark Keppler to serve as facilitator for upcoming meetings.
- Keppler has a background in mediation and has served with the Measure C committee since its inception.
- Concerns about bias were raised, but Mayor Dyer expressed confidence in his impartiality.
- Keppler committed to:
 - Stepping down as a voting member (his alternate, Mona Cummings, will serve instead).
 - Stepping away from his role in tree advocacy and will be resigning from the Tree Fresno Board.
 - Serving neutrally, with his role focused on guiding, supporting, and enabling decision-making.

Member Responses

- No objections voiced.
- Gail Miller praised Keppler's abilities and said the process needed him.

- Some concern was raised about why Kendall left; Mayor Dyer clarified it was mutual and amicable.
- Members stressed the importance of moving forward positively.

Vote: *Unanimous approval to appoint Mark Keppler as facilitator.*

Facilitator Remarks (Mark Keppler)

- Expressed gratitude and commitment to neutrality.
- Expressed his role is to encourage full participation, promote mutual understanding, foster inclusive solutions, and cultivate a shared responsibility.
- Distributed his business card for accessibility to members.
- Introduced a **“To-Do List” slide**, emphasizing:
 - Civility and goodwill.
 - Constructive criticism.
 - Compromise and curiosity.
 - Communication between members.
- Shared the proverb “If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.”

Consensus-Building Process and Agreement Scale (1–8, from full agreement to veto)

- Introduced and explained the **Consensus-Building Process** and **Agreement Scale**
 - **Step 1: Proposal Introduced**
 - A proposal is made and requires a second.
 - **Step 2: Clarification**
 - Members may ask questions or request clarification.
 - **Step 3: Friendly Amendments**
 - Members may suggest amendments.
 - Need two “seconds” to be considered.
 - **Step 4: Poll Using the Agreement Scale (1–8)**
 - **Purpose:** To test whether the proposal has enough support to move forward.
 - **Possible Outcomes:**
 - Proceed to vote** if the poll shows sufficient support (average < 4.0 or only a few “5–7” responses).
 - Do not proceed** if the poll shows insufficient support (average > 4.0 or many “5–7” responses).
 - Do not proceed** if any member uses a veto (each member has one veto per proposal).
 - **Step 5: Committee Vote**
 - If the proposal proceeds, the Steering Committee votes.

- Adoption requires at least 70% approval.

Application in Meeting

Poll on process: Average was less than 4, so the vote proceeded.

Vote on process: Approved by majority, with 6 abstentions (counted as non-votes).

Discussion on Abstentions

- **Mark Keppler:** Clarified that abstention was counted as a non-vote. Offered the option to conduct a re-vote or the option for members to change their vote.
- **Lee Delap:** Objected to treating abstentions as non-votes, expressing concern that votes were being taken without full agreement. Suggested that the committee should spend more time reaching consensus rather than moving forward with a process that leaves some members' votes uncounted.
- **Chuck Riojas:** Explained that he abstained to remain cooperative and avoid early conflict, though he found the rules unclear. Indicated that he would have vetoed had he understood the process and expressed concern that the grading system was unclear, particularly regarding what counts as a "yes."
- **Mark Keppler:** Encouraged members to give the process a chance, explaining that the goal is to build buy-in by demonstrating sufficient support to advance a proposal to the ballot.
- **Robert Phipps:** Noted that 27 members were present, setting the threshold for approval at 20, which was met with the vote taken.
- **Brooke Ashjian:** Observed that in city council, abstentions are typically counted as "No" votes and questioned how quorum and the 70% agreement threshold would be met if abstentions were excluded.
- **Mark Keppler:** Explains polling system further, asks Mark Scott for his perspective.
- **Dr. Amber Cowell:** Suggested redefining scale point 4 from "Abstain" to "Neutral."
- **Mark Keppler:** Committee members agreed, clarified point 4 would now be "Neutral."
- **Mark Scott:** Advised that whether an abstention is treated as a "No" or a non-vote should depend on whether it affects the ability to maintain quorum. Explained that once a proposal passes the poll stage, only actual votes are counted; if someone chooses not to vote, it is not included in the total. Encouraged members to vote "No" directly if that is their position.
- **Brooke Ashjian:** Changed his vote to veto.
- **Mark Keppler:** Inquires about Brooke's concern regarding the consensus proposal.
- **Brooke Ashjian:** Expressed concern that members were being grouped together and argued that abstentions resulted in a loss of quorum. Felt the process was being created on the spot and stated a preference to move directly to allocations.
- **Mark Keppler:** Communicated the importance of the process and preparation of categories and sub-categories.
- **Chuck Yeadon:** Emphasized the importance of staying open-minded and recognized the value of the process, while expressing concern that some members were bringing personal agendas or attempting to disrupt progress. Urged the committee to focus on

