Measure C Steering Committee

October 9, 2025

Minutes were taken from transcripts and edited for clarity as needed.

Summary of Meeting

The October 9, 2025, Measure C Steering Committee meeting focused on informational presentations and discussion regarding general category allocations, including Existing Neighborhood Roads, Public Transportation, and Active Transportation.

Staff provided an overview of how current allocations align with past measures and the Regional Transportation Plan, along with key considerations related to maintenance needs, funding formulas, and long-term planning. Committee members discussed issues of equity, funding distribution, and pavement conditions across jurisdictions.

Representatives from local agencies also shared input on project identification, maintenance practices, and coordination with federal and local funding sources. The meeting concluded with a summary of upcoming steps and future presentations to support continued development of the Measure C renewal framework.

Item 1: Roll Call

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

Chuck Yeadon	Darren Rose	Veronica Garibay
Lino Mendes	Tina Sumner	Mandip Johal
Karen Musson	Mona Cummings	Pastor Joby Jones
Larry Westerlund	Scott Miller	Nayamin Martinez
Jenn Guerra	Gail Miller	Evelyn Morales
Joseph Amador	Karen Bertken	Sher Moua
Susana Ledezma	Sabina Gonzalez Eraña	Espi Sandoval
Sara Montemayor	Dr. Justin Myers	Travis Alexander
Lee Delap	Dr. Esmeralda Diaz	

Item 2: Meeting Overview

Mark Keppler - Well, I guess the good news is there's no vote today, so we don't have to worry about that. This is really more of a day we're going to spend on information. And for those folks that are here or are not here, all this is being recorded, so you can go back and review this, so even if you're not here, you can still get access to this information. I would encourage those folks who aren't here. If you know them, please reach out to them and remind them to take a look at the presentation today so they have that information. I want to, first of all, welcome everyone, and just kind of go over, kind of what we're going to do today. You know, as you know, we've already done some general category allocations, and we've defined subcategories. We've talked about whether this is a 30-year measure or not, and we voted on that, on some accountability components, and on items to be addressed in the implementation guidelines.

We took a preliminary vote on general category allocations. There are going to be additional rounds of discussion and voting on those general category allocations after these informational presentations are made. So, that's kind of what we're doing today. We are going to do presentations on a few of the general categories. We'll spend about 40 minutes talking about existing neighborhood roads. We're talking about two things: maintaining the current transportation system, and maintaining the current system. We're also talking about aspirational things. What can we do to improve the system?
So, we'll start with roads. And then we'll take a little break, and then we'll go on to public transportation. Same thing. What is it going to cost to maintain the current system? What is the current level of service? Then what would it take to improve the level of service, aspirationally, and what are the costs that are involved? We'll take another break, and then we'll do presentations on regional active transportation, other, and administration. Again, same thing. What will it take to maintain the current standard? What would it take to improve, and what the costs might be? And at the end, we'll talk about the tentative schedule going forward. So, with that, if Paul is ready.

Veronica Garibay - Just a quick, clarifying question for the staff, because this came up. I know the staff has determined that the Brown Act does apply to the facilitation team supporting the Measure C renewal. Is Brown Act applying to this committee?

Robert Phipps - We have posted the agenda in accordance with the Brown Act.

Veronica Garibay - So, if members of the public wish to come to the meeting right now and participate, they can come and make public comment? Oh, I wish that would have been provided to the steering committee sooner.

Mark Keppler - Okay, going forward, could we post that on the website, so people would know that? Is that possible? It was posted on the web that people can attend?

Robert Phipps - The agenda was posted 72 hours in advance.

Mark Keppler - I think that's a different question. I think the question they're asking...

Nayamin Martinez - The good news is that it has been posted, but in previous meetings, the people knew that they couldn't make comments. I mean, they knew about the agenda, they joined via Zoom or were here, but they knew that they couldn't make comments. I don't think posting the agenda 72 hours in advance, but not making it clear about that, is now considered under those rules, that they can come and make public comments. That was not a clear understanding. At least that's how I see it.

Mark Keppler - Well, we can clarify that going forward. As you know, this has kind of been a bit of an iterative process. We've been kind of modifying and improving as we go along. If there's a shortcoming there in terms of notification, we'll rectify that and make sure that's available for folks going forward. So with that...

Larry Westerlund - Mr. Keppler, I'm sorry, I… the comment from staff was, and it sounds to me like you said, we've complied with the Brown Act because of the posting, but I don't know that we have a ruling, a legal opinion that says that we are under the Brown Act. So, it's one thing to say we've complied with what would be the requirements if we were considered under the Brown Act versus another, where the actual operation of this committee is under the Brown Act.

Robert Phipps - We are behaving, we're acting in compliance with the Brown Act to address any lingering issues, even though we don't necessarily agree with the complaint that had been filed on it. That's what it boils down to.

Larry Westerlund - Okay, I just want to try to understand.

Mark Keppler - I think the answer is, caution, is the discretion. Taking a cautious approach on this, yeah.

Joseph Amador - Mark, I just want to make sure I got this correct. So the public is allowed to attend?

Robert Phipps- Yes.

Joseph Amador - When did that change?

Robert Phipps - That began with this meeting.

Joseph Amador - Today's meeting?

Robert Phipps - Yes.

Joseph Amador - Okay. Yeah, because, yeah, I was told public could not attend, so I just want to make sure.

Mark Keppler - Well, here's the good news. The good news is there are no votes being taken today, that's number one. Number two is we can rectify the situation going forward, and that, I think, should be posted on the website. We'll have to build in a comment period, I guess, right? It'll we have to figure out how that's going to work in terms of timing for the meetings, because we're trying to get all this done in two and a half hours each meeting, so we'll have to figure that out. How much time... I don't know... I am not an expert in the Brown Act. Is there a specific amount of time you're supposed to give to a comment period, or...

Gail Miller - Are you kidding me? We have this huge group. now the public's gonna come and come up and comment? How long... we're gonna be here till... that's like a city council meeting.

Mark Keppler - Well, the first thing is we're gonna comply with... if we're trying to comply with the Brown Act, we'll do our best to comply with it. If there's a comment period supposed to be allowable, I just don't know if there's a... what's considered acceptable? A 30-minute comment period? I don't know. So... Can you help?

Robert Phipps - Well, normally that would be at the discretion of the chair. So, the issue here is, I mean, functionally, you are serving as the chair. A common approach is 2 to 3 minutes per speaker.

Mark Keppler - But how long is the entire comment period, though? Because there's a lot of work...

Robert Phipps - It's at the discretion of the chair. The chair can limit by, the chair can limit the comment period. To a certain amount, you know, 15 minutes, 30 minutes, whatever.

Mark Keppler - What we can do is... what we'll do is, maybe, if it's alright with everyone, after the meeting, I can talk with some folks, or people can send me an email and give their suggestions on how much time they think we should allocate for our comment period, knowing that these meetings are limited to two and a half hours, so we just have to decide what's a reasonable amount of time for people to make comment.

Robert Phipps - And to provide, further clarity. The Fresno COG was cited in a complaint from the DA's office. This was pretty widely publicized, as not having been in compliance with the Brown Act. This was a complaint that was filed. We issued, a statement through attorneys, that we disagreed with the complaint, but in the interest of, you know kind of trying to mitigate the issue. We have, gone ahead and opened the meetings up, both the facilitation team and the steering committee to Brown Act.

Gail Miller - So, tell me what the point of having all those workshops, doing all those surveys to elicit, you know, solicit comments for the public. Now you're gonna dump this on us. If you said you got an attorney that says, we're okay. End of Story.

Mark Keppler - If I can just step in. I think the point of this is also we're working toward a consensus measure. And sometimes it's not just what the law requires, it's also what people would like to see happen for a fair process. We are limited two and a half hours, we've got a lot of work to do. I expect everyone to be reasonable. If they want to have a comment period, we can fit that in, but we just have to be reasonable, given all the work we have to do. So I think we can work that out. So I don't want to... we're not going to be here for 10 hours. We will make it work. We'll make it work, so everybody calm down, we're gonna make this work. Well, I'll talk to you... just let me know what your thoughts are on this, and then I hopefully make a decision that's fair for everyone, that people can comment if they want to, but some limited time, and we can still get the meeting done. Okay, with that. I want to get moving. So, where's Paul? Did I lose him already? Oh, there he is! He's hiding back there. So, Paul, you're up, and this is a conversation on roads. So, the mic is yours

Item 3: General Category Allocations Follow-up

Paul Herman - So, Mark, you covered through all this here, just wanted to make sure. There was a few other things on the agenda before I got up here.

Mark Keppler - Before I got sidetracked. Yeah. Oh, this is what we're talking about. All right. Okay? That is yours. Oh, now this isn't working again. Oh, can you put the cursor?

Lee Delap - Quick question. Before we start talking, we're all on different pages together. Is this presentation covered by a handout and material that we have, or what was on...

Mark Keppler - I believe it is.

Paul Herman – There's a two-sided handout that will be this presentation.

Lee Delap - Very good.

Mark Keppler - I will say this, just to say it. I've been working with COG staff, and I will tell you, they are putting in some hours. There are lots of Saturday and Sunday calls asking, Did you get this? Did you get that? And so people are really working hard to get the information that you're asking for. A thank you to COG staff for doing all that work, I really appreciate it. That's why you're getting copies, right at the beginning of the meeting, because they're literally working on it to the last minute, so thank you.

Paul Herman - Yeah, I was working on this presentation up until about 30 minutes ago, so I apologize for that. It will be available on the website. It's available to all of you in handout form, and I'm happy to take any of your questions or comments via email. It is going to be a very dense presentation, so if you do have questions after the fact, feel free to email me or give me a call. I'm more than happy to talk this through with you as well.

Item 4: Category Informational Presentations

Paul Herman - So, I will start where we left off, three weeks ago, on the 18th of September. And essentially, I think the point of this meeting is that we wanted to take a step back and analyze. The committee has done an initial allocation, or an idea of an allocation, and what is that going to buy us, right? What do these numbers translate to in terms of projects, the needs that are out there, the maintenance needs, the transit needs, potential aspirational projects for regional or transit, or all the different aspects that this committee needs to consider when advancing a funding program for Measure C moving forward. So, this is where, on the 18th, the committee landed. Obviously, it's not a full allocation because of the process we used, which was medians. Our thought of reducing the gameability of the process in terms of not having extremes, so we felt like using medians was the safest way to come up with a consensus proposal. But again, this is not a finalized process. We're gonna be working on this for the next several weeks. Mark will touch on the next steps in regards to what we're looking at, but the staff is also going to look at putting together a recommendation based on what the committee's already put together. We'll highlight that at a future meeting. Today, I just want to work off what has already been developed and translate that into terms of projects and funding needs. We are primarily going to be using Fresno COG's Regional Transportation Plan. This is our long-range plan that we update every four years. We ask all the cities, all the transit agencies, and the county as well, to submit their projects, what they think they're gonna need over the next 20-25 years. Our current RTP ends on January 1, 2050, and the measure, obviously, you approved a 30-year measure, which would end in 2057, so I just want to put a little bit of a disclaimer out there. I'll touch on it in a slide coming up here; that's what we're looking at. It's not quite apples to apples. There is going to be some kind of translation that needs to occur because we're looking at different time horizons, but I will touch on that.

Okay, so this slide here is really a comparison of previous Measure Cs, so in 1986, and the current measure in 2006, as well as what was proposed in 2022. Just to give a full comparison of where this committee landed relative to previous iterations of Measure C, as well as the last proposed version of Measure C. So, we've done our best here to try to align, what this committee has come up with in terms of categories. You have your local streets and roads, or what we're considering the existing neighborhood roads program. In past versions of Measure C, there has been a local return or flexible fund, but this committee has made it clear that at this point, they're not comfortable with or do not want to advance that program. A regional program that includes airports and grade separations, in the 06' measure. There was a separate grade separation category, but for this steering committee, you've included grade separations in your regional program, and so, we're including that there. Transit, if you look at the 2006 measure, the transit number is actually higher if you just read the Measure C expenditure plan, and that's because it includes several different programs that, for this effort, we're actually including in the "Other" category, or a special programs category. So, what you're looking at there at 19.6 in 2006 was just the allocations to the transit agencies, not the other programs that were included in that category. Active transportation, you can see there, is pretty analogous to the current Measure C, but there will be a discussion about active transportation as well. And then obviously, like I touched on the other programs, we really consolidated all these special programs, the new tech, the carpool vanpool, the TOD, into this other category, in this committee's process, and then administration there. Yes?

Veronica Garibay - Paul, you clarified this, but just to be clear, for the transit in the current measure, it's a total of 24%, except that you've made the decision… in this presentation, you put the carpool, taxi script, vanpool, car share in the other. Why did you break out? Because in our subcategory… the recommended subcategories and subcategories, we have all of that grouped in the…

Paul Herman - I think the one that I saw in there was the carpool vanpool program. There was a mention about senior transportation, and it wasn't clear if that meant subsidies for fare programs for seniors, or if it meant the senior script program itself. So that will be something I think we clarify as we develop the recommendation, as we move forward. That could be something, for the carpool vanpool, that number would go to 20.

Veronica Garibay - 24% total, if you include the car van… from the current measure, it would bring it up to 24%.

