

# Measure C Steering Committee

September 18, 2025

---

## Item 1: Roll Call

### Roll Call

- Roll call was conducted by staff. Members present included representatives from Fresno County, cities, community-based organizations, and advocacy groups. Both in-person and online participation were noted.

The following steering committee members were present, either in person or online:

Chuck Yeadon  
Wendy Ozburn  
Lino Mendes  
Chuck Riojas  
Karen Musson  
Larry Westerlund  
Jenn Guerra  
Joseph Amador  
Susana Ledezma  
Sara Montemayor

Greg Garcia  
Lee Delap  
Darren Rose  
Mark Scott  
Nicholas Paladino  
Mona Cummings  
Scott Miller  
Gail Miller  
Marianne Kast  
Pastor Simon Biasell

Dr. Amber Crowell  
Dr. Esmerelda Diaz  
Veronica Garibay  
Mandip Johal Gloria  
Hernandez  
Nayamin Martinez  
Evelyn Morales  
Sher Moua  
Travis Alexander  
Espí Sandoval

## Item 2: Meeting Overview

### Mark Keppler

First of all, I just want to very briefly thank everyone, the steering committee, the COG staff, the jurisdictional staff, for asking great questions and then getting great responses from our technical staff, and then COG and I are putting those things out and getting those to you. I know it seemed like a lot of information to absorb, but I'm glad we're able to get it out to you, and believe me, we worked very hard to do that. So, I hope you found it very, very helpful.

You know, one of the things a facilitator or mediator has a role in these processes. I was asking COG and the facilitation team, you know, exactly what my role is, and we talked about that. But one of the things I can tell you is that I think my role is part like being a mediator, and that is an important part of being a mediator, is giving parties a reality check.

I have no, I have no dog in this fight, and so I want to give you two important things to consider as we work through some very, very important issues today. These are for you to consider. Do with it what you will, but I think they're two important reality checks.

Number one, don't forget this is a consensus measure. That means it needs 70% approval all the way through. Okay? And when you're thinking about what you want to do, you need to think about that. What's going to get 70% approval?

Second thing you have got to remember is that this is a recommendation to the COG board, to FCTA, and the county. It's a recommendation. If you want your recommendation to be taken seriously, it has to be grounded in reality. Because, you know, for example, I do mediate a lot of lawsuits, and a plaintiff might come in, "I want a million dollars". Well, if it's not grounded in reality, the other side doesn't take them seriously and just ignores it. So, just think again. You decide what you want to do with what I'm telling you. But I hope you just ground your approach in reality and what is possible, not only to get the 70% of the Steering Committee but also get the approval of the COG board, FCTA, and the County if we want this Measure to get on the ballot.

By the way, I was just wanted to mention a little anecdote today. I stopped at Sam's Deli to pick up some lunch and I was approached by someone and that person walked up to me and said, "you know your committee is going to blow up. Trust me, you're never going to get an agreement." And I said, "With all due respect, you know, you have right to your opinion, but I believe in the process and I believe in this committee, and I think you're wrong." Well, at the end of the day, I guess we're going to find out who is right. But I really do believe in the good faith of the people on this Committee, the effort you're putting in. I believe in the process. I think we can do something really special here that is so absent in politics these days, reaching consensus even though we all know we have very different opinions on this. So, I'm really hopeful, I'm relying on your good faith, and I think it's well placed.

So, with that being said, let's move on. A lot of big things to talk about today. First thing we're going to do is we're going to talk about accountability components. So, you guys did submit some suggestions for the implementation guidelines on how to go about dealing with this. We're also going to talk about General Category allocations and how to go about kind of getting to yes on that particular issue. Hopefully, we can do that today. We're also going to talk about Measure length of 20 versus 30 years, and finally we're going to talk about next steps.

### **Item 3: Measure Comparison of Accountability Components**

**SC took a vote and approve including addressing these accountability components:**

#### **Motion 1: Accountability Components in Implementation Guidelines**

- **Motion:** Should these accountability components be addressed in the implementation guidelines?
- **Made by:** Larry Westerlund
- **Seconded by:** Jenn Guerra, Greg Garcia
- **Vote:** Yes – 23, No – 2
- **Outcome:** Motion passed.

### **Item 4: 5-Minute Break**

#### **Mark Keppler**

All right., we have approval. Yes. Thank you everyone. Yay. We cleared a hurdle. Okay. Well, I guess we can take with that. We're going to celebrate with brownies and cookies for 5 minutes and then I'm going to come back. Okay, let's take a five-minute break.

### **Item 5 & 6: General Category Allocations & Measure Length**

#### **Mark Keppler**

Well, we can begin so we can try to stay on schedule. What we're going to do now is, I guess, is the big enchilada and that's General Category allocations. We're going to begin the conversation with COG staff. They've got some things to present to you.

#### **Paul Herman**

All right. Thank you, Mark. Thank you, Committee members.  
Last week we were supposed to walk through some comparisons to other measures, “comps” that we call them. What other counties are doing, what are the characteristics of those counties that kind of lead to their decision-making process of how they landed on those allocations. In addition, what Fresno has done in the past, kind of the history of allocations in Measure C and what they've funded. To kind of get us thinking about allocations in regards to the future of Measure C, I will walk through some the current measures, the prior (Fresno) Measure C measure in 1986', what was done in 2022 just as an example, a comparison point, and then we'll go and compare to other counties throughout the state. I am using the same counties that were used for the accountability measures. I'll show kind of where they landed on their allocation percentages.