substantive issues rather than prolonged debate, reminding members that decisions should prioritize the best interests of Fresno County as a whole.

- **Kay Bertken:** Stated that to avoid prolonging discussion and better reach consensus, members should be required to vote either “Yes” or “No” rather than abstain, expressing opposition to allowing abstentions.
- **Veronica Garibay:** Pointed out the limited time remaining in the meeting and urged the committee to move forward to guiding principles and categories. Noted that the 70% threshold had already been met and recommended proceeding without further debate.
- **Mark Keppler:** Confirmed that since the 70% threshold was met, the committee would move forward with the process.
- **Brooke Ashjian:** Withdrew his earlier veto.

Resolution: A vote of “4” during polling will now indicate *neutral*. Abstentions will be treated as non-votes, and the process will proceed.

3. Components of the Measure [ACTION]

Identify and agree on the steps and process necessary to establish the next Measure C Expenditure Plan.

- Vision = Language that inspires community
- Guiding principles = Core values that drive the “why and “how”
- Categories = Buckets of funding that bring life to the guiding principles
- Allocations = How much money goes to each category and how the funds are distributed to each city and county
- Implementing guidelines = Rules for how the funds can be accessed and used, and how decisions will be made

At its July 30 meeting, the Steering Committee approved the following vision statement and principles by 82 percent consensus.

Vision statement: “Measure C envisions a reliable, safe, equitable, and connected infrastructure and transportation system that enables all residents to travel efficiently and safely, regardless of mode.”

Priorities:

- Support community health and resilience.
- Enhance public safety.
- Ensure accessibility and access for all.
- Make equitable investments.

Subsequent to that discussion, the Fresno COG Policy Board requested adjustments and refinements to the priorities in the interest of further fleshing out the concepts originally

expressed. To meet everyone's concerns, the Measure C Facilitation Team recommended synthesizing the priorities into the guiding principles below:

- **Fix what matters most:** Repair and maintain existing local streets and roads.
- **Keep people safe:** Enhance lighting, road safety and safe routes to schools.
- **Get people where they need to go efficiently:** Improve connectivity, accessibility and affordability to essential services and amenities.
- **Improve transportation alternatives** that invest in building and maintaining trails, bike paths and public transit options.
- **Build strong, vibrant communities:** Add shade, trees and other features to combat heat and beautify transportation corridors.
- **Leave no neighborhood behind:** Invest across our county to strengthen all communities.
- **Foster innovation:** Make smart investments that keep our county competitive and connected now and in the future.
- **Ensure fair and transparent use of tax dollars.**

Committee amendments to the principles

Nicholas Paladino recommended amending the following guiding principle:

Original:

Improve transportation alternatives.

(Invest in building & maintaining trails, bike paths, and public transit options.)

Amended version:

Improve transportation alternatives.

(Invest in building & maintaining bikeways, pedestrian facilities, and public transit options.)

Vote: Passed (One (1) No vote)

Poll on Guiding Principles (as amended)

- Average was less than 4, so the vote proceeded.