Paul Herman - Yeah, so this body, this committee has put TOD and New Tech in the "Other" program. That's actually not in the current public transportation category. That's what I mean. It's not quite apples to apples, but we will, moving forward, when we advance a recommendation and we talk further about the actual finalized recommendation, we will clarify exactly where things are. For this 19.6, that is just to the transit agencies themselves. I want to clarify that to the committee.

Alright, here's my disclaimer page that there are some issues when just looking at the RTP and compare it to the measure. First of all, the time horizon we're talking about here for the RTP goes until 2050, but this committee has approved a 30-year measure, which would go to 2057. In the 7 years after 2050, there will be a substantial amount of revenue. Over $300 million annually will be collected in our forecast for this measure. So that equates to nearly over $3 billion between 2050 and 2057. So that's why when we're talking about the allocation, I go back to this first slide. When you see these totals of 6.7 plus the unallocated $665 million, that is for the entire 30 years, and the RTP is really only going to take us to 2050. So, I will clarify that in later slides, where we're going to be talking, looking at tables with a lot of numbers. I'll hit this point again, but I just want to say it up front that it is a little bit of apples to oranges here, and so a disclaimer needs to be said, especially if someone's just gonna pull this presentation later. I felt like we needed to have it in text here, so that's very clear what we're comparing between the RTP and the measure. And then I just also want to make one statement, and I'll bring this back up also at the end, that in the RTP process, it is much harder to identify the longer-term projects than it is the short- and medium-term projects. So the agencies, the jurisdictions, have done a really good job identifying the next 10 to 15 years. When you get beyond 20 years, it's harder to know all the project needs, and so we do think there is going to be, specifically in the maintenance category, a steep drop-off in the number of maintenance projects after 2040 in the RTP. So we want to account for that and call that out, that we definitely think there's going to be more maintenance projects than what has currently been identified in the RTP. We will try our best moving forward to remind the agencies that they've got to try to do their best in looking at the long-term needs, but it's just very difficult when trying to manage thousands of projects over such a long period of time. So, just want to make that point now. This really is our best approximation, with the information we have available to us today.

Alrighty, into the categories. So the way Measure C has done its allocation for local streets and roads, or the existing neighborhood roads program, as this committee has outlined, has been historically using the gas tax formula, which is a 75% population and a 25% road miles formula in order to distribute the funds to the cities and the county. In the current measure, in the 2006 measure, there was a $100,000 annual floor, so to speak. So, off the top, they would go… $100,000 would go to each agency every year, and then after that distribution is made, the rest of the money goes through a formula that's distributed to the agency. So, what we're actually showing here is that in 2022, the annual floor was raised from $100,000 to $200,000, and so, that calculation is what the table on the right is showing you. We're showing a $200,000 floor, and then the rest of the funds flowing through the formula. That's outlined in the top left of this slide, the 75/25.

Tina Sumner - Just a quick question about the 75/25. Has there been any discussions in changing that? Given that the county has such a huge number of road miles, but a low population, and so with the 75-25, they end up kind of getting a lesser amount than the road miles that they have really needs, and I was wondering, you know, kind of what the discussions have been on that.

Paul Herman - Yeah, I mean, I think if you asked our board that question, they would have a lot of thoughts about how that breakdown would occur. you know, a few years ago, there was a change that was made to the formula that was what some would consider not popular, in changing that formula. For us, we don't want to weigh into it at this moment, trying to change that format, just because it is a part of several different funding streams that flow into the county. So, it would take quite a conversation at a political level to hash out how that would need to change.

Tina Sumner - If it were at a later date, then this would change along with that.

Paul Herman - Sure.

Tina Sumner - So if something happens that this is made, you know, kind of more equitable, then the Measure C would just float right along with that change.

Paul Herman - Yeah, potentially. That would be something at a later date to talk through, I think, and this board can make a recommendation of how they would like to see the formula look. But again, how that finally lands, it's hard for us at this moment, just because the current 75/25 formula has been in place for so long, and touches so many other revenue streams, that it would take a lot of convincing, I think, for a lot of folks to change that. It's kind of been the established formula for so long.

Lee Delap - Yeah, in 2022, the formula was tweaked there at the last meeting before it went to the board. Was that formula, 75/25? Was that what was tweaked?

Paul Herman - It was changed to 78/22, so more towards population and less towards roadmiles.

Nayamin Martinez - That is the change, that was my question. That was a change that was made, so right now it's 78/22?

Paul Herman - That was what was proposed...

Mark Keppler - Hold on, hold on. When you talk, could you please turn on the mic so people can hear you?

Nayamin Martinez - So, it's a follow-up question on that. So, you said there was a change. Can you describe that change, and when it was effective, and if... which is the rate, or what is the formula that is in place right now?

Paul Herman - Yes, so the current formula is 75/25. The 2006 measure is 75/25. In 2022, the last time the measure went through this process, it was changed to 78/22. The 22 measure did not pass.

Nayamin Martinez - I think that's confusing, because we know it didn't pass, so I'm just saying that it means, like, for some, could be like, oh yeah, so that's what is in place right now.

Paul Herman - That is not what's in place right now.

Nayamin Martinez - And that 1.7 million, or... That is at Fresno, so that is Fresno... sorry, Billion. That is Fresno County?

Paul Herman - That is the city of Fresno.

Nayamin Martinez - Oh, yeah, I see. So, the city of Fresno is that one that is getting more.

Lee Delap - So, I think the important thing for you to reinforce is that the 75/25 is long established, and the jurisdictions have historically bought into that, and that's used for many things over history behind us, is that correct?

Paul Herman - Yes, that is correct.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - Sorry, I'm new to the party, so just making sure I understand, these numbers are just running the 75/25 formula on the allocation that this body arrived at not based on, like, staff projections or approved documents, but just, like, on our feelings.

Paul Herman - So it is the forecast, so how we get to this table on the right is, essentially, we developed a forecast for the measure, what we thought the overall measure was going to bring in over 30 years. We then take 52%. That was what the steering committee at the September 18th meeting took. We then take $200,000 off the top for each jurisdiction, then we run the rest of the money through the 75/25 formula.

Kay Bertken - I just wanted to clarify that the 75/25 has been added on top of the $200,000, so that's incorporated in these numbers.

Paul Herman - It is.

Veronica Garibay - Was I next, or somebody else? Okay. Yeah, just one thing, I actually would encourage the steering committee to think about this differently. I don't think we should put ourselves in a box, because it's been like this since 1987, I wasn't even born then, that it's now, like, we have an opportunity. We're... to do things differently. We're choosing to tax ourselves here. There's no law that requires us to tax ourselves. Like, we're choosing to do that, so here's an opportunity to think about things differently for future generations, and it doesn't necessarily mean that it has to be the way... there's no law that requires us to follow this, so just so everyone's clear on that. And then my second question is... Has staff considered... so, one of the guiding principles that this body, the... sort of the first things we recommended on talks about fixing, the worst first, and almost everybody on this committee, at least at that initial meeting, brought up equity and brought up the importance of At least with respect to this category. I know you're going to go to it next, but I don't think we have that slide in our slide deck today that identifies the current PCI by jurisdiction, that your consultant put together, which identifies... It's primarily the cities on the west side that are really, really... the countywide average is already 65. I think Clovis is the highest, current... anyway. that there's no reason why we couldn't say, go beyond $200,000. If we're really saying, fix the worst first, and we care about equity, whether there would be a discussion at the policy board level to talk about why not go higher for the jurisdictions that have really bad roads off the top before going into whatever formula. Anyway, that's just a suggestion to think about.

Paul Herman - Okay, any other questions on this slide? Alright. So this slide has been presented several times, as Veronica mentioned, and I just want to highlight where the committee's allocation lands us in terms of what this analysis shows. I know it's hard to see, I apologize for that, but essentially what's circled there is the 50% allocation, which 52 is our closest point in terms of this graph of showing us where we're landing in terms of PCI over, this analysis goes to 2050. Essentially, at the 52% allocation that we have today, we're looking at essentially treading water in terms of the maintenance of our local streets and road system. And so, that has been brought up, that really, when you get to that 60% or higher allocation of Measure C funds, you start to eat into the deferred maintenance backlog, At 50%, the models that put together this analysis really show that you're essentially treading water in terms of the, what we consider the maintenance backlog buildup over the next 25 or 30 years, so we're just making this point that, that difference between 50% and 60% is the difference between eating into the backlog, or just maintaining kind of a rough backlog over that period of time, and treading water in that mid to low 60s on the PCI.

Mark Keppler – Paul, you're saying that if I'm reading this chart correctly, if you go to 60% for roads, it gets you to 70 PCI, am I reading that right?

Paul Herman - By 2050, yeah.

Mark Keppler - By 2050, okay. But if you go to 70%, it doesn't really increase it very much at all.

Paul Herman - Yeah, essentially, the maintenance backlog, once you get above 60%, you're getting into the maintenance backlog. Now, at 70%, you're getting there faster. I mean, that is one thing. The amount of revenue, just the density of the revenue, is helping you get to 70 PCI about 5 years faster than at 60%, but at a certain point, yeah, it levels off, and has to do with the cost and the amount of road miles we have in Fresno County, so...

Mark Keppler - Okay, so I want to go... Lee at Lee had the hand up first, and then Larry.

Lee Delap - I just... I'm assuming we're starting at 66%.

Paul Herman - Oh, 66 PCI.

Mark Keppler - PCI, 65 PCI.

Lee Delap - And going down to 62%. Well, that's not staying even.

Mark Keppler - No. It is a slight dip, yes.

Lee Delap - That is a dip. And, assuming the value is $6 billion worth of assets, that is spending billions of dollars, and the quality of our roads is going down. I want to make sure everybody understands that. the way this is illustrated.

Paul Herman - Yeah, it is a 4-point drop, I think, in this analysis. It goes from 66 to 62 at 50%.

Mark Keppler - Larry, and then Kay.

Larry Westerlund - Yeah, thank you for the presentation, and thank you for the understanding of... these are the numbers presented at 52%, which was kind of the preliminary vote, last time. And what's become clear as I've had a chance to noodle it a little bit over the... certainly 52% is... we're gonna continue to lose our base roads and maintenance. And I think everybody here has to understand, and I'm sure you do, at the end of the day, this has got to be something that passes the electorate. And so, what has been clear to me as I've talked with people who are voters, you know, just maintaining what we have in our road system is not gonna work. we, you know, in the... when I used to represent District 4, you know, everybody lived in older subdivisions, and those subdivisions hadn't been touched since they were actually laid down in the 50s, in the 40s, after World War II, in terms of resurfacing. And maintaining that. So, you know, 52% has become really clear to me that it's way too low, based on our preliminary, and as you've kind of pointed out, we're not going to be able to even maintain what we currently have based on that. So, as we go forward, I think we need to consider that and think how we can raise that, and we're not talking about building new things, we're about maintaining what we have. So, I certainly will be pushing to raise the 52 going forward, because I don't think that's... 52 is gonna be able to get us past the voters.

Kay Bertken - I know a lot of you were here at the same meeting I was, when there was a very long discussion and argument about the costs... that were used to imagine what paving costs in Fresno County versus the cost estimates that were applied to these. It was a very long discussion, and a lot of people who presumably knew about paving were saying this is crazy, or the estimates are far too high, or the dollar per mile estimates were far too high. Do you have any answers to that at this time?

Paul Herman - Sure, yeah, we've actually gone and asked our consultant, asked others, frankly, their analysis from all the data they collected was accurate. I mean, and I think we've talked to our own jurisdictions here in the county, they all have seen a dramatic increase in the cost to maintain their road system. So, I think the comment that there hadn't been an increase in the last 4 years was not an accurate statement to this committee. There's been significant cost increases in the maintenance program for all jurisdictions.

Sher Moua - Paul, these are all roads, correct?

Paul Herman - Yeah, this is Fresno County, all roads, yep.

Sher Moua - I just wanted to point out, I think in the data gathering process, the community meeting surveys, one of the things that residents pointed to as a priority were roads in front of their houses, right? These are their neighborhood roads. I'm curious if... what it would look like if we were to separate this from neighborhood roads to, like, major arterials? Like, what would that look like?

Paul Herman - Sure, we are at our next month's meeting at our policy board, so in November, the same consultant that put together this graph and is helping us countywide with each jurisdiction is putting together their final report and presentation on that topic, making sure they do a breakdown by community, and actually looking at each different type of road, so the collectors, the arterials, the local roads, they're, they're gonna highlight all of those, different categories of roads in their presentation. So, next month, we can, at our board in a separate process, which is finalizing their pavement management system update, we will have more information on exactly those, those questions.

Lee Delap - I just want to point out that when we had examples over here on the wall. With major arterials identified, this committee didn't want those identified. I also want to point out that the people are voting for this measure Are looking in front of their houses And seeing what it means... the measure means to them. Not necessarily just the major arterials.

Mark Keppler - Just a slight clarification. I think the question was, because we use as examples certain arterials, some people were uncomfortable with using those specific examples, and they felt that those would be targeted first, and so we took the examples off.

Paul Herman - Yeah, we did... yeah, my understanding of the committee did not remove arterials or major collectors from, eligibility in this category. It was just the examples, were confusing and potentially misleading, so that's why they were removed. Any other questions on this slide?

Veronica Garibay - To make sure I got your timeline right, the consultants will present that information at the November...

Paul Herman - At the November board.

Veronica Garibay - Is there any way they could share preliminary data before this body makes a recommendation?

