

# Measure C Steering Committee

November 19, 2025

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

---

## Summary of Meeting

The Steering Committee reviewed the first draft of the Measure C Implementing Guidelines and noted that it is a preliminary version that will require revisions before completion. Staff provided an overview of the proposed funding categories, purposes, and performance metrics. Discussion focused on active transportation expectations, consistency in terminology, feasibility for smaller jurisdictions, and clarification of how requirements would be applied. Members and public commenters also raised questions about recreational trails, tree-related provisions, timelines for project delivery, and how transit measures should reflect rural operating conditions. No action was taken, and members will submit written feedback for incorporation into the next draft.

## Item 1. Roll Call

The following steering committee members were present in-person:

Chuck Yeadon	Artie Padilla	Veronica Garibay
Lino Mendes	Nicholas Paladino	Mandip Johal
Karen Musson	Carlene Jackson	Pastor Joby Jones
Larry Westerlund	Gail Miller	Nayamin Martinez
Joseph Amador	Kay Bertken	Cindy Jurado
Sara Montemayor	Sabina Gonzalez Eraña	Sher Moua
Greg Garcia	Dr. Amber Crowell	Emilio Hipolito
Lee Delap	Dr. Esmeralda Diaz	Espi Sandoval

## Item 2. Meeting Overview

### Mark Kepler

Okay, with that, we can get started. So I'll just go over just some basic stuff that we've already been through. That is the poll results. They... we talked last time about, kind of, the top line on the, overview of the poll results. We've also, last time. had a major decision on the approval of the general category allocations. As you can see from the PowerPoint

slide, just to remind you, that's what the The allocations broke down to under the high priority, proposal. In addition, what we're going to do today is really focus on... it's more informational, there's no intention of having any votes today. We're really going to be talking about the draft implementation guidelines. One thing I just want to stress is that these are the first draft of the implementation guidelines. And as I was explaining to someone, when I was a professor back in the day, you know, a student doesn't hand in their first draft of their term paper. It takes several drafts. So this is just a first draft. So we expect your input, and for COGS staff to consider when they redo this and come up with a second draft, and maybe a third or fourth, however many times it takes to get consensus around the implementation guidelines. So, with that, we're going to be talking about existing neighborhood roads, public transportation, regional connectivity, transportation innovation, administration. We'll start with, Robert's going to go over the implementation guidelines. And then, we're gonna open it up to steering committee questions, comments, concerns, and then we'll then open it up to the public, to give their comments and concerns. We're gonna do two at a time, right, Robert? That was the plan?

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, we'll see how far we get.

**Mark Kepler**

Yeah. The idea is, like, half of the categories, and then open it up to steering committee comments, and then public comments, and then go into the second half of the implementation guidelines. So, that's the way we're going to approach it, so with that, I'll turn it over to Robert.

### **Item 3. Review Draft Implementing Guidelines - Presentation and Discussion**

**Robert Phipps**

Okay, thank you, Mark. So, again, we apologize for, getting a lot of this out to you late. You should have received the draft implementation guidelines yesterday. This PowerPoint is a summary, but it's a pretty thorough summary of everything you're going to see. Very much like the general allocations, the implementing guidelines were cobbled together based on a lot of what we saw from the 2022 Guidelines, there was a lot of holdover from that, that we were able to use in collaboration with a great deal of input from this committee. You're going to see a lot of your comments reflected from earlier conversations in this. Hopefully you will notice that. And then in addition, input that we've received since then, very much like the general allocations from our board members, and from our stakeholders, elected officials, and so forth. So that's where all of this is coming from. And we start with the guiding principles, fix what matters most. Keeping people safe, getting people where they need to go efficiently, improving transportation alternatives, building strong, vibrant communities, leaving no neighborhood behind, fostering innovation, and ensuring a fair and transparent use of tax dollars. So, the guidelines begin with the general purpose. They