Vote on Guiding Principles (as amended)

- Twenty-five (25) Yes, Three (3) No, One (1) Abstention.
- Joe Giles abstained; Chuck Riojas, Brooke Ashjian, and Lino Mendes voted no.
- Guiding Principles were adopted.

Adopted Guiding Principles (as amended)

- **Fix what matters most**
 - *(repair and maintain existing local streets & roads)*
 - **Keep people safe**
 - *(enhance lighting, road safety & safe routes to school)*
 - **Get people where they need to go efficiently**
 - *(improve connectivity, accessibility, and affordability to essential services & amenities)*
 - **Improve transportation alternatives**
 - *(invest in building & maintaining bikeways, pedestrian facilities, and public transit options)*
 - **Build strong, vibrant communities**
 - *(add shade, trees and other features to combat heat & beautify transportation corridors)*
 - **Leave no neighborhood behind**
 - *(invest across our county to strengthen all communities)*
 - **Foster innovation**
 - *(make smart investments that keep our county competitive and connected—now & in the future)*
 - **Ensure a fair and transparent use of tax dollars**
-

4. Categories & Definitions [ACTION]

The committee was presented with the following list to help them arrive at a consensus on the categories and potential subcategories that should be considered for funding.

Existing Neighborhood Roads

- Streets near homes, schools, and parks
- Arterials such as Shaw/Jensen Avenues
- Major roads such as Whitesbridge/Lassen/Golden State
- Alleys, bike lanes, sidewalks (repair & new)
- Streetlights, signals, and other safety features

Public Transportation

- Transit systems – urban/rural
- Senior/veteran/youth Transportation
- Carshare/Vanpools
- Mobility Hubs

- Future transportation alternatives

Active Transportation

- Bike and pedestrian trail maintenance & construction
- Accessibility improvements
- Safe Routes to Schools

Regional Connectivity

- Major road projects for safety improvements and congestion reduction
- Airports
- Grade separations

Other

- Future alternative transportation
- Transit Oriented Development
- New technologies

Administration

- Administration/Planning

The Steering Committee was encouraged to recommend any arrangement of categories it sees fit, subject to feedback and approval of the Fresno COG and Fresno County Transportation Authority Boards. Additional amendments may be brought forward at the August 27 Steering Committee meeting.

Discussion Points:

- **Mark Keppler:** Introduced the general categories and opened the floor for member feedback.
- **Mark Scott:** Clarified that the process would address general categories first, followed by subcategories. Suggested that reviewing subcategories could help members better understand what they do or do not agree on, and recommended taking time to look at them.
- **Lee Delap:** Stressed the importance of keeping pavement conditions and the overall objective of the measure in mind when allocating funds. Noted that with over a billion dollars to be spent in coming years, road conditions should remain a primary focus, as they affect neighborhood roads, regional connectivity, and represent the core of Measure C funding moving forward.
- **Mark Keppler:** Clarified that discussion of allocations will take place at the next meeting, while the current focus is only on listing categories. Asked whether the categories reflect the concerns raised and emphasized that the list is not presented in rank order.
- **Lee Delap:** Agreed with the clarification and expressed that the general categories would address his concerns.