Paul Herman - Yeah, I can talk with them and see if they're able to... they're in the process of working on it right now, so, if they can't put that together in the next couple weeks before, the board, we can set up that, that meeting. Okay, any other questions? If not, I will move on. I'll show a couple of maps here, that highlight... so this map and maps you'll see like this throughout the presentation, are the projects we've received from the jurisdictions on the topic of that category. And my apologies, it's a big map, so it's hard to read every single road on there, but essentially, this is what has been identified by the jurisdictions as the maintenance needs for each of them, including the county. And if you look at the subset there on the bottom right, that is the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area as well. And then this body has actually increased what would be considered, a local maintenance program beyond just paving, including other elements, and so, those include operational elements. And so here is the operational, needs identified in the RTP. And operational elements can include, signal, signal synchronization, and also road, kind of, How do we consider it? Changes in the road patterns, so either road diets or roundabouts, things that can change the operational characteristic of a road is also considered in this category. And so, yeah, that is what you're seeing here on this map, is that both of these, the operations and the maintenance map. are gonna be allowable projects, in the existing neighborhood roads category that this committee has developed.

Veronica Garibay - Sorry, the numbers and the data you're getting, these are from the, Plan Fresno GIS map you have online, right?

Paul Herman - Yeah.

Veronica Garibay - So those lists the projects, like, by individual, some of these... considered capacity-increasing projects, so there's, like, a lot of 2 lanes to four, two to five, across the board. How are those considered maintenance projects?

Paul Herman - Well, we have a separate, capacity

Veronica Garibay - Yeah, I'm not including...

Paul Herman - So you're talking about in the ops?

Veronica Garibay - It's in the... yeah, it's in the maintenance.

Paul Herman - Oh, it's in the maintenance as well? So yeah, we will need to go through and make sure that they're in the right categories. Some of those are, like, reconfigurations, so you may have, like, a 2-in-2 lane that then gets converted into like a median and, one-on-one with bike lanes. Like, there is readjustments to lanes, in the operations program, but I would need to look at the specifics that you're citing just to understand, kind of, how, that changes, because I thought we did go through and make these, got these recategorized. There were some that we caught that were in the wrong category, and we've had to move some projects around. But I believe... I thought we had gone through all of them, so, I'll take a look again, and thanks for catching that.

Sher Moua - I'm looking at a map, PCI map, that was shared with us previously, and I'm trying to superimpose that on top of the streets and roads maintenance map, and one of the things that catches my attention is I noticed that in the key, in the legend in the left-hand corner, in I want to say that's San Joaquin, right? That San Joaquin, the little red dot on the west side, District 1. In this map, there's a lot of orange. There's a lot of orange there, but there doesn't seem to be a lot... if I'm reading this, the red indicates, like, road projects. I'm curious why that is.

Paul Herman - So yeah, these projects are submitted to us by the jurisdictions, so we do not, Fresno Cog does not develop these projects. These are submitted to us by the county and the cities and the transit agencies themselves. So I can't really speak on exactly the decision-making on what the projects or why the projects you see were submitted to us. What I did say in my earlier statement was that we know that the further you get into the RTP, the less, amount of projects we're seeing, and so, that is kind of a point that we feel like the county and the cities haven't gotten us all their projects, especially beyond about 15 years out. And so that is something that we want to raise with them and try to get more projects in there.

Sher Moua - Oh, sorry, can I make one more comment? This was raised as a question in the roads question, and it was responded to that because there's not really someone who keeps track of this, right? And I think that's been some of the... one of the things that's been pointed out in thinking the COG space is about there needs to be, I think, resources, right? Going to this so that these folks, right, these projects can be identified and submitted. So I just want to make that comment. Thank you.

Nayamin Martinez - Yeah, I think that recently, just a few months ago, there was one that I know of, but I'm sure there's going to be many more in the pipeline, a huge project that was approved that covers a little bit of District 4 and District 1 in West Fresno County. It's gonna bring additional 132 diesel trucks into that area, and the roads are already super bad. So, do we know if that's something that the county is going to submit so that they can, you know, fix the roads where they are right now, but also after the 3 years that construction is going to take place?

Paul Herman - Yeah, I mean, I've had conversations with the county that, that is their intent, is to make sure that they do capture that, especially if a project… my understanding is, they do actually collect fees in the development of a project that's supposed to be directed towards those specific roads that are impacted. Whether or not that happens, I think that's a question for the county, but for us, we're really at a high level trying to understand, kind of, all the projects as they're submitted to us, and really get a lay of the land in terms of, okay, this is what's identified. We know after a certain period of time that the amount of projects really does drop off, and so we're recognizing that this isn't capturing the full need, and that is an issue, especially as we're trying to do long-range planning. But, yeah, we will endeavor to go to the jurisdictions and ask them to look beyond just 10 or 15 years out, and look at, really, that 25, 30 years that we need as a body here and as a COG to understand kind of long-range implications of some of this work, so...

Mark Keppler - Not knowing all the specifics, I would just say, if the committee is saying you want to focus on worst first then, certainly, that'd be another reason why that should be addressed.

Paul Herman - And like I said, we have our consultant, our pavement management system update consultant, that helped develop those maps that you have. So, we encourage the jurisdictions to work with us in getting the best information, and trying to figure out, okay, where's the worst first to tackle? And to identify those and target those in their, in their budgets.

Mark Keppler - Larry has a question

Larry Westerlund - Paul, I think you've already... I mean, I think you've touched on this, so this isn't just regional transportation projects, these are actually transportation projects down to the particular community. So, there's no... I mean, at least the best I can tell, there's no tranquility, there's no San Joaquin...

Paul Herman - I believe there is some San Joaquin. If you look at the map, I do think there is projects identified in both Tranquility and San Joaquin. It's not much, I mean, it's light on the map, I know it's hard to see. And you can, as Veronica mentioned, on our website, planfresno.com under the RTP Roundtable page, you can find this map. It's the second link that says map on it and you can drill down into any of these maps, it has the project list, it has the budgets, it has a really dense amount of information if you want to look at the very particulars.

Larry Westerlund - And so that would actually include the local streets, not just the arterials and collectors.

Paul Herman - Yeah, as much as they can be identified by the jurisdiction. Sometimes, you know, the jurisdictions what I've found, actually, sometimes in how the jurisdictions treat, like, the very small streets is that they have teams that go out and look for potholes or alligator cracking, and just do those, and it's not really, like, an identified segment of a project, they just kind of hit those with their teams that they have. So, there's kind of several things going on when we talk about that local road in front of your house. There's several ways that they approach it. Sometimes it's an identified… we're gonna do this street on X date and repave the whole thing. And in other times, it's like, we've gotten a lot of complaints about a certain pothole at a certain street, or a lot of alligator cracking, and we need to go hit those. And so that's a bit of the equation that isn't really identified here at this level, right? Is that there are improvements made to PCI that isn't identified in the RTP process, so...

Larry Westerlund - Well, so if it was a resurfacing that, more likely than not, should be identified.

Paul Herman - It should, yeah. Yeah, a scheduled, like, full street resurfacing should be identified here, yeah.

Larry Westerlund - Okay, thanks.

Mark Keppler - Kay, go ahead.

Kay Bertken - Okay, and I know this may be just my problem given the size of this map, but the concentration of projects and roads that need attention is so obviously, you know, concentrated big time, and there are vast areas of gray that aren't being… Don't seem to have any projects, although you're saying that if we look more carefully, that maybe there are some in there, but is there any sort of reporting bias that you're perceiving with respect to jurisdictions reporting problems in their areas? Are you also involved, or the...

Paul Herman - Yeah, that is a comment that... I mean, I think that's a point well taken, that the resources, you know, the engineering or planning staff, in order to identify, are less in the smaller cities, they just don't have the resources like a city of Fresno or Clovis or the county has, and so that has been an issue raised. And it's hard for us to... because we can't really, ourselves, tell the cities what projects they need to identify at their local level. They really need to provide that to us. And so, yeah, there probably is some of that that occurs, right, where there are just fewer resources for the smaller cities to identify all the projects that they need. So, that is something to consider.

Mark Keppler - One of the things that could be addressed, I think Veronica made a suggestion about having some additional grant funding or money for perhaps smaller communities, and maybe that could help them. Because a lot of these small communities, at least my understanding, is the city manager does everything. They don't have a separate planning staff, etc., so maybe we can get some additional resources so they can drill down on some of the smaller communities with that money.

Sher Moua - From reading the PCI, it's my understanding that it includes paved roads, paved streets, right? Does this analysis take into account unpaved streets, unpaved roads, like dirt roads, gravel roads, or communities that don't have streets, etc?

Paul Herman - Yeah, again, that would be for the jurisdictions. It's within their identified and maintained road network, so if it's identified for them, then they would submit the project to us. If they don't have it identified in their maintained road network, it likely would not show up in this analysis.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - Alright, I'm still... did I hear this right? So, I'm still trying to understand why we would say that we're looking at local streets and roads, and yes, I am being nosy, I'm looking at her screen. Say why, we're talking about local streets and roads, but all of these say Caltrans. All of these are... and I'm trying to figure out, are we... well, some of them. Are we counting? Are we planning to cover Caltrans' turf? Is that... Because I, as a regular person, don't consider that...

Paul Herman - So, for some communities, the Caltrans highway is their main street. Like, the City of Firebaugh and the City of Mendota do have a state highway that is their main street, but to me, when... for the local streets and Roads program, it should be their...

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - But this is Fresno that I'm

Veronica Garibay - Fresno, Selma, a lot Fresno. Coalinga... yeah. It may be an issue that you have not fully filtered, but that's...

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - The only reason I am curious about that, well, because it's goofy, but also the reason why it matters is because I'm thinking about your previous graph, the PCI graph, and then I'm looking ahead to the table that shows me what the need for the RTP for local streets and roads is, and there just seems to be like, one table is telling me I should spend all of the measure on local streets and roads, and then the other thing is telling me the need is actually much smaller, where it's well documented, so I'm like...

Paul Herman - Yeah, that's what I was trying to get at with the RTP point. It's hard just to look at the RTP and make all the decisions regarding Measure C, because the RTP is limited in its time horizon. And as we've seen on this map, and what you've pointed out, it may not convey the full need of all the jurisdictions, so this is an imprecise kind of science here. We're using one process to, as best we can, inform us about the measure, but it can't be the only... in our eyes, it shouldn't be the only source of information. That's why we've brought in the PCI analysis that we've shown you with the graphs. That is using a model that's developed for street maintenance and repaving. And that's using essentially a theoretical model to try to help us determine the pavement need over the horizon of the measure, so where it's hard when you're talking 3 decades to know and have all of the data you need, but this is kind of our best guess with the information we have today. That's how I would put it. You're right that there are incongruencies, there are inconsistencies.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - But some... but some of the... but one analysis is strong... is more concrete than the other, and it seems like, on slide 31, that... that seems much more concrete than the PCI analysis, is that right? Those numbers seem harder.

Paul Herman - Actually, no, I wouldn't say that. I mean, the RTP... that's what I'm getting at when I... these numbers that you're seeing on the estimated cost of projects are from the RTP, which I'm saying that there are issues, right? There's... we know there are projects not identified, we know that there's a bias towards short and medium term. So, that's kind of what I'm getting at. The RTP is... It's our best with the data we have today, but it's not, I think, the barometer or, it's not the full, complete data that we should be looking at.

Mark Keppler - Yeah, I think that when you look at the numbers, it looks like, oh, that's... I don't want to say concrete, but those are, you know, very specific numbers. Actually, it's kind of an ish. This is their best guess based on the information that they have. I think Espi wanted to ask a question?

Espi Sandoval - Yeah, just, real quick on, because I'm looking at the, annual distribution of $200,000, that's what... Now, could that be raised, or...

Paul Herman - Yeah, that could... this steering committee can deliberate that and want to raise that, absolutely. I mean, that's something that this body can consider. It was... $100,000 is the current measure, or, you know, in the 2006 measure, it was $100,000, and in 2022, the last time it was tried to extend the measure. It was raised to $200,000, but there's nothing to say that that couldn't be raised further. Absolutely, that could be considered.

Espi Sandoval - Because this would really help our smaller communities if we were to raise the, the base.

Lee Delap - These maps represent planned projects, correct?

Paul Herman - Yes.

Lee Delap - Do you have a similar map, or just a chart with a breakout as to the Inventory of roads by jurisdiction? That would be one way to kind of mitigate. For example, there's not a lot of red in the county area, which goes from coast range to the coast of Sierra Nevada. Not a lot of red, a lot of roads. So, maybe an inventory of roads?

Paul Herman - Yeah, we do have the road miles. That's used when calculating the PCI, but, yeah, that's...

Mark Keppler - Paul, is this accurate? Because the county has so many road miles, that 25% is weighted heavily. The county really does well at that portion of the calculation, because they have most of the road miles.

Paul Herman - I think that's a subjective opinion. If you're asking the county, they'd love to see that number go up. I mean, that's, you know, to them, the need is, you know, they have such... Fresno County, in terms of a county network, so I'm not talking about like, the city of LA has a massive 22,000-mile road network, but if you just look at the counties all throughout the state of California. I believe Fresno County has the largest county road network in the state, and so that is quite, quite a network to maintain.