include important definitions of all the related program requirements and processes that are specific to each program, the percentage and amount of each program, and the list of eligible projects for which Measure C funding may be used. The funding categories, as we've mentioned already, 65%, this hews to what, the steering committee decided earlier, 65% for the existing Neighborhood Streets and Roads and repair program, public, 25% for public transportation, 5% for regional connectivity, 4% for the Access and Innovation Program, and 1% for administration. So, getting into the nitty-gritty, in the existing neighborhood roads, as we've discussed previously, funds go directly to the cities and the county for local neighborhood street and road repair traffic safety, with a minimum base of \$400,000 annually. After the base funds are distributed on an 80-20, ratio of, population to road miles. Active transportation projects are folded in, those that build and maintain bike lanes, walking trails, and safety improvement projects, including Safe Routes to school infrastructure and non-infrastructure programs. Funds may be used to support infill and mixed-use development, and also may be used for planning to get projects ready to a shovel-ready status or position. For public transportation, the intent is for public transportation funds, number one, to improve bus frequency, also bus rapid transit frequency, paratransit services, and transit infrastructure generally, such as shelters and transfer centers, point-to-point programs for seniors, veterans, and mobility-challenged individuals. In particular, transit agencies are to develop expansion plans within two years of passage to inform voters how they intend to use and leverage additional revenues, and then it is also intended to assure affordability going forward for transit services countywide. Regional Connectivity provides matching funds for major projects benefiting multiple jurisdictions. So including multimodal and interchange upgrades, improvements to major arterials, bridge improvements and replacements, and, a particular set-aside for the Fresno Yosemite International Airport. And freight corridor improvements, also. Access and innovation, innovative projects and programs that improve access to public transportation systems region-wide. For more effective and efficient delivery of services through technological capacity improvements, demonstration, deployment, and evaluation of projects that promote innovation in public transportation and that have broad applicability, planning and construction of those projects, and specifically regional transportation hubs. Zero-emission infrastructure, digital connectivity, and zero or low-cost public transportation fares for special populations. Under administration staffing, appropriate staffing to ensure effective and efficient collection, auditing, outreach, and other functions associated with using Measure C funds. Effective and timely notification for updates, amendments, and reviews. Disseminating information effectively and efficiently from a public database focused on outcomes and performance metrics, providing technical assistance, and enabling jurisdictions to comply with the requirements and leverage funds to implement the projects we've talked about. Okay, so in terms of the purpose behind each program, the intent here under Neighborhood Roads, to bring the road systems within the 15 cities and the rural unincorporated areas of Fresno County. To an average pavement condition index of 70 or within the good category, to maintain and build 150 miles of new bike lanes and trails, Class 1 or Class 4 by 2057, as identified by the Active Transportation Plan for each jurisdiction. To improve walkability, safety, and connectivity for students, and reduce serious and fatal injuries, to reduce VMT,

vehicle miles traveled, to increase access to jobs, services, and schools. What are the metrics? Okay, so there's a purpose, and then for each, for each of the funding categories, there's a purpose, and then there are also metrics and performance measures. So the metrics for the existing neighborhood roads. The intent is to have the average PCI for each jurisdiction to be 70, including arterials, collectors, and neighborhood streets and each street or road will, need to reach at least a minimum of 65 PCI or above. And then we discussed the 150 miles of new, bike lanes and trails, so to further delineate that, urban areas would be responsible for 105 miles, and the remaining cities and the county would be responsible for 45 miles. This is over the 30-year lifetime. So, by year 11, at least 50 miles of trails must be completed. Safe Routes to Schools projects that include Class 1 or Class 4 facilities may be counted towards satisfying this requirement, and up to 20% of the requirement may be met by routine maintenance. A minimum of 5 Safe Routes to Schools projects per year will be completed to result in improved walkability, safety, and connectivity for students, and reduce serious and fatal injuries. Jurisdictions collectively may meet this minimum by ensuring that at least 50 projects have been completed every 10 years. And I should probably pause here for a moment to indicate that these are guidelines, from here. These guidelines are then further refined and specified in a strategic implementation plan. That probably would not be detailed for another year or so after the measure is approved. That document is considerably thicker. Goes into a lot more specification as to how this is to be accomplished in terms of meeting, like in this case, how the jurisdictions collectively may meet this minimum, how that is going to be determined. Certainly, there would be reporting requirements that is part of the annual performance audit process. But, a lot of this is going to be, addressed in that strategic implementation plan. These are the guidelines. Improved safety and accessibility for walking and biking within a mile radius of school zones via infrastructure and engineering improvements. This is a slight deviation from the current program, which emphasizes a half mile. But it does allow for additional distance. For implementation, every 3 years, a countywide pavement condition survey would be conducted, and funding would come from this program. Agencies would then be required to develop a capital improvement program that would address the pavement repair and maintenance strategies that would be submitted to the FCTA, and that survey and plans would be used to evaluate progress toward that 70 PCI goal. Again, to be further refined in the, the SIP. Independent financial audits of the program annually would be required to verify that funds were expended consistent with the requirements. Agencies found out of compliance would be subject to withholding of program funds until appropriate reimbursements are issued. And then triennial compliance evaluations where jurisdictions must show how they spent the program funds would be required. Agencies would be allowed to accumulate funds for up to 6 years if they are needed for match purposes or for a large project. If an agency is not in compliance with the three-year requirement, the authority shall withhold funds until the jurisdiction is compliant. Repeated noncompliance shall be subject to reallocation of funds, as determined by the FCTA Board. Active transportation projects would be included in a local agency 5-year capital improvement program, or annual expenditure plan, or an annual budget, or by resolution, approving a specific project, or a list of projects and or