Then we'll open up to discussion and potentially a Mentimeter session to start us off here today.

This is essentially the historical (Fresno) Measure C. Now these percentages aren't exactly as they are aligned in the expenditure plan. We did some consolidation to more align with what this committee has set up for its (proposed) Measure. So, you'll see in the Regional program we've also included the grade separation program. That's actually its own siloed 6% in the current (2006) Measure, but we think it best fits really in the Regional program. This committee has approved the subcategory of grade separation and the Regional Connectivity category.

In the special programs, there is a slight difference. So, the transit component (in the 2006 Measure) is 19.6%. That's actually what the transit agencies get themselves. There is the separate “senior script” program that's in our transit program today in (the 2006) Measure C, but really, I put that in the “special programs,” or what would be the “other” category that the SC

developed. And so, you'll see under special programs for the 2006 Measure, it's at 7.6%. and that really encapsulates all these smaller programs that don't necessarily fit a particular General Category.

So, the 1986 Measure was passed by just over 50% of voters, 57%, in 1986. It went into effect in 1987. In the 80s, the threshold was only 50% plus one. That was changed, I believe, in the year 2000 to needing 2/3 if it's a government-endorsed or sponsored measure. So that's why you'll see in 2022, even though it got a higher percentage, 58%, it did not pass. And so, I just want to clarify that when you see these numbers, these percentages.

In 1986, the Measure was focused on building out the freeway system that you see in Fresno. primarily 41, 168, and 180. The 99 had already been established, and 41 had already been partially established, I believe, up to Bullard Avenue. But when the (1986) Measure came in, it completed 41 through Fresno County to the north and then established 168 and 180 as well.

In 2006, there was kind of a desire to move away from such a large freeway measure. That much funding wasn't really required. The freeway system had mostly been established at that point. So, you saw a much broader kind of allocation between several different modes. Obviously, you can see transit, active transportation, special programs all got an allocation where they previously had not. Then you'll see in the next slide that, in a lot of measures, they have a local streets and roads allocation or they have a local return allocation. There's a few that do both. Our current (2006) Measure is one of those measures that actually has its own dedicated local streets and roads allocation, as well as a local return or flexible funding allocation. The SC did not pass a flexible funding allocation category. While it did get 65% of this committee's support, but did not hit the 70% threshold needed for adoption.

Going back to the 2022 Measure, the maintenance program received vast more support than it had received in the '06 Measure. So, it saw 51.37% and the flexible pot went up to over 17%. The Regional program has reduced in its importance, I'd say, for Fresno County due to the nature of CALTRANS not really being in the mode of freeway expansions. It's really gone into a maintenance program statewide.

There are some areas that are still growing that can support wholesale freeway expansions, but for Fresno, that really hasn't been the case. So, you'll see this decline from the 86' to what was proposed in 22' – a decline in the Regional Category from 75% to 14.6%. The Transit category was reduced from 19.6% to 11.8%. The Active Transportation Category was reduced from 4% to 1% and then the Special Programs Category was reduced from 7% to 2%, and the Administration Category was reduced from 1.8% to 1.2%. I'll now move on to the next slide, which is the comparisons of other counties.

### **Veronica Garibay**

Quick question if you have it accessible. What was the 2002 Measure? What were the categories for in the 02' Measure.

### **Paul Herman**

I don't have it in front of me. I can try to find that actually, but that is an interesting question. So, here we've laid out all of the measures including the three that I just shown you that were either enacted in Fresno or proposed.

Now we're going to look at several different counties starting with San Joaquin County in 2022. I believe the most recently passed of these is Santa Barbara in 2008, Contra Costa in 2004, Sacramento in 2004, Orange in 2006, Tulare 2006, Sonoma and Alameda.

I think there's a couple key things to take from here. As I mentioned earlier, you really have a Local Streets & Roads or sometimes you see a "flexible allocation" Fresno is one example. They did do an allocation for both Alameda County also had an allocation in both the Local Streets & Roads, and a flexible pot. And so, you generally see one or the other, but in a few cases you do see both of those categories funded within a single measure.

You can see in the Regional program, depending on the different counties and what their objectives are, and where they are in their growth pattern. You see a lot of variety in terms of the Regional program from 9% in Alameda County in their latest measure all the way a 54% in Orange County. If you do go through Orange County, you'll notice that their freeways are some of the best maintained freeways in the entire state. And so, they put a heavy emphasis on the Regional program.

Now, about the Transit Category you can see that every single county that has it above 20% is supporting some sort of rail-based transit infrastructure. So, in San Joaquin County, they have the Altamont Corridor Express or the ACE Service from Stockton to San Jose. In Contra costa County, they have BART and EBART. In Sacramento County, they have SACRT, which is their light rail network. Orange County has Metrolink. Alameda, of course, has BART, and Sonoma has the Sonoma Marin Area Rapid Transit or SMART. So really you see that level of investment above 20% in all these rail- based transit-focused counties at different levels of funding.

With Active Transportation you generally see it hovering around 4-5%, some lower, some higher. Sonoma County, known for their extensive trail network, as well as Napa who isn't shown here, but they have a quite extensive and robust funding for Active Transportation, as well as Alameda County has a has a focus on this as well.

The Other Category you can see similar to how Fresno has done it. Usually in the low percentiles if they have one, and admin around 1%.

I think that I'll open it up here for any additional questions...

### **Mark Keppler**

Paul. Can I ask an initial question? When you look at all these, what counties do you think are the most similar demographically or vehicle miles traveled? Which of these seem to be the most comparable to Fresno?