Robert Phipps - And also, to point out another issue surrounding using the RTP, which again, for Fresno COG, it's really the only tool we have to capture the projects, but it is incomplete data because the jurisdictions, the RTP, the Regional Transportation Plan Hosts any project that intends to use federal dollars. The vast majority of those projects are also leveraged with Measure C dollars. However, not all projects, and especially when we talk about specifically this, this category, neighborhood streets and roads. So, keep in mind that neighborhood is a key phrase, right? When we're talking about a residential neighborhood. There is no federal interest in a residential neighborhood. So you do not have federal dollars going into a residential neighborhood, which means that those streets and roads are not eligible for... and so they would not be included in the RTP. Okay, so Measure C dollars would be used for arterials, for example, which still fall under this category. But when we're talking about the street in front of your house. That is not an eligible expenditure, so I just want to make sure that there's a clear delineation there, and distinction.

Mark Keppler - That's really helpful. A few things, just a point of order here before we take some more questions. I want to stay on schedule, I guess that's part of my role here, and I want to get to public transit. And I'm wondering, we do have some people in the audience, Public Works folks, like Scott Mozier, and I just wanted to, maybe if it's alright, I think, Veronica, you're gonna have to raise your hand, but I just... would it be okay if anybody has questions specifically for our Public Works folks that they might want to ask, while they're here, we could get... Have them answer your questions. So, is that okay? Does anybody have any questions for our Public Works folks that are in the audience? I know Scott, I don't know the others, if there are other people here. I'm sure I'm missing someone. I should know that, but I don't.

Veronica Garibay - I do, I actually do have a question. Well, one more for the county thought, based on your presentation last time. First of all, thanks, Paul. I know we're peppering you with questions, I really appreciate the conversation.

Mark Keppler - One quick point. Could the Public Works folks go up to the mic so they could answer questions, and it could be recorded? So other folks, when they see this videotape, can get the same information.

Veronica Garibay - Okay. Sorry, Scott, when we last met, you identified a, for the City of Fresno, $1.2 billion need for in deferred maintenance. Do you have a breakdown of how that breaks down by type of road? For the City of Fresno?

Scott Mozier - We do have a breakdown of that. I do not have that right with me. I can try during the steering committee meeting to see if I can get a hold of that, have it available. I did want to comment on those, the RTP versus the PCI, deferred maintenance discussion. So, I wanted to mention a couple of things. Historically, the RTP submission by agencies to the COG has been to ensure that projects are eligible for federal grant funding to be in the RTP. My colleagues at City of Clovis have done better, to put more resources into mapping. You see, Clovis has done a great job within this time period. Every one of these streets is going to need to be repaved, so they're all shown on the map. At the City of Fresno, we had looked more short-term at what kind of projects we'd be pursuing for federal grant funding, and you see them on the map. That does not include all of our road maintenance needs, by far, even for the arterials. It's a little spottier. Looking at the map for the county, same thing. You can see there are more county arterials and main roads in need than on that map, simply because we haven't had the resources as public agencies to submit every single thing we see doing in the next 20 to 30 years in the RTP. Unfortunately, it'd be nice to do that, but we haven't been able to put resources to that level.

Paul Herman - You said Muhammad's on Zoom? Muhammad Alimi from the county is available. So, if you have specific questions...

Veronica Garibay - It was a similar question to the City of Fresno. When the county made the presentation, the county identified a 500, a need of, I think, to get to 70 PCI, identified a range of needing between $500 million to $2.5 billion total for their need. Can they talk about that, why that range is so big, and where those... and what roads are we talking about?

Mohammad Alimi - But also for some capacity-increasing projects. So the capacity-increasing projects are close to maybe a, you know, billion dollars just for that. So, the deferred maintenance...

Mark Keppler - They didn't get the first part of that. Could you start again, please?

Mohammad Alimi - Yes, so the range is wide. I guess the question was why we have such a huge range. That was for all the county needs, for deferred maintenance, also for capacity increasing projects, widening certain roads from two lanes to four lanes. So, depending on what, how much, and what level of funding is available. We can prioritize.

Mark Keppler - Just out of curiosity, can you bifurcate capacity increasing versus maintenance?

Mohammad Alimi - I don't have the details at this point, because all the rules, as for maintenance, I don't have the, thickness of overlay that's needed, and also, when we overlay these roads, we have to go and widen the shoulders or pave the shoulders if there is no paved shoulders available, because some walking air pollution control districts require us to stabilize those shoulders, so that's why the maintenance is not detailed at this point for all the county rules. Does that make sense?

Mark Keppler - So the steering committee got a better understanding. Could you give us any percentage breakdown? How much is capacity? How much is maintenance? Just so they have a general idea of what we're talking about here?

Mohammad Alimi - Yes, the maintenance is somewhere in the neighborhood of $900 million, and the capacity increasing is over a billion dollars, close to maybe $1.5 billion. And when I say capacity increasing, that means widening the shoulders and increasing the existing pavement width.

Mark Keppler - Okay? So that could potentially include bike lanes, for example.

Mohammad Alimi - Yes, yes.

Mark Keppler - Alright, are there any other questions for our technical staff while they're here? I'm sorry, go ahead, Tina.

Tina Sumner - Just a clarification. So, the city, the local jurisdictions put projects into the RTP, so that they can be eligible for federal funding. But the local streets, the potholes in front of my house, are not eligible for federal projects. So, it doesn't matter, then, if those projects are in the RTP. But how then do the local jurisdictions access, like, the Measure C money, for which they can use on those local streets.

Paul Herman - The Measure C funding, being that it's local, it would be up to the jurisdiction of how they utilize those dollars, right? They would, in their budget-making process, have a revenue stream from the measure that flows into the city. They, when they allocate their budgets, would then do what you're talking about, the neighborhood...

Tina Sumner - So they could choose to use it as a match for one of the projects that's on the RTP? Or they could choose to use it for the local streets.

Paul Herman - Yes.

Tina Sumner - And so, it doesn't matter if those projects are on this map.

Paul Herman - No, it doesn't.

Tina Sumner - Because they can, at any point in the 30 years, they can choose to focus the money on that.

Paul Herman - Yeah. And that was the point I tried to raise at the beginning, that the disclaimer of just looking at the RTP is not accurate. There's a ton of projects we know exist. That just would not be in the RTP, because they're not federally, you know, federally eligible projects, and so... but this is, for COG, you know, we do this process every four years to get kind of the big picture, and so that's why we're presenting this information to you today.

Tina Sumner - I think that makes a big difference in how much time and energy we spend on this. Because this map, then, it's important for the projects where Major C is going to be a match for that. But a lot of what we're talking about is the streets, you know, in front of people's houses, and that's... it's not on this map, and it doesn't have to be on this map.

Paul Herman - Yeah, that's why this PCI graph, which more incorporates the neighborhood roads, is really critical for us to present, because that is capturing both what you're seeing on this map from the RTP, but also down to the granular level of the neighborhood road. That's why we present both information.

Mark Keppler - Yeah, and just to follow up, this is the best available information. It's not the best information; it's the best available information.

Nayamin Martinez - So... We were told just a few minutes ago that it depends on the, in this case, the county, to submit projects to fix roads in, you know, county roads. what is the criteria that you have been using so far to say, okay, I'm gonna fix a road between Manning, you know, Manning Avenue, or whatever other road, versus, you know, how do you select it? The county has so many miles or roads, that how do you go about it, and how do we make that change of what we were talking, that it's about equity, so that we, moving forward, go to those roads that have not been fixed, you know, for decades.

Mohammad Alimi - Sure, so until I have the specific road you're mentioning, I really cannot answer accurately, but the way we submit our, applications for different types of grants that are available, whether it's STBG or ATP. You know, we like our projects to be competitive, so they can be selected for those grants. So for STBG, you know, some small local rules may not be very competitive, because it doesn't have the cost-benefit that the scoring committee would like to look at, you know.

Mark Keppler - Can I ask you a question? I'm wondering, is this a staff recommendation on roads, or frankly, is this coming from supervisors saying, there are roads in my district that need to be corrected? How do you decide what roads get repaired?

Mohammad Alimi - We go to our board, when we apply for these grants, we get their authorization, for submission for those grants.

Erin Haagenson - Muhammad, can I just jump in? Erin Haagenson, with Fresno County. So we have our pavement management system that ranks the roads in order of, whatever the road quality is, and then that's how they get prioritized for whatever treatment, but obviously, if the Measure C committee feels like we or any other agency isn't prioritizing roads in certain areas, you could add some sort of criteria that other factor that we consider, when we consider pavement condition, but if there's some other factor, then you guys could propose that, and if that's what you're...

Mark Keppler - Potentially, that could be something that's addressed in the implementation guidelines. Okay, Larry has a question, and then Espi?

Larry Westerlund - Yeah, so, Paul, and I don't know if this is you or Scott Mojer, I know I've talked, chatted with him about it. So, I know there was a question about there's Caltrans and what Caltrans' responsibility is, versus us, and Measure C, and it's my understanding that, you know, generally, you know. Fresno doesn't have any more state routes that aren't already highways in Fresno, so that's not an issue anymore. But, like, in Kerman, 145 is Madera Avenue that runs right through there. Is Measure C dollars used for that, or is that the responsibility of the state...

Paul Herman - So it is the responsibility of the state. The local jurisdiction can supplement that, right? It really is at their discretion to say, hey, we're gonna make this a priority, we want to... and sometimes with Caltrans, to match a grant, it helps things move along, so the jurisdiction will take some Measure C dollars and match a Caltrans grant. or, you know, match the shop program. So, yeah, but typically, these are Caltrans' responsibility, and it really is on them to maintain those roads. But the local jurisdictions can, if they choose, help supplement that.

Mark Keppler - There's... just out of curiosity, if the local jurisdiction provides money, like, as a match, is it more likely that product's gonna get done more quickly?

Paul Herman - Yes. I mean, when you have a matching fund, it just raises the likelihood that it'll get funded.

Espi Sandoval - I had a question. Last time, I stayed late asking questions to Muhammad. And one of the issues that came up is that roads are also fixed based on complaints. People complain, and they complain to their supervisor, and I guess their supervisor says, go fix that road. Am I right? I mean, that's the point that I...

Paul Herman - We'll let Mohammed address that, I don't want to touch that.

Mohammad Alimi - Well, I mean, we do get complaints from the public, and sometimes it is brought up to the supervisor's attention. So what we do is we go out, you know, I mean, our PMS database is updated regularly, but if something is... needs immediate attention, you know, we do go out and look at that, and our road maintenance crew, sometimes they do projects with their day labor workers, so if it can be done with our own forces, we can go take care of it, you know? So I'm not saying that every time somebody complains, we can go immediately do the work, because there is so much needs that, we have throughout the whole county, and we are not really biased, you know, we try to do as much work as possible with our budget and with our forces that is possible, but everybody has to understand that there are needs everywhere, you know?

Erin Haagenson - One thing is, for the SB1, the new gas tax, we take a list of projects every year that we're going to do for maintenance. And so, perhaps, for Measure C, you'd like us to do something similar. I mean, that's... It's that we're, so usually we're reporting after the fact what we do with our money, instead of before. So if that could be a possible, again, implementation guideline, that mirrors... every jurisdiction has to take a list of projects every year, and then report on it. So, if you... what would be easier for local jurisdictions? If you want to mirror something in, like, the state process. It doesn't necessarily add to the burden, because we're already doing it. That would be, instead of having a whole different process. Think about what's...

Mark Keppler - Yeah, it's proactive versus reactive. I do want to get to... I was going to give you guys a 10-minute break, but I'm not going to give it to you anymore. If you want to get something to eat, go up and get something to eat, because we need to push through, because one of the things, if we're done talking about roads, I want to push on to, public transit, I don't want to give that short shrift. So do we have any last questions before we move on?

Joseph Amador - Fresno County, it just... I can't understand. How much technology are we using to... for maintenance, or the paving of the roads, and so forth? You know, I talked to you... because earlier I mentioned to you about are we using law enforcement, information, first responders, fire departments, you know, the PCI studies that we've done? Mendota, I believe, is... isn't it the worst, or San Joaquin? Aren't we the worst? And I mentioned this when we first started these meetings. I was born in Mendota. Before I die, I hope it improves, the PCI out in Mendota, and San Joaquin, and Tranquility, and here on Parlier, and Parlier's doing a very good job. I've seen the roads, I was there recently, but... wow, what are we doing in Fresno County as far as technology? Let's get these drones out there, let's do something, let's use the university for these students. Come on!

Mark Keppler - Yeah, I think that's a great suggestion, and maybe there's funding at some point in Measure C for that, but I think that's more of an editorial comment than a question. But I'd like to move on, if it's okay with everyone, because we have a lot to cover, getting into public transit. So, again, if you want to grab something, lots of good food, and then, we can go on to public transit, if that's okay with you guys. So, Paul, you can take a breath and then move on to public transit. All right.

Paul Herman - We are running out of time, so I'll get started. So yeah, for the public transportation, We touched on this at the start, about the 19.6%, and so there will need to be further refinement, but just if we took the 18% that the steering committee, allocated in their last meeting, this here is how the distribution would work, and typically, historically, again, similar to the road, kind of formulas that are used, there is an established formula for our three transit agencies here in Fresno County. These are based off STA, the state's Transit Assistance Program, as well as the federal TDA, or the Transportation Development

Act program. And that's a 70% to FAX, 20% to FCRTA, or the Rural Transit System and 10% the Clovis Transit. And this is roughly based off of the area, or the population that's served, and Fresno's is a little larger than their population, because there is county islands, and there is, kind of areas surrounding Fresno on the perimeter, that FAX serves. And so, this is kind of the established, formula, 70-20-10, and then when you run through, the allocation of 18%, or $1.33 billion. This is where the three agencies land in terms of their allocation.