- **Scott Miller:** Suggested that, given the focus on roads, the categories should specifically reference unincorporated areas, road conditions, and roads connecting cities. Recommended that road repair and maintenance be explicitly mentioned as a separate major category under “Existing Neighborhood Roads.”
- **Mark Keppler:** Asked members if, for the sake of time, it would make sense to address general categories and subcategories together.
- **Robert Phipps:** Explained that the “Existing Neighborhood Roads” category was refined by the facilitation team based on outreach and committee feedback. Emphasized that it is intended to include all local roads, both urban and rural, but exclude new roads created by development, which should be the responsibility of developers rather than Measure C funds.
- **Scott Miller:** Expressed concern that the wording of the category seemed to exclude roads outside of neighborhoods that also need repairs, safety improvements, and upgrades.
- **Mark Keppler:** Confirmed that the intent of the category is to focus on maintaining existing infrastructure, with new development expected to be funded by developers. Clarified that the current task is not about percentages but about ensuring the categories and subcategories are inclusive of concerns. Noted that subject experts will review the list for gaps before the committee votes. Emphasized that the more detailed discussions will take place at the next meeting and asked Scott Mozier if he was comfortable with the approach.
- **Scott Miller:** Stated he would revoke his motion if others felt the category was already inclusive of unincorporated roads.
- **Karen Musson:** Questioned why sidewalks were included under the “Existing Neighborhood Roads” category and why bikeways appeared in multiple general categories.
- **Mark Keppler:** Explained that bike lanes are included in multiple categories because when roads are built, bike lanes are required as part of the project. Clarified that it would be confusing to fund them separately from roads since Classes 2, 3, and 4 bike facilities are built within streets and should fall under the “Existing Neighborhood Roads” category. Noted that Class 1 bike paths are off-road and therefore placed in a separate category.
- **Nicholas Paladino:** Clarified that Class 4 facilities are not standard protected bike lanes but cycle tracks or separated bikeways that run adjacent to roads. Noted that they may be part of a road project but are not always included within the roadway itself.
- **Veronica Garibay:** Observed that the discussion was becoming too detailed and moving into implementation guidelines rather than focusing on categories and subcategories. Stated that the current list reflects facilitation team input, committee discussions, public feedback, and comments from mayors at the Policy Board meeting. Recommended moving forward with the categories as presented.
- **Mark Keppler:** Reminded the committee that they would have the opportunity to revisit and make changes at the next meeting if needed.
- **Karen Musson:** Expressed that emergency response was a significant missing element and felt the list of categories seemed arbitrary but chose not to make a motion.

- **Darren Rose:** Stated that developers pay road impact fees for new development and new home construction along arterials.
- **Lee Delap:** Asked Scott Mozier whether alleys had previously been part of the funded criteria or if this was a new addition.
- **Scott Mozier (Subject Expert):** Explained that alleys are eligible for funding under the current Measure C only if they are part of the maintained network; if not, they are ineligible. Noted that each agency decides what is included, and state gas tax guidelines also require inclusion in maintained mileage. Added that in Fresno County, some alleys and streets, particularly in unincorporated rural developments, are not accepted into the maintained network and remain the responsibility of property owners.
- **Lee Delap:** Noted that adding more items could increase expenses and ultimately leave fewer tax dollars available for the main priority allocations.
- **Mark Keppler:** Acknowledged the concern but clarified that funding distribution will be addressed during the allocation discussion at the next meeting.
- **Kay Bertken:** Asked for clarification on what is included under transit-oriented development and what the term refers to.
- **Paul Herman:** Explained that transit-oriented development funding is currently included in Measure C and refers to transportation-related improvements tied to infill development, such as sidewalks and bus stop improvements, but not for housing.
- **Nayamin Martinez:** Thanked Scott for his comments, noting that rural communities have strongly expressed the need for funding to address their roads, as many currently lack any maintenance. Suggested adding language to allow funding for unmaintained roads and asked Scott how such roads could be included.
- **Scott Mozier (Subject Expert):** Explained that some roads are open to traffic but privately owned, which makes them ineligible for public funding.
- **Mark Keppler:** Reminded the committee that they would have the opportunity to revisit and make changes at the next meeting if needed.
- **Sara Montemayor:** Asked why people with disabilities were not included in the “Senior/Veteran/Youth Transportation” subcategory, noting her understanding that free transportation for individuals with disabilities had previously been discussed.
- **Moses Stites:** Explained that each transit agency receives an allocation that can be applied toward passes for seniors, people with disabilities, and veterans, with the discretion left to each agency on how funds are used.
- **Sara Montemayor:** Proposed a **friendly amendment** to change the subcategory “Senior/Veteran/Youth Transportation” to “Senior/Veteran/Youth/Disabilities Transportation.” The amendment was seconded by two members and **approved** unanimously.
- **Nayamin Martinez:** Proposed a **friendly amendment** to change the subcategory “Carshare/Vanpools” to “Carshare/Vanpools/Microtransit.” The amendment was seconded by two members and **approved** unanimously.
- **Veronica Garibay:** Proposed a **friendly amendment** to add two subcategories under Public Transportation: “Programs and Services” and “Public Transit Supportive

Infrastructure.” The amendment was seconded by two members and **approved** with Two (2) *no votes*.