### **Paul Herman**

Obviously, with Fresno County being in the Central Valley, I would look at Tulare County and San Joaquin County. There are definitely similarities there in terms of our demographic makeup, our types of mode share, and the transportation network. Santa Barbara County has, you know, similar in terms of its kind of road miles, like a lot of a large county road network, and not too many other similarities. I think each one of these has an element that can be comparable to Fresno County. Contra Costa has a similar population. Sacramento obviously being also in the Valley, but much larger in its size in terms of population. So, there's not quite a great one-to-one fit, but this kind of gives you a good example of how throughout the state. It all, depends on the types of infrastructure, where their growth patterns are, the types of density or population forecasts that you see, you have kind of a wide swath of different allocations in these general categories.

### **Robert Phipps**

What we're not comparing are those that are completely dissimilar, like LA, San Diego or San Francisco. So, the Bay Area specifically, Alameda County has one of its own, but then you also have the greater regional area that is encompassed by the Metropolitan Planning Transportation

Commission. So, we're not comparing that because it's a much larger area.

**Paul Herman**

That actually brings up a really great point. A lot of the major counties like LA County and San Francisco, have multiple sales tax measures for a particular element. So, LA has two transit-only measures, one of them that's permanent. San Francisco has multiple transit-only measures as well. So what we've been describing to you are really generalized measures that are broad-based and fund the main thrust of transportation in those counties. But when you get to the larger counties, they have just a lot more resources. They tax themselves one to two cents for transportation, where Fresno County has a half-cent sales tax measure for transportation. So, again, that's something to keep in mind here is that we're really trying to compare. I think Sonoma's is a quarter cent, where every other one of these is a half cent. That's really the apples-to-apples comparison.

**Mark Keppler**

So, some of these jurisdictions have other transportation taxes specifically for light rail or whatever.

**Paul Herman**

Yes.

**Mark Keppler**

I want to open up some questions. Anybody have questions on these numbers? Go ahead.

**1:25:45 – Unable to identify committee member**

Thank you. I noticed that the 2006 Measure is on the lower side for public roads and the 22' one that failed increased it considerably. Is local roads going to be a priority for the reup that we're working on right now?

**Paul Herman**

I think that's a great question for this committee. There's been a lot of information shared with that committee.

**Gail Miller**

It's your choice.

**Mark Keppler**

Let's have other people if they have any questions. Let's see if we can get them addressed. Anybody have any other questions?

**[indistinguishable question 1:26:18]**

**Paul Herman**

Madera is kind of much smaller than any one of these counties. Fresno I feel is more comparable to some of these medium-size counties that you see here. Madera's is much smaller than Fresno.

**Mark Keppler**

Does Merced have one in place?

**Paul Herman** Yeah, they do.

**Mark Keppler**

One of the things I think when you're saying in Fresno County, we've got the city of Fresno with half a million people. That doesn't exist in Madera County.

**Paul Herman**

Yeah. There's no major city in Merced or Madera County with a comparable population to Fresno.

**Robert Phipps**

So, by comparison, Madera, countywide, their population is I think just over 100,000 like around 128,000. And so compared to Fresno County, Fresno County tops out at just over a million.

**Mark Keppler**

So, Madera County's population is the size of the City of Clovis.

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

I was looking at the other San Joaquin Valley measures. So, Tulare and San Joaquin, and I'm wondering what is San Joaquin County doing in transit that Tulare is not

**Paul Herman**

San Joaquin does fund a train service that's an inner-city train service that goes from Stockton to San Jose. It's really for tech commuters, that's a major component (Altamont Corridor Express or ACE) and then they have actually a lot of regional bus service to BART in Dublin/Pleasanton. So, San Joaquin does fund transit services beyond essentially their county with the recognition that San Joaquin County has really become kind of a residential community to the Bay Area.

**Larry Westerlund**

So, I know you touched on it just briefly, on the flexible funds category. Could you touch on that again? And it was included in the 17% on the 2022, but not here?

**Paul Herman**

The current 2006 Measure has a flexible fund of 14.8%. In 2022, proposal also had a flexible fund at 17.69%. But what you see in other counties is that it's really either they have a local streets & roads or they have a flexible fund. There's a few like Fresno that currently has both. Before you joined the committee the SC did take a vote on including Flexible Category Allocation. It did not hit the 70% threshold.

**Mark Keppler**

It did get 65%. I think if we had the two people from Fresno not attend and it lost by two votes.

**Larry Westerlund**

But can you explain, what was the flexible fund?

**Paul Herman**

A flexible fund is essentially allows the jurisdictions or the agencies to fund any project. There is no limitations on the types of projects.. So, each jurisdiction could take their flexible fund allocation and fund active transportation projects, road projects, or transit projects. It's essentially a flexible fund for any of the priorities that each of the jurisdictions have.

**Larry Westerlund**

Okay. So, it still has to be a transportation-oriented thing. It's not a Six-Flags...

**Paul Herman**

Yeah. You can't just build a parking lot somewhere. Yeah. The local return or flexible funds category has been spent on road projects for the most part, local street and road projects, because typically roads are the largest asset in any county's transportation network. So, it does take a lot of the resources that a flexible fund would pay for.

**Larry Westerlund** Okay. Thank you.

Yeah. Just kind of thinking over the flexible funds. It got 65%. So, it got pretty close but didn't get all the way. What were the objections related to that?

**Mark Keppler**

I don't, I can't get inside people's heads. So, I'm not going to answer that.