Mark Keppler - Can I just make a reminder to folks to remember that when we did the medians, there was still 9% that was not allocated, so... There's still unallocated amounts.

Paul Herman - Just want to touch on, real quick, that the airport is in the regional program, not in the public transportation program. So, what you see here is slightly less than the current allocation. The three transit agencies right now get 19.6%. I think our hope would be to see that at least be met in the current... in the extension of the measure. When we develop a recommendation for this body, I would expect that to go up, to at least match that. But yeah, so this is where the steering committee landed, and these are your three agencies' allocations when looking at that, general allocation to public transit, from the steering committee. I have other slides that touch on kind of what we're seeing from the RTP side, and I will say for public transit, that because there's fewer projects, but they are very expensive, that the public transit agencies have done a better job in terms of identifying the longer-range needs. Then maybe the maintenance programs, just given the amount of projects that are considered on the maintenance side and the ops side of roads compared to public transit. Essentially, 150 projects, or just over 150 projects, are equating to about $3 billion. That gives you a sense of the need on the capital and operations sides to run the public transit system. And some of what's in here is aspirational on the RTP, and so not every single one of these would probably get funded, solely through measures funding. But we want the jurisdictions to give us projects that are aspirational in the long term, so that we can look at different scenarios. Part of how the RTP works is that we identify several different scenarios, and we run them through our model, and that helps us figure out what is going to be the emissions from the transportation system, and that really determines our eligibility in the state SB1 programs and other funding sources. We need to have a real variety of projects that we can then run through our models, through the different scenarios, to get an understanding of the potential benefits, the pros and cons of all of these projects, the thousands of projects that are submitted to Fresno COG over the long-range plan. As you can see here, we've identified a sampling, kind of a high-level sampling to show the service expansions that are planned, the frequency increases that are planned, the zero-emission bus fleet conversion. That's probably one of the highest, priority elements of the transit agencies, is being able to convert to zero emission. I believe they're under state statute, to convert their entire fleet. Is it by 2040, Greg? Yeah, so by 2040, they have to have entirely zero-emission fleets, and so there is a pending deadline to get as much of their fleet conversion done over the next 15 years or so as possible, so that's what's identified here. Obviously, we have some other priorities as well, mobility hubs, increasing, FAX's service in the peak period. Extending night and weekend service throughout the system. Mobility hubs is a new topic. It's been established in the Bay Area and LA, and it's starting to make its way into the Valley, and so we've identified some need to build some mobility hubs in the county as well. But again, over 150 public transportation projects have been submitted, totaling over $3 billion.

Mark Keppler - Paul, I just want to make sure I heard you correctly. I think you said that public transportation, in terms of the RTP, is more detailed than the roads that the transit agencies have.

Paul Herman - Yeah, they've identified projects beyond 10 or 15 years better. It's just because there's less projects, but they're expensive projects. It's a little easier for them to identify the needs further out than on the maintenance side. Last one's just the map here. Sorry, it's hard to see on the orange. I tried to get this contrast a little better. But, like I mentioned, in the Plan Fresno website you can drill down and look at this. If you look at the city, it's really identifying back to this bulleted list of the expansions, planned for FAX in terms of Bullard Avenue, Peach Avenue, getting service into Roading Park, or expanded service into Roading Park. The west area and southwest Fresno have been identified as growing and needing additional bus services with the new educational facilities and the new residential developments occurring on the west side of the city. So, there's been quite a lot of projects identified. I just wanted to touch on, from the RTP's perspective, that we think they've done a pretty good job in terms of identifying the future needs for their systems. That's really what I have. I'm willing to take any questions on public transportation.

Nayamin Martinez - It's more than a question, a comment. You know, I think if you... I felt that you were very anxious about, oh my god, we don't have... we need all this money for roads, but I am now just now seeing this. $3.1 billion, and we are... if we go with what we recommended a few meetings ago. At $1.3 billion. So the difference is huge. And unfortunately, I didn't bring my notebook when I took copious notes of the presentation that Moses and, you know, Scott did about it's not even enough, the money that we... they have right now, to maintain it. And according to also something else that we find out is that, and correct me if I'm wrong, that FAX will be at a $17 million deficit by 2029, and $30 million by 2030. And that's just considering, you know, not even accounted here. So, my point is. I don't under... I understand this slide, but then on the slide 16, that I bet I... you're getting there. You have a column that says, remaining funding gap and $1.7 billion for public transportation. I don't know how you came up with that number, it's very different to this 3.1, but at any rate, it's under that $1.3 billion that we have already supposedly recommended. So, I just... I highlighted before, oh, we need a lot of money for roads. We need a lot of money for public transportation, and just to also remind ourselves public transportation was the second priority in the data that the COG collected, and the data that we collected also in moving forward together, so...

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - Yeah, so, I mean, similar. And... and continuing on that same thought, I'm wondering if... so if we know that just, like, to stay in the 21st century, we'd need $3.1 billion. And we're proposing less than half of that, or half of that. Is this, do you think... like, in keeping with the trend of other cities our size, because I feel like it's not, but...

Paul Herman - Yeah, I think what you see in other parts of California when it comes to transit is that there are counties that take a look and do a broad-based approach, and then some counties actually specifically target transport or transit improvements through exclusive sales tax measures, so... It's a question of the city of Fresno potentially could have an enormous transit project that would cost, you know, nearly a billion dollars, right? Let's say that were to occur. It may be difficult to fund that project as well as all the road maintenance needs on a half-cent, you know, county sales tax measure. I think that's a challenge, potentially, right, is to try to fund every single need through a broad, county-wide, half-cent sales tax measures. When you see other communities, other cities actually target their transit improvements through a sales tax measure that's exclusively funding transit and not, also, the road maintenance needs, and... their airports and other needs of the county. So, it's a philosophical challenge of how do you address the needs of a county? But I look at other parts of the state and the country, and there are quite a few targeted transit-exclusive sales tax measures that build those very expensive transit projects.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - Even though we don't have that, right? We don't have that. We're not talking about that. And so, just generally speaking, it doesn't seem like we're trending in the right direction.

Paul Herman - Well, that could be pursued, though, right? I mean, that... we're talking about the future. That could be pursued by a city. That could absolutely be something that a city pursues.

Mark Keppler - I think also, you weren't here for that meeting, there was a discussion about, in San Joaquin Valley counties, that put more money to transit. They have some kind of light rail, or some kind of rail connection

Paul Herman - Yeah, when we did the analysis statewide of some of the sales tax measures. There had been established rail programs, and so they, you know, allocated more funding towards their transit programs. And then there's several counties that, like I said, have 2, 3, even 4 sales tax measures that fund some of these very expensive, transit programs, so... It's kind of a question of, do we think a single half-cent countywide sales tax measure would be able to fund a very, you know, expensive transit program, and also all the maintenance needs in the county from a road perspective. Again, that's like a philosophical question. I just identify it because the fact is, there are counties that have multiple measures. And, you know, you see that all over the state. It's not something that we couldn't... that the Fresno County couldn't pursue in the future. I mean, I think it's expected, honestly, if we're talking about doing a major, you know, say, a billion-dollar light rail project, It would probably need an exclusive local revenue source, to get there, just speaking frankly, I mean, that is a very tall task to ask of all the road maintenance needs that are out there, and also building a very capital-dense project like light rail in Fresno.

Larry Westerlund - Well, maybe more of a comment than a question. So, again, I go back to this idea that we have to, look at all of these categories based on what we think the voters will support. And while there might be $3 billion of identified projects, certainly the thing that I still get people asking me most about is, how come the Fresno FAX Bus only has one rider on it? I get that over and over again, and it drives me nuts, and I say, well, you gotta watch it at 7 in the morning. And at 7 in the morning, there's not one rider on there, there's many riders on it. And Greg could go into all of that in the details, but what voters see is when they're driving to work at 8 o'clock. One or two or three people on a 40- or 60-person bus. So, I think we need to balance, and ultimately, what we do have is we have low densities in terms of how we have built, and the mistakes that we've built out over the years, in sprawl, so that we don't have the densities because I looked at very... for a long time, on the bus rapid transit, and where bus rapid transit would work, and where there were densities that would make that even slightly possible. Right, which was Kings Canyon Avenue at the time. Well, now it's Martin Luther King... no, Cesar Chavez, sorry Cesar Chavez and Blackstone Avenue. So, again... What are voters going to support?

Nayamin Martinez - It was a second priority by the voters.

Mark Keppler - Hold on. Hold on, hold on. Let Larry finish his comment, and then I did want to get to Pastor Jones.

Larry Westerlund - Right, yeah, so, you know... Anyway, I don't think... I mean, I guess we'll see what we've got, but over time, we've seen that voters, the people who pull the levers, have concerns about that, because they don't use it. And they don't have a need for it.

Mark Keppler - I was going to mention this a little later on, but I'll bring it up now because it's apropos. There is a poll that is out in the field right now of likely voters, and that information is going to be coming in toward the end of the month. That should give us some additional information. There were some things done by Transportation for All at their meetings, there were things done by COG at their presentation, asking people. That wasn't specifically targeted to likely voters, it was people that attended those meetings. This is going to be a poll of likely voters, so that should give you some additional information. Pastor Jones?

Pastor Joby Jones - Yeah, our voters do ride the bus, so, so, and my issue is the percentage. A lower percentage, how would that impact FAX? If you're not getting what you're getting this year, I think ours was 24% or something like that, this one is saying 18.

Paul Herman - Like I said, what the agencies get today is 19.6%. Our hope is, and our... I think in a recommendation, you'll see that number at least match what they currently get today. We do not want to see that number go down. For me, 19.6%, right, what the current agencies have, they've been able to grow their systems. I mean, it doesn't... if keeping them where they're at in terms of their allocation for Measure C does not mean they're going to reduce service or anything like that. They've continually, incrementally grown the amount of bus routes available, the frequencies, they built the BRT line, right? So, there's been incremental progress at the funding level that they've gotten from Measure C, and we want to continue that moving forward. We do not want to see them go backwards, and so, that is really our hope, is that we continue to invest in our transit system and that they can continue to expand frequencies, expand routes, replace their bus fleets, do the things that maintain a strong and healthy bus system that they currently have.

Mark Keppler - Just one quick follow-up. Since they built some BRT with the current measure. Now that's... if it's the same allocation, they can build additional BRT in the future. So, just to think about it that way, because that BRT's already been built. Go ahead, Greg.

Gregory Barfield – FAX - Gregory Barfield, Director of Transportation for the City of Fresno. Let me just be clear about BRT. BRT was a $43 million investment by the federal government, matched by other funds, including Measure C and the state. Not the majority of BRT was built with Measure C. That's the first thing. Second, I know COG staff has said this several times, so I probably need to clear this up so I can go back to City Hall tomorrow. We are not seeking another sales tax measure. We will do on the critical large investments, if we went into light rail, that would be a federal investment. A very big federal investment, similar to BRT. So, we're not going to be doing another sales tax on transit, right? Or specifically for that. We've got Measure P and other things in our... Our community is just trying to extend this one. So I think it's clear that we're not gonna add more to a person's pocketbook, right? So, I just want to be clear about that. Finally, on the investment, yes, I think you're all right, we would love to be. and I've said it before, don't take away. We can make it work, you just can't take away. So... and takeaway is really... I'm more worried about the measure itself, and getting it renewed. Not the percentage, if it was 18 and a half, I'd live with that. Right? If it was 52, I'd live with it. Whatever it is, we're gonna live with it. Because that's what the voters want.

Mark Keppler - Can I say one... first of all, two things. I think you'll be able to go back to City Hall tomorrow. Number two, remember, this is a 30-year measure, which is going to generate more revenue.

Gregory Barfield – FAX - Yeah, but you have 10 years of more operating service that you'll have to...

Mark Keppler - How does that work out? Do you get ahead? Do you just break even? How does that work?

Gregory Barfield – FAX - So, right now, we only use Measure C for match. Right? There is some operating dollars in there that we're using for, like, night service and extra service on the weekends, but most of the Measure C is used for match. So remember, when the Feds gave us that $43 million. That was... we needed to match that with 20% local. It could be Measure C, it could be the state. So the whole project is more like $60 million. Right? And so, you continue to need that investment from both the federal government and the locals to make the match work.

Mark Keppler - Can you help me, just because I'm just trying to understand the numbers. When we did the 30-year, it said that it would increase annual revenue by 26%. If it increases revenue by 26%, doesn't that help you?

Paul Herman - So, let me help you, Mark. Yeah, so... It doesn't change the revenue in that year that it's collected, right? Extending it from 20 to 30 years doesn't mean the revenue collected in year 10 is going to go up, right? It's just averaging out 30 years of the total, that's the number you're citing as 26, but it's not going to change the annual revenue. I just want to also touch on Greg's point. I am not here to suggest that the City of Fresno or anyone else is going to implement or pursue another sales tax measure but similar to

Measure P, which was a citizen's initiative, that could be pursued by citizens. I'm not suggesting that anybody would actually do that at a governmental or political level, right? I'm just suggesting citizens' initiatives are on the table for citizens to pursue.