programs at a public hearing of each local agency. Okay, so I don't know if we want to stop here.

### **Mark Keppler**

Yeah, I think we should stop here and let the steering committee kind of absorb all this stuff. I assume that some of you at least took a look at this prior to this meeting. Perhaps you have questions. I mean, I can start it off first by saying again, this is a draft, and as you walk through it, this is as a lawyer I'm looking at it, there's lots of issues that I see. For example, not consistent use of terminology, that needs to be cleaned up. So, things like that, and I'm sure that when the lawyers take a look at this, because they'll take a look at this after this and they'll do their review, those kinds of things will be cleaned up. I do think that there are things here... again, this is a first draft, so these numbers that you're seeing aren't locked in stone or anything like that. This is a conversation that the steering committee has to have. So, with that, I want to open it up to comments and questions. Nick, you have a question? Go ahead.

### **Nicholas Paladino**

Yeah. I'll make my routine speech. I believe it's slide 15. Existing neighborhood road's purpose? It's just the neighborhood road's purpose. Yes, to a certain extent. This is a speech I make at almost every other meeting. The second bullet, maintain and build 150 miles of new bike lanes and trails, Class 1, Class 4. And that bullet, I think that bullet needs almost to be totally rewritten. I have a standing complaint and a comment. Standing complaint, of course, number one, it totally disregards Street and Highways Code Section 890.4, which defines the definitions of four classes of bikeways. You make the reference to new bike lanes, and then you say Class 1 and Class 4. Neither Class 1 or Class 4 are bike lanes. Referring to street and highway code sections 890.4, bike lanes are Class 2. Class 1 is bike path or shared use path. What the cities of Fresno and Clovis are building, I assume other jurisdictions and what the trails advocates want, also are Class 1 facilities. They are called trails, but what they actually want are Class 1 facilities. Class 4 are in the street and highways code, defined as cycle tracks or separated bikeways. Commonly referred to as protected bike lanes. When reading this document through, the draft. Wherever I see the word protected bike lanes, that should be thrown out and replaced by cycle tracks. This is going to be a legal document that should be consistent with state law, not with common usage, but state law. So that's number one. That's... boy, it needs to be basically redone. Yeah, I think what you had in mind is build and maintain 150 miles of either Class 1, shared use paths, or Class 4 cycle tracks. I think that's what you had in mind. I don't think you had in mind Class 2 ...

### **Robert Phipps**

Or to say just Class 1 or Class 4 facilities.

### **Nicholas Paladino**

Class 1 and Class 4 facilities. Even though I'm primarily a Class 2 user, I also recognize that unfortunately, not all bicyclists come out of the same cookie cutter. There are many

different kinds of bicyclist who have different needs. The second is a comment and not a complaint. 150 miles Seems to be a rather low bar. That's only 5 miles a year. So I'm just curious as to why You're only asking the county as a whole, you want to come up with just 5 miles of Class 1 or Class 4. Why such a low bar?

### **Robert Phipps**

And the answer to that, again, goes back to the first statement I made with regard to the collaborative nature of the guidelines, and how they came together, and the input that we received from all kinds of folks, including our elected officials, the board members, our technical folks, all kinds of input on this, and this was the number that we landed on. So again, this is as Mark said, this is a draft. This can be amended, this can be adjusted. And for the recommendation, we would go through the motions that as I understand it, we would go through the motions. If you want to increase that, this body is certainly free to recommend that. It would simply go through the motions as we have in the past with taking a vote on that.