**Gail Miller**

It was my suggestion; I lost by one vote.

**Larry Westerlund**

Oh, okay. All right.

**Mark Keppler**

Just to speculate. I think there might be some distrust that electeds may not do what the SC wants them to do. There's some concern. They want the guardrails a little tighter. Of course, the electeds want flexibility. They want to do as they wish with the numbers. And this group may say, "No, we want a little more restrictions." Both sides will have to give a little bit on this. There needs to be some guardrails, but it can't be so restrictive that they can't do anything.

**Larry Westerlund**

Right. Um, yeah. Well, and if I could just add on to that So, I mean, at least for the eight years that that I was an elected official, the flexible funds were incredibly important to hit choke points where choke points developed in the road system that hadn't happened before. I wish Scott Mozier was here because he would have helped me remember where we did it. But having that flexibility to do things that you know but it was always related to transportation.

**Mark Keppler**

Remember this is a recommendation to COG. It would not surprise me at all when they make their final decision that they address local flexibility. That's very likely. All right. Simon, did you have a question?

**Pastor Simon Biasell**

Would it be easy for staff to get a breakdown of how the flexible funds have been used by each city?

**Paul Herman**

Yeah, we do have audits. We would need to analyze that to get a full picture. But that is something that we can work on and present.

**Pastor Simon Biasell**

By each city and what and how they use the funds. I'd be interested. So, if the local roads allocation is going to jump. assuming exponentially, and if all the funds in the past in the local spending or the flexible spending has gone to roads...

**Mark Keppler**

Not all, but probably the vast majority.

**Pastor Simon Biasell**

Well, that's my question. It'd be good to see.

**Mark Keppler**

I don't know what the breakdown is, but my understanding is the vast majority (of flexible funds) have gone toward roads.

**Robert Phipps**

And when we say to be more specific, a couple of points on this. To be more specific, when we say roads, we might be including improvements like ADA improvements, cutouts, and you know, the sidewalk improvements

**Mark Keppler**

Kind of like a "complete streets" project right?

**Robert Phipps**

Right. Well, elements of complete streets.

We do have Nicole Zieba, who is the city manager of the city of Reedley, and she's happy to offer some testimony if you would like on how some of the smaller jurisdictions tend to use their flexible funding.

We can also get information for you on how much has gone into flexible funding by jurisdiction. I don't know if we have the specifics at our fingertips about how they've spent it. I know we can get that at some point through 2012.

**Mark Keppler**

Nicole, can we draft you to come up and just make a few brief comments about how you've used flexible funding in Reedley?

**Brenda Thomas**

I can say that there were guardrails on flexible funding. There was a list of things you could spend it on. It was like lighting, studies, and we did analyze that and break it down internally. We do have a spreadsheet of how they reported spending their money, but there was a large list. It wasn't just, hey, here's the money, do something with it. They had to report and it had to stay within the designed categories.

**Nicole Zieba**

Thank you, committee members. My name is Nicole Zieba. I'm the city manager for the city of Reedley. I've been the city manager there for 14 years, having come from the city of Fresno. Um, my joke with Reedley is that our entire budget is Fresno's rounding error. And so that's an important joke, though, because the flexible funding has really helped small cities like Reedley, where we don't have pots of money where that we can pull from for other projects.

So, I would give you some examples of our flexible funding. We had an opportunity to do a major street project that ran across a railroad line. San Joaquin Railroad runs through Reedley, and they have multiple crossings. We had an opportunity to work with the railroad basically once. They're very difficult to work with. And so we were working on getting approval to improve the railroad crossing where the street goes across the railroad. We wanted an opportunity to then fix all of the crossings at one time because they are so difficult to work with and because we knew that the

funds or rather that the project cost would go up over time. And so, we used our flexible funding to improve the other railroad crossings that we didn't initially envision we would do. And so that's an example of flexible funding.

We have used it for streets and roads. And I'll give you a current example just right now that's going to our council on Tuesday night. We have a CDBG road project at Rupert and Church that we're doing. That CDBG funding from the federal government does not cover the entirety of the project because costs have risen. So, we're going to be using Measure C flexible funds to fill in that gap. And for a little city like Reedley, that's a lot of money to try to find somewhere. So, that's what we use flexible funds for. It sort of fills in along.

**Mark Keppler**

Can I ask, I think Simon's question. Simon, correct me if I'm wrong. I think Simon's question was what percentage of your flexible funding ends up going toward roads? Is that what your question is basically?

**Pastor Simon Biasell**

Or public transportation or...

**Nicole Zieba**

You know, honestly, I can get that for you, but I don't have it right now.

**Mark Keppler**

Can you give us like a general breakdown

**Nicole Zieba**

I cannot do that right now without completely just giving you off the, you know, they would be wildly inaccurate, I'm sure.

**Mark Keppler**

So, can you say the vast majority goes toward roads? I mean, can you give it...

**Nicole Zieba**

No, I wouldn't say the vast majority goes through roads. We use a lot to connect bike lanes. We use a lot to connect sidewalks if we have development projects that then are going to connect somewhere else. You know, off the top of my head, I would say maybe 60%, but I wouldn't say the vast majority go for local roads.

**Mark Keppler**

By the way, I can't attest railroads are extremely difficult to work with.

**Nicole Zieba**

Yes. So, just to give you some color and flavor of what a small city might use it for. Thank you.

**Mark Keppler**

Thank you. Any other? Yeah. Go ahead, Mona.