- **Veronica Garibay:** Proposed a **friendly amendment** to add three subcategories under Administration: “Technical Assistance,” “Community Engagement,” and “Public Database by Category.” The amendment was seconded by two members and **approved**.
- **Gail Miller:** Asked whether Fresno COG already provides assistance with grant applications.
- **Robert Phipps:** Explained that Fresno COG staff, through the Circuit Planner and Engineer Program funded by federal and state sources (not Measure C), are available to provide support.
- **Nicholas Paladino:** Proposed a **friendly amendment** to change the subcategory “Alleys, bike lanes, sidewalks (repair & new)” to “Alleys, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities (repair & new)”. The amendment was seconded by two members and **approved**.
- **Kay Bertken:** Pointed out that bikeways are included under both roads and active transportation categories.
- **Mark Keppler:** Clarified that not all bikeways are located on roads, which is why they are included in both the roads and active transportation categories, and reiterated his earlier explanation of the different bike facility classes and their placement across the two categories.
- **Robert Phipps:** Noted that from a staff perspective, including bikeways in both categories makes it easier for agencies to access funding through either the road-related pool or the active transportation pool.
- **Scott Mozier (Subject Expert):** Explained that adding cycle tracks to active transportation could create dual eligibility. If located within the street curb-to-curb (such as Class 4), they would fall under the Existing Neighborhood Roads category, but if adjacent to the road, they would be included under Active Transportation.
- **Nicholas Paladino:** Proposed a **friendly amendment** to change the subcategory “Bike and pedestrian trail maintenance & construction” to “Bikeways, pedestrian facilities, trails, maintenance & construction.” The amendment was seconded by two members but was ultimately **rejected**.
- **Evelyn Morales:** Proposed a friendly amendment to add a subcategory under Existing neighborhood roads “basic street infrastructure”. Clarified that she feels the “Streets near homes, schools, and parks” subcategory is not inclusive of main cities routes and businesses.
- **Paul Herman:** Clarified that arterials and major roads generally cover commercial corridors in Fresno County. Explained that the intent is to maintain local roads in commercial areas, though further details may fall under implementation guidelines. Emphasized that the intent is not to exclude roads with commercial activity, which is why major roads and arterials are included.
- **Evelyn Morales:** Withdrew proposal.
- **Mark Keppler:** Introduced a poll to vote on the categories and subcategories as amended, emphasizing that the purpose was to establish an outline.

- **Nayamin Martinez:** Emphasized that when presenting to the Policy Board, it should be made clear that the document is a working draft.

Poll on Guiding Principles (as amended):

- Average was less than 4, so the vote proceeded.

Vote on Guiding Principles (as amended):

- Unanimous approval.
- Categories and Subcategories were adopted.

Adopted Amendments

Public Transportation

- “Senior/veteran/youth transportation” → “*Senior/veteran/youth/disabled transportation.*” (*Passed unanimously*)
- “Carshare/vanpools” → “*Carshare/vanpools/microtransit.*” (*Passed unanimously*)
- Add subcategories: *Programs & Services; Public Transit Supportive Infrastructure.* (*Passed, Two (2) No votes*)

Administration

- Add subcategories: *Technical Assistance, Community Engagement, Public Database by Category.* (*Passed, Five (5) No votes*)

Existing Neighborhood Roads

- “Alleys, bike lanes, sidewalks (repair & new)” → “*Alleys, bikeways, pedestrian facilities (repair & new).*” (*Passed*)