Dr. Esmeralda Diaz - Yes, thank you. I'm going back to Larry, your commentary. I do represent Southeast of Fresno, District 5 is in that area, and we have registered 30,000 voters, and they do ride the buses. And one of the things that they sent me in here, in this committee. is to represent them, and that if we are asking them to vote for a measure that, they're gonna auto-self-tax they need to be included. The services that they do need, and they do use. They use it to go to, doctor's appointment, they use it to go to, Fresno State, to the high schools, elementary schools, and I can name every single of them in there, so I want to be sure and be in the record that we do have 30,000 in just in District 30 in Southeast Fresno.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - There's a question for Greg. Hi, Greg. Information was really helpful, actually, but in the... somewhere in my frantic prep for today's meeting, I read in the previous Q&A that even maintaining even, like, trading water for facts, still over 30 years would be, like, a... equal, like, a cut. It would be the equivalent of cutting, I think, by 3% or something like that, if I recall correctly. Is that... Is that accurate? Because then it's like, I don't... maintaining can mean different things to different people, and it seems like maintaining would be actually cutting in this case.

Gregory Barfield – FAX - Well, I look at maintaining something versus nothing right now. So that's where I am with that, right?

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - You're killing me, Greg.

Gregory Barfield – FAX - I know, I'm sorry! But I also don't want to fight... I also don't want to fight with my brother Scott, right? Because I'm riding on his roads, so I gotta make sure they're in good repair, too. But I do believe, yes, it would, over time, if you shorten it in the 20-year window, yes, it would be a small decrease at this point.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - OK, thank you.

Espi Sandoval - I had a question just on, I'm from, Western Fresno County and our buses are empty. You know, I see the buses. I don't know... How can we... Yeah, I'm trying to see how do we convince the voters when they see an empty bus, I mean, and a lot of them are just parked. And that's what we're seeing on the west side, so I'm trying to... And a lot of the people are basically... because I've been trying to promote Measure C, and that's what's coming up, you know, well It's only one person on the bus, or somebody's paying 50 cents to get on the bus, so... How do we convince voters... That this is important for them to have these buses, you know, going back and forth, you know.

Moses Stites - Sure, Moses Stites, Fresno County Rural Transit Agency. That's a very good question, and part of that is perception, and we always hear that all the time, as somebody says, like Larry indicated, seeing one person on a bus. But specifically for Fresno County Rural Transit Agency, we have approximately 30 routes. Of those 30 routes, seven of them are inner-city routes. And if you look at that map, right over here to the left of the flag. There are 13 incorporated cities in Fresno County, Mendota being one of them, and 39 unincorporated communities. We have inner-city routes that go from Firebaugh through Mendota, Kerman, and into Fresno. Twice a day. And that route, accommodates individuals coming into school, doctor's appointments, social services, and other types of needs. The unfortunate thing is, based on limited funding, those routes are limited and only operate from 7 a.m. to 5 pm. So, it is very important to understand that the majority of the ridership is during those hours that are most frequented by the passengers. There is a need for evening service, and there is a need for weekend service. We can't afford to provide service on those fixed routes, inner-city routes on Saturday and Sundays. And we do have one bus in the city of Mendota. And that one bus in the city, that's our intra-city transportation, does at times only have one passenger or no passengers. And oftentimes, it's dictated by... Is there a health clinic there? Is there a bank there? Which there's not. They have to go to Firebaugh to do their banking. So it's a matter of the type of services that are needed there, and if there's a senior center. A lot of these incorporated communities, with the exception of maybe San Joaquin, do not have a senior center. Or an active senior center. The majority of these senior centers are the ones that accommodate our passengers that go to these senior centers for a hot meal, for other activities, and so forth. And it's very important to understand that.

Then we do offer services to the unincorporated communities on a demand response basis so that individuals in those unincorporated communities can come into Fresno or the nearby community for different services. So, it's very important to understand that. And just let me, backtrack a little bit on that light rail notion, and also the specific transit tax. I think we need to focus on the Measure C renewal and staying with that. I think the Transit tax, that's a whole different discussion, probably a different subject matter altogether at some point in time. Let's get through this major... Challenge before us right now. FCRTA did a light rail BRT study from Kingsburg into Fresno most recently, and the outcome of that study revealed that, one, it is not feasible. It's not cost-effective. The likelihood of FTA, Federal Transit Administration, investing in a major capital project, that's what it would be. You heard Greg talk about it earlier, about the FTA investing federal funds, it's not cost-effective. The population base is not there. Kingsburg, 15,000 population. Selma, 25,000 population. Fowler, 7,500 population, coming into Fresno, okay? The percentage of riders that would get on that light rail does not make it cost-effective. You have the right-of-way issue, you have the roadway system, Golden State Boulevard, there's a lot of things that are taken into account. It's a good outlook for the future planning, okay? Nothing wrong with that. But the reality is that it's not cost-effective or feasible right now. We've already studied that particular route. There's other quarters we can look at, but I'm sharing with you information from individuals, consultants that are experts in this area, and they came back and told us, no, go with BRT, bus rapid transit along that corridor, that would be more cost-effective, and you could generate and garner ridership, and then you could get cross-valley... I'm sorry, cross-county passengers to come in and connect to that corridor, Golden State corridor. So there's a lot of issues there. So I just wanted to address those two points as well.

Evelyn Morales - Yeah, so given that we keep hearing this reoccurring theme of empty buses, specifically in rural communities. Is there a possibility that, with this new renewal, We could perhaps prioritize the implementation of microtransit options in rural communities, such as sending fleets of cars or vans, so that we already know these communities aren't heavily populated, the bus won't be full, would that also cut back on the cost effectiveness, and it'll be less, right, to operate and send those cars to and from larger cities, where, like, for instance, here in Fresno, they can come see their specialist, as opposed to not having those appointments, because they have trouble navigating the bus system, or it doesn't align with the timing of their appointments**.**

Moses Stites - Yeah, that's a very good question, and just for your information, we... FCRTA did do a pilot project in the community of Biola, where we did implement a microtransit project, and unfortunately, due to the lack of ridership, we had to, cancel that demonstration project. And let me tell you briefly about that project. We, FCRTA, put in an electric charger at the Community Services District there in Biola. All of you know where Biola is. Okay? Just... Out on West Shaw, about 8 miles just west of State Route 99 in Shaw, FCRTA put in a charger. We also upgraded the security cameras and lighting there, because it is an enclosed facility. And we electrified the gates there. We assigned a vehicle specifically for Biola. We hired two residents to drive the vehicle, trained. And we also received a subsidy unsolicited from the League of Women Voters of $12,000. And we used approximately $5,000 over an 18-month period. And due to the lack of ridership, and the fares were augmented, we charged $5 a trip, which is very reasonable. The Uber, Lyft services would have cost $16 to $20 one way from Biola into Fresno, just going to the Walmart on Shaw Avenue, okay? So it was very cost-effective. Unfortunately, it was unsuccessful, but we're willing to try that again. We're gonna do one, hopefully, in the... City of San Joaquin to address the communities of Cantua Creek, El Porvenir, and Tranquility as well in the future.

Evelyn Morales - Did you receive any feedback on the outcome of that pilot? Like, why was it unsuccessful?

Moses Stites - Yeah, we did receive feedback. A lot of the residents indicated that it wasn't convenient, they didn't want to ride the service, even though they knew their neighbor who was driving and was trained, and the electric vehicle was there at their disposal. We went to the board there at the Community Services District. We implemented different hours, we just tried different, accommodations unsuccessfully.

Mark Keppler - You know, one of the things that... one of the things you might want to think about in the future for microtransit is autonomous vehicles. That'll drive down the cost of microtransit going forward, so maybe that is a possible entry going forward. Was there a question over here?

Nayamin Martinez - Well, it was the same question as her, so it's more like a comment. And by the way, I know 5 elders in Biola that were using it, and they are very upset that it went away. But I just want to say to the, Espi remember that we had this conversation that that's why we were calling it public transportation, because it was going to be different modes, so it didn't have to be a big bus, or even a small bus, but this other... and that's why in that slide that they were showing. There are different things, so it's not only about having these buses as the only way for public transportation.

Moses Stites - And the measurable objectives of that was not just the ridership participation, but we also measure, under the state, what's called Transportation Development Act that measures, and that's cost per vehicle, cost per hour, cost per mile. So we have a measurement of a tool, and the hourly rate, was $53 an hour, and, approximately... almost $53 a trip, so the cost-effectiveness of it, and... but there's takeaways from that. And again, we are going to explore it again. The next one that we're going to do is in the City of San Joaquin to address the communities of Westside, and that's Cantua Creek, El Porvenir, and Tranquility. So, there's lessons learned from that, but... Those are objectives to do. And also, just so you know, to our knowledge, there's very little or no Uber and Lyft services out there, because they're unaffordable for the communities.

Lee Delap - Assuming that public transportation. That includes... Rural Fresno and Clovis, correct? And out of this $3.1 billion, first of all. These roads to operate these systems on. But my question is... Out of these costs that are identified, And the $3.1 billion, are any of those related to fixed assets, or roads, or... transportation stops, etc.

Paul Herman - Bus stops, yes, not road cost. This is all related to operating the transit service. From a fleet perspective, the infrastructure and maintenance yards and the fueling infrastructure, bus stops are included in that. There are curb cuts. Clovis is proposing to do quite a bit of curb cuts to allow their buses To go along, or along the sidewalk without impacting, the road, operation. So, there is a little bit of potential, road work, but it's not, not repaving, or restructuring roads in that sense.

Lee Delap - So, that would be, like. Veterans Boulevard, Bullard, Peach.

Paul Herman - Those would be bus route extensions, so there's currently a bus, they would get extended, or establish a new line on those...

Lee Delap - And maybe a new stop.

Paul Herman - Yeah, a new stop, yep.

Key Bertken - I just want to go back to the community meetings and what we heard over and over and over from community, which was, you know, the need for expanded public transit. And the fact that there may be few riders on some of the buses you're seeing has a lot to do, according to what we got as feedback, routes, frequencies of routes, coordination of routes, timing, whether services were available at particular times of day, and so forth. And I just want to remind myself and everybody, this is a 30-year measure. And it seems to me that it's the public transit part that is aspirational, or should be, about this measure. I mean, we can fix all the roads and make them beautiful, and in 30 years, the traffic issues in Fresno and the air, and all the issues related to expanded use of our roads, and that being the only option available for people, is gonna make this place a mess. So, unless we really do think about, in a kind of aspirational way, how to improve our public transit system, not just keep it the way it is, but really think creatively about the use of different sorts of vehicles, about different routing, about different hubs and spoke routes, or whatever it might be, and the coordination of our agencies. It seems to me we're just gonna dig ourselves in a hole by 2055 when this is over.

Mark Keppler - It's a fine balance. You have to balance. There's a lot of needs here, and there isn't enough money to meet everyone's needs, so everybody's gonna have to give a little, as we move forward on this. Veronica, do you have a question?

Veronica Garibay - Yeah, I have a question for Greg, and then a question for Moses. Greg, my question for you is, based on the, Fresno County... the Fresno-Covis Metro Area Short Reach Transit Plan that you just adopted. Am I... is it correct to interpret that table, your operating and cap... the operating revenue, that you are working with the diminishing carryover you will have a $17 million deficit come 2029 on the operations side, and a $39 million deficit by 2030 on the operations side.

Gregory Garfield – FAX - So I can tell you that we always fall off a cliff around year 5 because you can't project transit dollars, particularly in today's times, we can't project that far out. And in that projection, I believe we've removed Measure C, because it's not renewed, so I can't count on it after June 30th of 2027. So that's also part of the equation that you see there. And that forecast, we do annually. So I can, I can always tell you about the end of the fourth year, beginning of the fifth year, we always fall off a cliff. And remember we work on a reimbursement basis, so it may take us 2 years to get that money back. And so, if it's not in my hand, I can't count on it, right? I know it's gonna probably come, but that's why every time we do a pro forma, we always fall off the cliff. About that same time.

Veronica Garibay - And is, is the carryover that you're carrying, is that, what's the funding source?

Gregory Garfield – FAX - So, it's not carryover. Okay. So, I just got today's budget report and, I think we've got, like, $96 million in the bank right now, but by the time I get... we get through the end of the fiscal year, right? And then we start asking the feds for our money for last year, It may take them a year to give us the money. So, you gotta think of that, that's all operating. That's all the money we have in the account to operate. And it's... I need to have at least two and a half years of operating available to us at all times. So, that's kind of where... that hit and miss is, and plus, that is just the operating. That does not count the capital dollars that we have that may be sitting someplace else.

Veronica Garibay - And then the follow-up question to that is, based on the Q&A doc that we didn't get to talk about last time, thank you for responding to those questions. If I understood it correctly, for at least the current fiscal year... fiscal year 26, 50% of your revenue right now is one-time grants.

Gregory Garfield – FAX - Yes. And that's the cap and trade. So, we've been blessed, with, two sources of cap and trade money. So, the SB125, which for the Bay Area and the LA, was the bailout money. We could only use it for capital. And then, of course, the cap-and-trade dollars we get directly. And then the third part, really, is actually a TIRCP grant, which is $52 million. That is for the, improvements along church, purchasing buses, so that's both operational, public works, and us all working together.

Veronica Garibay - I have a question for Moses. Thank you, Greg. Moses, you talked about the need. In the, you just... so, if I understand this correctly, each agency submits projects to the RTP, so any projects that are in the RTP from Fresno County Rural, you submit it for the consideration and scoring and the RTP. There are two projects in here that I think are great. I mean, there's two, I think $400 million total for passenger rail in East... connecting east side cities into Fresno, and passenger rail, connecting west side cities into Fresno. Can you talk a little bit about those projects?