**Mona Cummings**

I'd like to ask about the active transportation category. We have 2006 Measure at 4% and we have the 2022 Measure (that failed) at 1.1%. And this includes urban trails, rural trails, and also bike improvement, bike lane improvements, etc. So, it's astonishing to me that it would go down nearly 3%. And I know that trails poll really well.

**Paul Herman**

I wasn't at COG at the time. When I looked at this, I was astonished. I mean we gave more money in our admin budget than we did for the trails. So, if I were here at the time, I probably wouldn't have recommended that. But I actually wholeheartedly agree with you on that.

**Robert Phipps**

I can speak to that a little bit, having worked on the 2022 measure. The logic behind it was that the 2006 measure was a 20-year measure, whereas the 2022 measure was 30 years. And so, in an absolute dollar from an absolute dollar basis, the dollar amount was higher. That was the logic. So, the category was actually receiving more dollars because of the length of the measure, and so the percentage then was slightly lower but the dollars generated over the life of the measure which is what they were looking at was higher.

**Mark Keppler**

While I promised not to weigh in on trails, I wouldn't say slightly when it's three-quarters of a cut. Other than that, no comment. Do we have any other questions?

**Gail Miller**

I just have a comment since I'm on the Citizens Oversight Committee and we review all their projections. So, we get their reports on how they're going to spend their money, and there is the category. We get a sheet on flexible funding. We make sure it fits the categories and it's going where it's supposed to. And then at the end of the year, with the audit, did they spend their money like they said they were going to spend it? And when I came on board, yes, it would just say street maintenance or whatever, slurry seal. But so I go, well, where?

So now they have to, we've made them tell us we are going to do this street from here to here, and exactly detail what they're going to do, because when I worked for Caltrans, we ran into a problem nobody ever went back out to check did it ever get done. I mean nobody checks there was random checks and a little town in Kern County said they were going to do something nobody ever checked. It didn't go to where they said it was going to go. It went totally somewhere else and helped a developer out. And just that one instance has always stuck with me. And I'm going someone needs to verify that. Yeah, they can say on paper they did, but I don't know.

**Mark Keppler**

I think that's a great point for the Implementation Guidelines to make sure we address that issue. With no more questions on general allocations, I'd like to go forward with a suggestion on how to get to yes on General Category allocations. So, here is my suggestion.

What we have first of all, I think we need a maximum range. One category can't get 100% because then that's not really reasonable. So, what is the maximum any category has ever gotten in the history of Measure C? The maximum has been 75% that went to highways in the 1986 Measure. So, what I'm suggesting is when we're going to give you guys an opportunity to do an allocation. The maximum you can give any category is 75%.

The minimum you can give any category is 1%. You have basically you have 100% to play with but we're going to ask you to put 1% in as a placeholder for administration. Everyone has to vote. We really need everyone's vote here. We've had like 26 out of 30 people voting in the past. Everybody needs to vote on this.

So, what we want to do is say okay, we're going to give you 100% to play with. We're taking away 1% basically and saying apply that to "Administration" just so the Mentimeter works. Take the other 99% and allocate it as you will to the other General Categories. No category can get more

than 75% and no category can get less than 1%. Okay?

So, once we do that, we're going to calculate a median, which is the middle number of the group, for each General Category. Then we're going to report that out. It'll be a specific number. You then we'll be given an opportunity if you want, again with a motion two seconds, to take a vote on all these median numbers for the General Categories and submit them to the COG board as your thinking in terms of General Allocations.

Or if it's not successful (i.e., Median package of General Category allocations does not receive 70% approval), we'll take a second step. The second step is we're going to create ranges. If you can't accept the medians as they are, we'll say, okay, let's get a plus or minus 20% from the median. So, let's say uh one category gets 60%. that category that now has a range of 48 to 72.

Okay? And so if we do that, we'll have ranges for each of the General Categories. Then I'll ask you a question: Do you want to submit the ranges of the General Categories to the COG board as your final decision on General Category allocations? Again, it would need a 70% vote to pass. If the median range package of General Category allocations does not pass, next time, we're going to drill down on those ranges and come to a specific number on each of the General Categories based within those ranges. And to be very honest with you, I have an idea how to do that, but I want to think a little bit more about it to make sure it's a fair procedure. So, that's the process that we're going follow.

So, the first thing we're going to do is we're going to give you the opportunity to allocate percentages to all of the General Categories. Please put 1% in for administration, then take 99% and allocate it as you will, but no category gets more than 75%. Your total allocation has to equal 100%. So, if you end up with 99%, someone's going to say, "Excuse me, Mark. You forgot to add some. You have an extra percent to play with." I want this to be secret ballot. We don't want gamesmanship. We want your own personal judgment on this.

How much time do you think you need? 10 minutes, 15 minutes to do that, five minutes? What are your thoughts on that? How much time is appropriate? Let's try 10 minutes

**Larry Westerlund (1:45:15)**

I want to revisit the flexibility category. You know, Mark, I hate to be the cog in the process but what would be the process if I wanted to reconsider the flexibility category?