Rejected Amendments

Active Transportation

- Bike and pedestrian trail maintenance & construction” → “*Bikeways, pedestrian facilities, trails, maintenance & construction.*” (*Rejected*)

Adopted Categories and Subcategories (as amended)

Existing Neighborhood Roads

- *Streets near homes, schools, and parks*
- *Arterials such as Shaw/Jensen Avenues*
- *Major roads such as Whitesbridge/Lassen/Golden State*
- *Alleys, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities (repair & new)*

- *Streetlights, signals, and other safety features*

Public Transportation

- *Transit systems – urban/rural*
- *Senior/veteran/youth/disability transportation*
- *Carshare/Vanpools/Microtransit*
- *Mobility Hubs*
- *Future transportation alternatives*
- *Programs and Services*
- *Public Transit Supportive Infrastructure*

Active Transportation

- *Bike and pedestrian trail maintenance & construction*
- *Accessibility improvements*
- *Safe Routes to Schools*

Regional Connectivity

- *Major road projects for safety improvements and congestion reduction*
- *Airports*
- *Grade separations*

Other

- *Future alternative transportation*
- *Transit Oriented Development*
- *New technologies*

Administration

- *Administration/Planning*
- *Technical Assistance*
- *Community Engagement*
- *Public Database by Category*

Other Items Discussed

- Emergency response inclusion suggested, no motion made.
- Concern over dual eligibility for certain bike facilities (Class 4).
- Proposals to add “basic street infrastructure” withdrawn.
- Motion to expand Active Transportation category failed due to insufficient support.

Final Vote

- *Unanimous approval of the amended General Categories and Subcategories list.*
-

5. Next Steps

Upcoming Meeting Dates

- **August 27, 2025:** The committee will meet from 3:00-7:00 pm with dinner provided. The meeting will focus on allocations (percentages per category, city/county split, and urban/rural breakdown).
- **September 11, 2025:** The committee will finalize implementing guidelines.
- **September 18, 2025:** The committee will review finalized recommendations to be presented to the Policy Board.

FCOG staff will provide background data on city/county/urban/rural splits before the next meeting.

Discussion Points

- **Mark Keppler:** Clarified that the next meeting will focus on allocations, beginning with general categories and then subcategories. Noted that discussion of allocations between cities and counties may occur, but it is a secondary point. Emphasized that completing general allocations is the mandatory objective for the next meeting. Reminded members that the August 27 meeting will begin at 3 p.m.
- Mark gave the committee homework. He directed staff to converse with other members, and research what other counties have done with their self-help measures. Mark took questions from committee members.
- COG staff confirmed the meeting would go until 7 pm or later, with dinner provided.

Summary of Motions & Outcomes

- Appoint Mark Keppler as facilitator – ***Unanimously approved.***
- Adopt consensus-building process – ***Approved (Six (6) abstentions, abstentions treated as non-votes).***
- Guiding Principles amendment (Update language to “invest in building and maintaining bikeways, pedestrian facilities, and public transit options”) – ***Passed (One (1) No vote).***
- Adopt Guiding Principles (as amended) – ***Approved (Three (3) No votes, One (1) abstention).***
- Public Transportation amendment (add “disabled” to subcategory) – ***Unanimously approved.***
- Public Transportation amendment (add “microtransit”) – ***Unanimously approved.***
- Public Transportation amendment (add “Programs & Services” and “Public Transit Supportive Infrastructure”) – ***Passed (Two (2) No votes).***

- Administration amendment (add “Technical Assistance, Community Engagement, Public Database by Category”) – ***Passed (Five (5) No votes).***
- Existing Neighborhood Roads amendment (change wording to bikeways & pedestrian facilities) – ***Approved.***
- Active Transportation Amendment (change wording to “Bikeways, pedestrian facilities, trails maintenance & construction) – ***Failed.***
- Adopt amended General Categories & Subcategories – ***Unanimously approved.***