Moses Stites - Yeah, FCRTA didn't submit those. Those came from FCOG, yeah.

Veronica Garibay - Oh, it's listed as you, as the agency.

Paul Herman - Yeah, I'll touch on that. So, we are conducting studies to analyze those two projects. FCRTA, being the rural transit agency, if they were ever to come about, would be potentially an operator of that service, but again. Right now, those are at the very end of the RTP, and it's for us to analyze their potential in reducing VMT and greenhouse gases in the county, and so those are included because in order for us to model them. we have to identify them in the RTP, and you'll also see light rail, actually, in the RTP as well, and that's for our ability to model and understand the benefits that come from those projects, so... Yeah, there are projects, in the RTP for us to... in order for us to understand the potential of them, we need them to exist there, for our purposes, for our modeling purposes. And... but we do have... Two grants, both awarded by Caltrans, to study this further, to give us more information, both from a capital and an operations perspective. A $300,000 grant, to study the regional rail services you just mentioned, and a $700,000 grant to study light rail In the city of Fresno, so... They're in there to help us understand the long-term benefits if they were to happen, but we're at the feasibility level, so the certainty of these actually being feasible is still undetermined at this time.

Veronica Garibay - Yeah, I mean, that raises a bunch of other questions around FCOG's ability to actually meet its greenhouse gas emission targets as laid out by ARB, and whether or not you're including projects that... The agencies never intend to implement to meet those, which is not great, and potentially not good from a public perspective. And I guess the follow-up to that, it's... this is gonna be more of a comment, is that... we're talking about transit. I also want to remind us that we... Fresno County is home to the fifth largest city in California, and we need to start acting like it. That does require us to think about a future generation, and what we heard... I know we talked a little bit about likely voters, likely voters... who's voting and who's not. We're all paying into this tax. We're all choosing to pay into this tax. Everybody's paying into it. And what we heard from young people is they can't afford to have a car, pay insurance, pay registration, have the maintenance. What we heard from our aging population, which is aging pretty rapidly, is they can't drive themselves or get to where they need to go in a couple of years, and many are not... don't have the privilege to have people to help them get to where they need to go, so they're really looking towards, what is my option to when I can't drive anymore, to doing that. I mean, we heard, so I would urge the steering committee and the policy board to think about these issues in a way that is creative, and then to your earlier point about other measures, there are other measures, across the state. I think the state has 26 other... 26 other counties have self-help tax measures like we do that do include and think about public transit in a very different way, and so we... earlier you said, you know, it's all philosophical, it could be a philosophical debate about what you agree on, and I agree, and I also agree that there's more of a need than we have money for, so that's also true. So, anyway, I would just remind us all that we're in the fifth largest city in California, and... We often act like That's not the case.

Mark Keppler - Well, my responsibility is to keep the trains running on time, as it were. And we're running a little behind, so there was one person in the audience who said he'd like to make a comment about public transit. If that's okay with you guys, let him make the comment, try to keep it to no more than 2 minutes, and then we'll see what we can do for the remainder of the time.

Matthew Gillian - Inspiration Transportation – Member of the Public - Thank you very much. Matthew Gillian, speaking to you from the capacity of Inspiration Transportation is the nonprofit that was operating the program that Moses was referencing. We started by operating a vehicle in the West Park community and one vehicle in the Biola community. And admittedly, I was new at this, right? We do still get calls from those communities, as well as from family members out in Kerman, and I thank you, Kay, very much, because you'll make my comments much shorter, because to your point, yes, if we could look at how we add the logistics that we already potentially use, but look at triangulating and community hubs, and Veronica, thank you for your comments there, because I think we can be creative if we look at, how we look at the assets that we have, and how we maybe change the mindset of that vehicle, right? If we can put enough of these vehicles in small hubs throughout these probably rural communities providing these services, then we might be able to shift that mindset of car ownership, right, which can change the quality of somebody's life, the economics of somebody's life, but also provide all the services, as well as then as they're coming into Fresno, we have all these vehicles that can be used for other services as well. I do not have all the answers, but I love that this is a board that can potentially think very creatively about it, and still use the fundamental infrastructure and logistics to implement and tie those things together. So, thank you very much for giving me a little bit of time.

Item 5: Break – 10 minutes

Item 6: Category Informational Presentations (Continued)

Mark Keppler - Thank you for your comments. So, Paul, you're up. So, we were going to talk about, active transportation, regional... do you think you could do that in... about 10 minutes?

Paul Herman - Let me try. Maybe just active, I think maybe that's all we can get through, but, yeah, sorry. For active transportation, just to clarify and to start us out, this is also in the current 2006 measure. It uses the same formula, the 75/25 formula that is used in the local roads program. A lot of this has to do with... there's many, in jurisdictions, there's cities and bike lanes that are either adjacent to or actually on the roadway network, and so, it is considered probably the of all the formulas that are kind of out there, they like to maintain the similar formula for active transportation, given that most... a lot of the projects are sidewalks and bike lanes. But there are trail projects. The current Measure C has 3.11% to trails, and so there is a separate, in the current measure, allocation to trails. At 6%, as you can see here, we've run this through the... what we currently have is the 2006 formula for active transportation. There is also, in the current measure, a designation of flexibility for those cities under 25,000. 25,000 is the threshold that the state considers that you need to have an active transportation plan, and to have an active transport... To be eligible for many state ATP, it's called, programs you need to have your own plan, and so that's why the 25,000 population designation is set there. Also, with the smaller jurisdictions, you can see the amount of monies available. This would be over 30 years, so I mean, take, for example, the city of San Joaquin, $1.4 million over 30 years. I mean, that's, like, less than $50,000 a year. That really doesn't buy you even a single project these days, and so the idea around making them flexible is that they can combine this with their other revenue sources in order to actually build projects, and so that's why we have that in the current measure. Now, that's... It's something, again, for the steering committee to consider as you deliberate, what flexibility you would like to include in the active transportation program. I think it's something that COG staff would recommend that we continue doing, just because it has allowed these smaller jurisdictions to build projects that they otherwise couldn't, if they were just to be kept solely for active transportation. At the amounts they get, it's quite small. Also, what's not shown in here that this committee and we, I think staff, would very much like to see as well is Safe Routes to Schools. Fresno COG has implemented it just in the last, several months, a new Safe Routes to Schools program using one-time Measure C dollars, from reserves and programs that hadn't, used their allocation, mainly the carpool vanpool programs, and I think a little bit from the Senior Script program as well. So we... and there's been a lot of discussion in the community around Safe Routes to Schools, and so that's not shown here. I think that could be, another program, a new program that could be established, for Measure C. That could be a competitive county-wide program and, use these active transportation dollars you see in the table to match against that. But it's something, you know, we'll talk about in the implementing guideline discussion and future discussions as well. talk a little bit about the projects here. So I've, the city... the cities and the county have Submitted to us through the RTP, over 730 active transportation projects that total over $800 million, from bike lanes and sidewalk improvements to, new trails or extensions of existing trails. You can see this is just a sampling of those projects and kind of what they come out to in terms of a dollar amount. And so... That is the examples, and then here is your map county-wide within the RTP of the active transportation projects. I will make note that the county has done a really good job identifying new trails. You'll see, just like on this last slide the California Aqueduct Trail, that's a new one that's been identified in the RTP, and really trying to provide more trail access to communities on the west side again, this is a kind of a... our understanding from the RTP, this isn't to say that there isn't any other ATP projects that the jurisdictions are pursuing, but this is the projects we've collected from the RTP process. And then, yeah, with that, I think that's all I have on active transportation, so I will I take any questions.

Tina Sumner - Question. So, on the Safe Routes to Schools, did the COG create a list of Safe Routes to Schools projects from the school districts?

Paul Herman - So we... we did, have a lot of communication with the school districts to help us identify, areas of concern, and then we've relayed those projects back to the jurisdictions to show them, kind of, what those... those identified areas were. Right now, the, the current Safe Routes to School program is actually only available to the county and the 13 rural jurisdictions, and not to the cities of Fresno or Clovis. We felt like with the amount of money available, it really needed to be targeted to the more rural communities that have more of the need, or less access to other types of funding sources to pay for active transportation projects. And so, but yeah, we have done that. We've gone through and had conversations with school districts across the county, made an inventory, and then relayed that information back out to the jurisdictions.

Tina Sumner - So this, this 730 active transportation projects number. Are we going to know, then, what the additional, number of projects is when you look at the, Safe Routes to Schools projects also?

Paul Herman - They would need to submit those in the RTP process.

Tina Sumner - So chances are, for this process, we know that they're out there, but we're not gonna know...

Paul Herman - Yeah, potentially some of these projects would be, you know, projects we receive in the Safer House of Schools program, right? If they align, right, they need to be within a certain radius of a school site, so, but yeah, I do think there's definitely probably additional projects beyond what you see here. That will be identified through this concerted effort of developing a Safe Routes to School.

Mark Keppler - Paul, what I'm hearing, though, is the City of Fresno and City of Clovis, though, have not submitted Safe Routes to School projects.

Paul Herman - Oh, they have their own... they kind of do their own, they're just not a part of this specific Measure C program that was just developed, but they have their own, programs that they pursue for... and they work on Safe Routes to School projects all the time.

Mona Cummings - Yeah, on that note, and Scott, you probably... there's a small question at the end here. As part of the Master Urban Parkway Plan, 214 miles of canal miles are projected to be built out connecting all areas of Fresno and Clovis, very highly populated areas. The system will create an alternative transportation system for people to get to work and to school, to shopping centers, etc. So at the current allocation, the percentage allocation for active transportation, this entirety of this system has a possibility of being actually completed over the course of 30 years, which is really exciting. And it offers, again, that alternative to driving on the highway if you don't have a car, or as an alternative to the highway, etc. So it actually could also serve as a tangible result for taxpayers when they're thinking about voting for something, it's good to have examples of what we could actually complete within a 30-year span. So, Scott, I know Fresno and Clovis have been, advancing the plan, so I'm thinking, representing Fresno. How do you feel about the future of the plan?

Scott Mozier - All right, thank you, Mona, for that question. We're very excited. We are delivering what has been named the Midtown Trail. Currently, you can see even along the south side of McKinley Avenue, from Clovis Avenue to Millbrook in the center, central part of the city, you can see that trail along the canal system. So that's pretty exciting. We, and you know, there have been some naysayers out there, you know, oh, people won't use it, there are concerns. I was so excited just the other evening. I went to pick up my wife from the airport on a Sunday evening, and it was a little bit before sunset. And, between the 168 and Peach, I was so thrilled, I counted 12 people out on the trail already. We haven't even officially accepted the whole project from the contractor and kind of declared it open, but it's underway. There are significant challenges with that. Our agreement with the Irrigation District. We're very appreciative of the partnership, but there's a very sizable cost to maintaining those facilities because of the burdens that the municipalities must take on from the irrigation District, by building those facilities, such as, addressing any issues with the unhoused along the corridor, taking full responsibility for weed abatement, illegal dumping, all of those, elements, which have otherwise been the irrigation district's responsibility. One other challenge with that, love those facilities. We're, we're also challenged to find areas. We'd love to plant more trees on those corridors, but that's not feasible kind of within the banks. Since those are really levees, usually the water level in those canals is actually above the level of the surrounding homes. So, planting trees and delivering more mileage, and having a program that has more trail maintenance funding in it are all really big goals for us.

Mark Keppler - I don't know about you, but I feel that's a good way to stop.

Mona Cummings - Well, I would like to actually ask, what are your feelings about connectivity within the city? Like, being able to go from the south to the north, or southwest to south central? Like, is that something that we want in our community, is to be able to get on a bike, or be able to walk, or get on a scooter and be able to do that? Would it offer more opportunity?

Scott Mozier - I would say absolutely. Even one area, you know, there was one newspaper article about it, it hasn't been a secret, but we've been trying to connect the Midtown Trail to the Clovis Old Town Trail. City of Clovis was a great partner, and although we weren't seeking, you know, funding, but just to support, could we connect and we had a little bit of conform work. It's very challenging to close the gap. There's a railroad, a very limited right-of-way, and trying to figure out how to get through there, through that area, but we have just a short quarter-mile gap, and then that opens up these 7 miles into the entire Old Town, Sugar Pine, Copper, Eaton Trail system, so... And there's potential, you know, with that plan, to tie all those together to really create that network.

Mark Keppler - Okay, do we have one more question? Because I want to just follow up on what we're going to be doing going forward. Any other questions? Oh, we got two, okay. Two more questions, and then that's it. All right.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - Did I hear that right? Just because we've been talking about what voters want, and likely voters, etc. I thought I heard casually mentioned that there was a poll out already in the field, and...

Mark Keppler - It just went out.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - Wouldn't this committee have needed to have known that at one point?

Mark Keppler - We just found... I just found out about it, so... That just went out in the field. If Paul or Robert wants to talk about it. There has been mention about a poll, we just didn't know the timing of it, and so...