**Mark Keppler**

Well, unfortunately that ship has sailed. We've already voted on that. While this point it sailed, maybe at some point if there is a strong change of opinion and people want to revisit maybe we revisit that later. Right now I think we have to go forward with what the SC has decided to do. It did not pass, and if we allowed that to come back in then everyone that has a proposal that didn't pass could come back and ask for a remove. So I think we have to go forward. The reality is, like I said, I cannot predict what the COG board or what the County is going to do, but I would assume that they would like some flexibility/ That being said, my suggestion to the COG Board would be to seriously consider the SC's recommendation because you don't ask someone for their suggestion and then ignore it. That's a bad idea. So, that's the guardrails on the elected bodies. But there may be a little bit of tweaking but I don't expect those boards to make wholesale changes. Maybe they will, but chances are they're going to probably tweak this a little bit. Depends how far

they tweak it. If it's too far, some may say wait a second that's not what we want, and that's your decision to then go in a different direction. But right now, for this process what I want to do is keep moving it forward, and give you 10 minutes to vote on your General Category allocations. Please put 1% down for administration and take the other 99% and allocate it to the General Categories. Remember, every category gets at least 1% and the max you can give any category is 75%.

**Question:**

Can we do like point something?

**Mark Keppler**

No, I don't think you can.

**Paul Herman**

So, the way it will work, and I do want to clarify that in the Mentimeter, you're going to see plus 10 or minus 10 in the box that's in between there. You can put in whatever percentage allocation you'd like. I'm not sure if it does a point. So, you'll have to put it a whole single number. With ranges, if that were to be developed, we could talk about half percents in the future. But we like to start with an allocation with the whole percentiles. Let us know if you need any help.

**Mark Keppler**

You have about five minutes. Okay, you got about two minutes.

**Paul Herman**

We're at 25 out of 30. Chuck was having trouble. We need a few more minutes. I'll let you know when it hits 30.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay. There's just one person that hasn't voted. There is one person who has not submitted their vote. We're going to give you 60 seconds and then we're moving forward. So, whoever that is, please submit your vote. The second thing is Paul is going to have to sit down and calculate the numbers. It'll take him a few minutes.

But I want to keep moving here. So, I'll put you on a stopwatch. You have 60 seconds. the last person to vote.

Okay, time is up. The voting is closed and he's now going to calculate. Should take him about five minutes or so. So, grab something to eat, talk amongst yourselves or whatever.

I just want to give you a little update. It's going to take a little while longer because some people apparently voted for more than 100%. So, we have to get that fixed for those people.

I'm going to ask you guys something. What we wanted to do was get these numbers and then calculate the numbers here if it was a 20 or 30-year measure (annually and total). Instead, we could just go ahead – without having that information --and vote on 20 versus 30. How you feel about that? As you remember the last time when we looked at 20 versus 30, there was a significant difference in revenue with 88% more revenue for the 30-year measure total and 26% per year annual more money if it...

**Paul Herman**

Percentages and revenue. Yeah. In your packets, there's...

**Mark Keppler**

So, while they're figuring out the median here of these General Categories, we could take a vote on 20 versus 30 if that's what you want to do.

**Mandip Johal**

I'm a visual person. I think kind of what we are voting for to see that up for me would make more sense at least for myself visually.

**Mark Keppler**

How much... I know we scheduled this for 5:30. This is really, really, really important stuff. I know some people have to leave. Um, but if you can, we'll stay around for a few 15 minutes or whatever to get these things resolved because our next meeting isn't for two weeks.

Okay. If you're on Mentimeter, you could still vote. But then we got to make sure we know who's on Mentimeter. Some folks will be leaving at 5:30 on Zoom. I know that for sure.

Okay. So, let's go back, and we had Mandip said uncomfortable voting on 20/30 without having the numbers. That's the way it was set up this way, because I agree with you. But I'm also looking at the time and how long it's taking for us to get the medians. So what do you, is there anybody else who has any feeling on this? Any thoughts on this? Any ground swell of let's get to 20/30 or stay where we are, and just get this thing done.

**Lee Delap (2:25:38)**

Let's vote. We're going to have to vote anyway.

**Mark Keppler**

Ok that one that says let's vote. Um anybody else wants to get to the 20/30 vote right now? Got to be a motion.

Probably have a second two seconds and then put it up for do we go forward in the 20/30 vote.

**Robert Phipps**

Are there any questions about the handout? Does everybody have the handout that gives you the aggregate? So, this is the aggregated numbers on a percentage basis, starting with you know point or yeah 10% and then all the way from .10 to 100%. on a 20 versus 30. So, this doesn't break it down by category obviously, but it does give you total revenue 20 versus 30 based on the percentages that are listed on the sheet. So, you can kind of you can kind of cobble together in your own head how much revenue you're talking about, and say based on the percentages that you assigned for a category, you can calculate how much money that would be. for example, right? Based on a 20 versus 30 scenario.

**Mark Keppler**

Larry.

**Larry Westerlund**

So, if I understand the handout, what it shows is at full revenue gathered from a 20-year is almost four billion dollars. While a 30-year revenue is 7.3 billion, almost 7.4 for the additional 10 years. That's a really huge number.

**Mark Keppler**

Yes, it is. And staff can speak to that. The numbers really accelerate in those last 10 years. That's why the average the annual average is 26% higher per year under the 30-year measure because of those last 10 years

**Robert Phipps**

And again, this was assuming now, you know, this is a forecast, right? So this is assuming an annual increase of 4%

**Larry Westerlund**

Of the sales tax revenue?

**Robert Phipps**

Right. And a revenue forecast of 4% is conservative relative to the current (2006) Measure's actual numbers. So, the current Measure actuals are running at about 4.26%, 4.3%, something like that. So, some people may say, well, you're still not being conservative enough, but relative to the current (2006) Measure, we're being more conservative than the current Measure.

**Larry Westerlund**

Right. Okay.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay, Gail, go ahead.

**Gail Miler**

I think a really good point between 20 and 30 is the is the issue of bonding. And I know what that's done to other counties, especially Tulare County. The fact that they were able to leverage their money with that bonding. So, it to me that's a really important.

**Mark Keppler**

I want to bring it back though, because we're running out of time, to whether you want to vote now on 20 versus 30. I would need a motion and two seconds, and then we'll take a vote for that for 20 or 30 to pass. It needs to get a 70%. One of those numbers needs to get 70%. It doesn't get 70%, it doesn't pass. So, do you want to take a vote now without getting the median numbers, because I don't know if we have time for that, and I want to get something done here? Someone's going to have to make a motion. There have to be two seconds, and then we'll go forward.

**Lee Delap**

I'll make the motion.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay, Lee makes the motion. Do we have a second?

**Jenn Gurrera**

**I'll second, Jenn. Mark Keppler Uh, Jenn and**

**Nicholous Paladino**

He's made a motion. Motion for what?

**Mark Keppler**

The motion is to have a vote on the 20 versus 30.

**Larry Westerlund**

So, it's a procedural vote to determine whether we're going to vote.

**Mark Keppler**

Yes.

**Larry Westerlund**

Got it. Thanks.

**Unidentified committee member**

Why not just make a motion to say, "I make a motion to vote 20 or I vote 30."

**Mark Keppler**

You want to just move? You could. We could just skip that process. Right, we could skip that process and go right to a vote. We're going to skip if that's all right with you, Lee. We're going to go right to the question, the motion, if this is what you want, Lee, is 20 versus 30 is. Not a poll. I'm asking for a vote. We're going to have a vote on 20 versus 30. Is that okay with you?

**Lee Delap**

[indistinguishable 2:30:11]

**Mark Keppler**

Yes. And do we need do we have a second on that?

**Jenn Gurerra**

I'll second.

**Mark Keppler**

Jenn seconds. Do we have a second? Is that Marianne?

**Marianne Kast**

Second.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay. So, with that, um, can we use, is Mentimeter  
How many people are online currently? Seven. So, Larry, you're eight, and we're going to go around the table to see how many people we have here. Okay, so we have 30 people. The magic number is 21 to pass. So if either 20 or 30 years gets 21 votes, it passes.  
All right. Yes. 20 or 30.

**Nick Paladino**

Hey. Yeah. What's the motion?

**Mark Keppler**

The motion is, do you want this measure to be 20 years or 30 years? One of the, one of those 20 or 30 has to receive 70% to pass. Otherwise, we have not resolved that issue.

**Nick Paladino**

That makes no sense.

**Mark Keppler**

We can discuss if you'd like. There's been a second there. Unfortunately, we're at 5:27. People are going to leave at 5:30. So, I think we should go forward with it.

**Robert Phipps**

And again, the threshold is 21.

**Mark Keppler**

Twenty-one is the threshold, I think, if we still have the nine people online. I'm sorry I can't hear you. The text says we have 21 votes for 30 years. So 30 years is the Measure going forward.

**Motion Summary:**  
**Should this be a 30-year or 20-year Measure? Motion**  
**made by – Lee Delap**  
**Second - Jenn Guerra**  
**Second – Marianne Kast**  
**Final Vote - 30 Years-23 : 20 Years-7**

## **Item 7: Next Steps**

### **Mark Keppler**

Now, the last thing I wanted to do is I wanted to get the median number for the general category allocation. So, they're getting the numbers for us right now. Let me just see if we can get this thing done.

What I wanted, and we may not get to it today, but what I wanted to ask you to do was, do you want to go forward to the COG with just the median package, all the median numbers, and say this is our General Allocation. Now, wait, wait, wait, wait.

If no, then the second thing is, okay, we were going to give a plus or minus 20% on all the median numbers. Then the second question was to be to you was going to be okay do you want to go forward to the COG board with those ranges as your General Category allocations. If the answer is no, then we go back finally and the next meeting we'll deal with the ranges and we'll work to get a specific number within those ranges \. Does that make sense to everyone? I would like to get a vote on do you want to send forward the median number package numbers to the COG Board?

### **Paul Herman**

Sorry guys, just to explain what's happened here. So, when we did the median calculation, it's not zero sum, meaning when you isolate each category, we're taking the median number of each one of those categories. And so, there is a remainder left over. As you can see, it's adding up to 91% when you take the median numbers exclusively. So that's where we're at with the medians as taken by the committee. It's not adding up to 100 because it's the median of each category. It's not the total.

<b>General Category</b>	<b>Percentage (as polled by the committee)</b>
Existing Neighborhood Roads	52 %
Public Transportation	18 %
Regional Connectivity	10 %
Active Transportation	6 %
Other	4 %
Administration	1 %
Total	91 %

**Mark Keppler**

Very good. Maybe we skip the vote on whether we submit the median package to the board, because the 9% -- I'm not sure you want to do that. So maybe what we do is we hold it here and we say okay, these are the numbers, and next time we revisit this. We could either explore the +/- 20% ranges or work with that 9% and put it into one of the other categories.

**Robert Phipps**

Are there any questions about the math before we begin, because we don't want anybody worrying about how we arrived at this? Does this all make sense? Okay. So, I just want to make sure that there are no concerns about the math. Median by category So you have that extra 9% right, that you can then allocate to one of the other categories. So, it kind of forces us then into a range essentially.