Robert Phipps - Yeah, so the poll was originally scheduled with the intention of having allocations. The intent was... or the thought behind it was that it would test the allocations that were being recommended by the committee. But as we approached the holidays, there was not going to be time to do that, there were going to be significant obstacles to completing the poll in time for, to have that, and the committee was not prepared yet to deliver allocations. And so the poll now is focused on looking at priorities. So it's going to be very similar to the intent of the outreach that we've done, both Transportation for All and Fresno COG has been working on collaboratively in terms of testing voter priorities. So, the difference being that, again, it has an emphasis on likely voters and would be statistically valid because it would be randomized.

Sabina Gonzalez Eraña - Quick follow-up, but shouldn't... I mean, the way that the question... the question's asked and the way that they're asked makes a huge difference, and so I'm wondering why this body... this is my first meeting, but why this body wouldn't have had some input or be able to inform in some way, what are the questions even being asked?

Robert Phipps - That was handled at the staff level, and so the poll is, again, we'll test, and at this point, it's out in the field. We can't, you know, really go into that At this point, because now it's out in the field, so it's not going to be available for public review at this point. But when the, report comes out, we will be able to show the methodology, all of the demographics, you know, it is being conducted, I can tell you, in, four different languages, including Punjabi, Hmong, Spanish, and English. And so, but the poll was always envisioned as being handled at the staff level.

Mark Keppler - Okay, we've got 2 minutes left, and I want to get to what we're going to talk about, going forward, but I want to... Veronica has a question, then...

Veronica Garibay - Yeah, I had a question for Paul, but really quickly, Robert, how long? Oh, the poll's gonna be out for how long? Until what day?

Robert Phipps - We believe that the results should be available by October 29th.

Veronica Garibay - Okay, thank you. Paul, thank you for... Did you have a question on the poll? Oh, okay, go ahead.

Nayamin Martinez - Question on the poll, sorry. I was here at the COG meeting when we were, you know, making some recommendations about, like, the languages, so thank you, but also the distribution, you know, because, yeah there are voters, even in these unincorporated communities, however, they are not consulted. Because I don't know which, you know, what data, what information you gathered to send out the polls. So, it's not that they are not citizen, or they don't want to participate, it's that they are not asked. So, can you share about what is the distribution methods of that polling, and how we can get assured that Those people that live in those communities, are also able to participate?

Robert Phipps - Well, again, so the methodology is to be statistically valid, I believe, plus or minus 3%. In terms of external validity, for likely voters. And that's the key issue there, is likely voters. So it is going to be randomized. And it is, like I said, 4 different languages. The intent is to reflect the demographic, cross-referenced by age, ethnicity, location, so, you know, the point is that they will continue the call, and that's why the dates are kind of tentative, because it may take them longer in order to get that representative sample. Depending on how quickly they're able to get people to respond in order for it to be statistically sound.

Nayamin Martinez - Is it a survey, or a phone call, or how is it?

Robert Phipps - Yeah, it's... well, there are... there are two means, it's being distributed online, but primarily it's a phone survey.

Mark Keppler - Okay, with that, because I want to be fair to people, since we are already over, if it's all right, and not anything crucial that we need to say.

Veronica Garibay - I would like to, just... But if folks need to leave, we can... I can just ask Paul, that's fine.

Item 7: Next Steps

Mark Keppler - Okay, well, I would like, you know what, can we do this? Let me go over what we're doing going forward, and then we can stay around. Paul, you can ask the question, that'll be on tape, so then people can read... see the responses if they can't stay. So let me just talk about, very briefly, where we're going forward on this. So our next meeting is next Thursday. The idea was going to be that we were going to talk about general category allocations, there was going to be some options offered to you as to how do you want to approach this, but then we just found out about this poll, so the question for you guys is, do you want to hold off on making that decision on general category allocations until you see the results of the poll? You know, the argument could be made that your recommendation may have more heft with the policy board if they say you've considered everything, including the poll, but that's your decision to make. You can either make the general allocation decisions on the 16th, or wait until our following meeting, the 29th, hopefully you'll have the data to pull by then, to make your decision. So that's one thing. In addition, if you decide not to do general category allocations on the 16th, because you want to wait and see what the poll results say, we still can use that 16th meeting to start to dive into the implementation guidelines, specifically flexibility and oversight, and how we're going to deal with those. Those are the two, it seems to me, the really big issues in implementation guidelines. There are other issues, but those are the big ones. And we can start getting your input as to what you think you need to see in that, to make you comfortable with the implementation guidelines. So that's kind of the schedule going forward. So on the 16th, we might do a general allocation decision, but you might decide to wait to hear the polling data; but in any event, we'll certainly do implementation guidelines.

Robert Phipps - Well, Mark, also, just to clarify, we're still about at least a third of the way, you know, only about two-thirds of the way through the presentation today.

Mark Keppler - Yes, and so... okay, so the other thing we could do is, at the beginning of the 16th, we will finish up the presentation on information, and that's going to be basically on regional, other, and administration. Unless there are any questions, and if you have questions in any of the categories, bring them to the meeting on the 16th, or even better yet, send them in advance so staff can ask those questions, either by email, if possible. We can do some of this by email. So the 16th would be general category allocations, if you decide to do it then, or you may decide to punt that ball until the 29th, so you see the polling data, but we can also talk about implementation guidelines. So, three things. Finish the informational, two, decide on general allocation, if you want to make that decision, and three, implementation guidelines. On the 29th, the goal is that we are going to have a decision at that point on general allocation numbers, because then you hopefully will have seen the poll data, and then you can make a decision. Again, you'll be given options as to how you want to approach that. Just, I put in the notes, there's, a COG meeting just to your benefit, so you know, a COG Policy Board meeting on the 30th, the day after the 29th, and then the idea would be, we'll have one more meeting on, right now, scheduled for November 5th for a final vote on the whole package, on your recommendations on general allocations, as well as implementation guidelines, I... you know, Robert keeps saying, keep stressing the word tentative, because it may take, for example, COG policy, I'm sorry, COG staff to write up those implementation guidelines based on your comments, so we maybe have to push that back a little bit. The bottom line is that the COG Policy Board meets on November 20th. The goal is to have this done and to the COG Policy Board by November 20th. So that's the timeline we're doing going forward. Do you have any questions about that timeline?

Lee Delap - Yeah, do we have relative assurance that the pollster will have Results on the 29th?

Robert Phipps - The key term being relative. That is the last information that I was provided.

Mark Keppler - We can keep this group apprised of how we're doing, and then we could, you know, send out a note saying, if, for example, worst case scenario, we're not going to have it by the 29th. Maybe you might want to say, you know what, let's postpone the 29th meeting, let's wait until we see the poll results. And then have another meeting, maybe do that meeting on the 5th, and then have maybe we skip to the 29th, have it on the 5th as scheduled, and maybe one more meeting at the end to just give the final blessing and approval for your recommendation. So, this is an iterative process, we're working through it, there's always something that comes up. I've described it much like planning a wedding. There's... you have all these plans, but the best laid plans, always something happens. So, just be flexible with us. We really appreciate all your time and effort. I know there are a few things...So now that we're in Brown Act, I should mention this, that you have to attend the meetings, to vote, I guess, in person, you cannot do that online, because now these are Brown Act meetings. So those folks who are thinking about online, please think again, because we can't do it that way.

Larry Westerlund - Mark, just for whatever it's worth, I think we need to have those poll results, or at least I'd like to have the poll results. I'd like to have enough time to digest it a little bit, so getting it the same day as having the meeting seems...

Mark Keppler - Now, that's not the intent right now. My understanding is that they're actually looking at about October 24th to get the results, if possible. If that, you'll have a few days then to consider it. But right now, let's just take it one step at a time. Right now, we're focusing on October 16th. And again, we've got 3 things due on the 16th. Finish up the informational presentations. You decide, as a group, whether you want to vote on general allocations without the... we will not have the poll data by then. You may decide to wait on that. And then third, let's start to talk about implementation guidelines, specifically flexibility and oversight. Okay, now I think...

Robert Phipp **-** I'm sorry, I just... I do need to clarify that. The polling data, as I understand it, unless... and again, I will double-check this, but as I understand it, the polling is scheduled to complete around the 24th. That is to say, the phone calls. So, the soonest that a top-line report, and that is all that would be available by the 29th, is a top-line report, we would not have the full methodological breakdown by the 29th.

Mark Keppler - Well, we still have a meeting scheduled for November 5th, so if that's the case, we could decide you see, either meet on the 29th and work on implementation guidelines, so we don't lose that time, and then on the 5th, after you've got... hopefully have the report by then, then make a decision on general category allocations then. There has to be some flexibility here because of what we're dealing with. Unfortunately, the polling is a little behind where we are. But I'm sure we can work this out. Now, with that, I can let you guys go. I know Veronica had a question. I want to get it on tape, so whatever your question is, you can ask it, and then the rest of you, you're free to go, and you can watch the tape if you can't stay.

Item 8: Adjournment

Veronica Garibay - Thanks. Just, before I ask my question to Paul, Robert, just to clarify, maybe I misunderstood you, but just so we're all clear and it's on the record, T4All did not help with the development or collaborate with the drafting of the poll that is out right now. So we're all clear.

Robert Phipps - That is correct.

Veronica Garibay - Thank you. Okay, Paul, I have a question on the ATP data. I know you look... I know we've talked about the RTP may not be the best example, so I looked at all the currently approved ATP plants countywide. So the City of Fresno, the COG-led ATP plan, City of Selma, City of Clovis, and City of Reedley plan that did their own, except I think

Nicole left, but the City of Reedley plan didn't have cost estimates, so they have a beautiful list of projects, but not... anyway. The total there, when I added up all the cost estimates for the priority projects, adds up to $1.8 billion across the board. Would that be a better number to look at for determining need than this one, or...

Paul Herman - Yeah, I mean, that gets back to the point about the RTP not being totally encompassing of all the projects that have been considered in the county. So yeah, I think that that's something you can... obviously, those are all publicly available documents for folks to review and to, you know, determine and weigh that in their decision making.

Erin Haggenson - The active transportation plan that COG did for the county only considered a handful of communities, so it doesn't actually even consider all the needs and...

Veronica Garibay - It's more than $1.8 billion overall, thank you. Okay, and then since I... my follow-up question, since we didn't get through the entire presentation, I see the slides include, to what extent is it possible to see how you're programming. So, on the last slide, you have a funding gap after that table, that's... You list the revenue sources... I guess that's the programming. How are you programming the state and federal funds to each category? So, you know, when you're in the current 2022 RTP plan, you have a table that looks at revenue, and then you program the source of revenue by category. Can you do that here, based on... for us for the next meeting?

Paul Herman - Yeah, I mean, in these charts here, this is kind of the guidepost, and again, you know, this is looking at a subset of all the programs that are out there, but programs that Fresno COG has been able to get in the past, so we feel somewhat confident that they will be available revenues in the future, and so when I put together that table, It was really my best... At this point in time, right, looking at the past, or the formulas that have already been established, and then looking at the competitive programs. It's really our best kind of guess of how you can translate that into what a measure can support. But again, it's pretty conservative because, frankly, it's... the formulas are pretty set, but the competitive programs can swing wildly in terms of how much funding they provide to any particular region. So that's kind of how I came up with that graph, but again, looking at 30 years, like when we develop our scenarios in the RTP process, all these funding sources. They need to be able to fund all of the scenarios, and those scenarios shift between transit-focused, maintenance-focused, or capacity-increasing focused. And so, it's not really realistic to expect all these sources to be available to us over the next 20 or 30 years, but if the county were to pursue a particular path, we wanted to make available those revenue streams so that Measure C could match against them. So that's how I would look at the federal and state funding graphs, is that it's really what we think is the maximum that we could get out of a particular program within a particular scenario, if it were to be pursued. That's the best way... if I had time today, that's kind of how I would have framed it. it's not that all of these funding sources are going to be available; they won't be, but if the county or, you know, if we go a certain path, then certain revenue sources open up, and certain ones wouldn't really be accessed. So, that's how I would frame this, how you're thinking about these slides.

Veronica Garibay - Yeah, and then... so, for example, how would it, I guess, for that slide 31, if let's say one of your... STIP share. So, COG has historically used the STIP shares to support the regional program in Measure C, major capacity, but you could use that money for other uses. It's not... state law doesn't require you to use that money only for capacity increasing, for example. Where did you... where would you program the... like, how did you...

Paul Herman - Yeah, the STIP, I really did rely on the regional, or the historical STIP share usage, but yeah, that is a point that could be made.

Veronica Garibay - So, if I looked at the 2022... is it fair to say that the 2022 table in the RTP, in the financial element of the RTP, that I could look at that table and see how you've approximated?

Paul Herman - Yeah, he 2026 numbers are gonna be a little different. They're not gonna match up one-to-one, especially because, on the cost side of these projects, there's been substantial increases since the 22' RTP, so... It's a little challenging just to look at the 22' and try to extrapolate, like, how the revenue would be, divvied up, but... Yeah, I mean, this is really just our best, approximate, well-rounded state and federal revenue stream. How would it look? And again, the formula funds are really the main thing, because there's a note at the bottom there that it's formula plus some competitive, so... it's looking at the formula funds, but also including, you know... we're gonna get some competitive grants, absolutely, that's gonna happen.

Mark Keppler - That's a really small footnote.

Paul Herman - I know, sorry, it's extracted from an Excel spreadsheet, that's how I would approach that topic.

Veronica Garibay - Thank you. Thank you, Paul, for your work on all this. I really appreciated today's conversation, so... Thank you.

Mark Keppler - Thank you, everyone, for being here. We'll see you next week. Thank you