**Mark Keppler**

What I would suggest we do is agree to a plus or minus 20% range for each of these numbers. So, for example, neighborhood roads were 52%. So, if you multiply that by 1.2, that's 62.4 on the top end. 41.6% on the bottom. So that's the range that would be You may decide I don't want to send ranges to the COG board. You also have this 9% So potentially if you were like I'm all for roads, you could put 9% onto 62.4% and now roads all of a sudden become 71.4%. If that's the SC's decision. If you develop. Does that make sense?

**Mark Scott**

No.

**Mark Keppler**

Let me try it again. So, there's going to be a range of plus or minus 20 between these median numbers for each of the General Categories, with the exception of the 9% that we're not adding here because it only goes to 91%. So, there's 9% kind of off to the side. All these other categories will have ranges. Maybe what you're going to then decide to do is you know they'll say okay, but between 41.6% and 62.4% where do we land on roads? And then but you also know you've got that 9%. So, you can allocate that 9% either as a second secondary question or part of that calculation, or no. Okay. So how would how would you do it, Scott?

**Scott Miller**

Discussion about the 9% allocation that is off mic.

**Mark Keppler**

I'm just trying to think of how we do that. Can somebody have a suggestion? Go ahead, Amber.

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

Yeah. That surplus 9% is going to shift depending on if people max out on everything or they go to the lower end of that range on everything. And so, then everyone's going to have a different either surplus or deficit to deal with depending on how they work with those other numbers.

**Mark Keppler**

So, what would you suggest we do going forward? You think we just give just leave these numbers as they are and then deal with them in future negotiations?

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

No, I think just broaden you're saying everyone gets that 9% to play with, and in reality, they're all going to have different numbers to work with depending on what they do with the other categories. So, then they decide what to do with that extra if they have extra left.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay. So, what's the next step forward? I thought maybe ranges would be helpful to give people an idea. Maybe we just go forward with these numbers and next time we just negotiate. Okay, here are the numbers that we came up this time. We now need to take that and reconfigure it so it comes up to 100%.

**Veronica Garibay**

Well, not to complicate things, but I, at least for myself, it's it goes beyond just a range or a percentage or a math issue. Like we have all these questions that were answered by the experts that question sort of the needs the different plans call for different on funded needs. So, I would want to have a conversation around that, too. And I don't think it's a 9% this or that, and that's it. I think that there's a whole bunch of more context here.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay. So, the suggestion would be then October 2nd when we meet again we want to get to some numbers. This is just a general idea, and maybe what we can do is table it at this point and say, okay, this is what we're working with. We're going to have to come back next time, and we're going to have to spend the whole 100%. In these categories, right? And then the question becomes either we go with then ranges or we go back to median, and then we try to work it that way. So, let's just say we table it at this point. Does that make sense? We made some progress. So next time we'll deal with these numbers. Not talking about ranges. We're going to deal with these numbers and try to come up with 100% allocation. Does that sound okay?

**Veronica Garibay (2:47:25)**

Will we have access to the spreadsheet so we can think through what the...

**Mark Keppler**

Yes, we'll get that to you. Thank you for your patience. This is, by the way, before you go, a few things. Take a look at the agenda. We have listed the next meetings. Please remember, this is an iterative process. We're kind of building the plane as we're flying it. So, please be patient as we work through some of these things. And thank you very much for your time.

**Robert Phipps**

And note that we have added an October 2nd meeting.

**Mark Keppler**

Yes. Note, October 2nd's next meeting. Thank you. Meeting Adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

**Summary of Meeting & Motions****Meeting Summary**

The Measure C Steering Committee meeting of September 18, 2025, focused on accountability components, general category allocations, and measure length for the upcoming renewal measure.

Key discussion points included:

- **Accountability Measures:** Staff presented compiled suggestions and comparisons to other counties, covering annual reports, public databases, transparency, equity, and public engagement. Members emphasized review periods (commonly every 10 years), oversight structures, and amendment procedures.
- **Oversight Committee:** Challenges with recruitment and outreach were discussed, with suggestions to improve outreach strategies, including targeting rural and non- English

speaking communities.

- **Amendments:** Examples of past amendments were reviewed (e.g., Safe Routes to School program, trails maintenance). Members stressed the importance of public review for future amendments.
- **General Category Allocations:** Staff reviewed historical allocations from the 1986 and 2006 measures, the failed 2022 measure, and comparisons across other counties. Members discussed priorities such as local roads, flexible funding, active transportation, and transit. Input from small cities (e.g., Reedley) highlighted the importance of flexible funding for smaller jurisdictions.

## **Summary of Motions**

### **Motion 1: Accountability Components in Implementation Guidelines**

- **Motion:** Should these accountability components be addressed in the implementation guidelines?
- **Made by:** Larry Westerlund
- **Seconded by:** Jenn Guerra, Greg Garcia
- **Vote:** Yes – 23, No – 2
- **Outcome:** Motion passed.

### **Motion 2: Procedural - Hold a Vote on Measure Length (20 vs. 30 Years)**

- **Motion:** To hold a vote on whether the measure should be 20 years or 30 years in length.
- **Made by:** Lee Delap
- **Seconded by:** Jenn Guerra
- **Discussion:** Members questioned whether a separate procedural vote was necessary. Consensus was reached to skip this step and move directly to a substantive vote.
- **Outcome:** Motion dissolved; no vote taken

### **Motion 3: Measure Length (20 vs. 30 Years)**

- **Motion:** Should this be a 30-year or 20-year Measure?
- **Made by:** Lee Delap
- **Seconded by:** Jenn Guerra, Marianne Kast
- **Vote:** 30 Years – 23, 20 Years – 7
- **Outcome:** Motion passed in favor of a 30-year Measure.