### **Nicholas Paladino**

Okay, and moving on to the next slide, which is metrics. And I have a comment on our next slide, the metric slide. On the second bullet, where you have by year 11, at least 50 miles of trails. Once again, 50 miles in 10 years is once again, 5. But, in the previous slide, you say 5 miles per year of 1 or 4. Now you say 5 miles of trails. There's an inconsistency in the first slide, it's 1 or 4. Now, on the second slide, it's 1 only. So, I think you need to be consistent. I think what you need to do is change the second slide by year 11, at least 50 miles of 1 or 4. You need to make the two slides consistent.

### **Mark Kepler**

Just for edification for the folks here, there's a difference between Class 1 and Class 4, as Nick's pointing out, and for those of you who live in Fresno, you can compare Class 1 is something you'll see along the Midtown Trail along a canal bank, that's a Class 1. Class 4 is what you'll see on Barstow Avenue going by the university, which is those plastic bullards. There obviously is a huge difference in cost between a Class 1 trail and a Class 4 protected bike lane. So just, that's something for you to consider. It's not a one-for-one cost expenditure at all. It's substantially different.

### **Nicholas Paladino**

Also, another difference is pedestrians are prohibited from Class 4's. Class 4 is for bicycles only.

### **Mark Kepler**

So, yes, go ahead, Larry.



**Larry Westerlund**

Yeah hi, kind of following up on what Mr. Palladino is talking about, I would... and maybe I wasn't part of the committee very early on, but where did the 150 miles come from? Was that decided by this committee? Earlier, or is this...

**Robert Phipps**

No, no, no, this was, like I say an amalgamation of all of the input that we've received. Throughout this process in terms of, the board, what we've heard from the steering committee members. Like I said, there's been various stakeholders who've approached us with their concerns about how the implementation guidelines would, implement the allocations, because in the allocations, the active transportation was called out as a separate category, now has been collapsed into that existing neighborhood, streets, and roads category. So, the understanding was that there were going to be specific metrics assigned to the existing neighborhood streets and roads category to capture the active transportation needs.

**Larry Westerlund**

Okay. So somebody came up with 150, just kind of out of...

**Robert Phipps**

Right, right.

**Larry Westerlund**

Okay. And so my follow-up question on that, under the current measure that we're under right now, is there a minimum number of miles in this category, or...

**Robert Phipps**

No, but there is dedicated funding, so that's the difference, is that there is no specific metric but there is a dedicated funding source, a sub-allocation, if you will.

**Mark Kepler**

How much was that Robert?

**Robert Phipps**

It amounts to 3%, approximately 3.1% of the measure is dedicated to active transportation.

**Larry Westerlund**

And then under the current project, under the 3%, do we have some idea of how many miles were created in the last 20 years of trails?

**Mark Kepler**

Well, we have Scott Mozier here, at least for the City of Fresno. I'm guessing Midtown Trail's about 8 miles, I'm thinking? And that projects basically been done over the last...

there's been some other projects, smaller projects, but that's been the major one. But Scott, maybe you can comment as to how much the City of Fresno has done over the last 10 years.

**Larry Westerlund**

Right, and so there's trails, but then there's also the protected bike lanes.

**Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

Right, good afternoon, Scott Mozier, City of Fresno Public Works. So, City of Fresno has at the moment, about 12 miles of Class 1 trails. Midtown Trail at another 5 in construction on completion. We have a couple miles in for, so we'll be...

**Mark Kepler**

just to be clear, the other part is the Sugar Pine Trail?

**Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

Sugar Pine, so we have, the Eaton Trail, Copper, North Point, Sugar Pine on Shepherd and Willow. We also have the McKinsey Trail, in southeast Fresno. And then we have some smaller sections. We have a little bit of the Midtown Trail in, there's a section on Clovis Avenue, north of McKinley. We have some segments open on Shields and McKinley, and then we have the Southwest Trail. That kind of goes cross-country, southwest of Cesar Chavez Boulevard, from Thorne to about West Avenue. So, there's a number of them. We have another 5 miles in construction, so we're quickly getting to about 17.

**Mark Kepler**

Over what period of time?

**Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

That would be over about a 25-year period, because I think Phase 1 Sugar Pine was 99-2000.

**Mark Kepler**

Yeah, that's about right.

**Larry Westerlund**

And then, Scott, on the protected bike lanes. I know that's more recent.

**Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

That's more recent. We have quite a few... I believe we're close to about, I want to say about 4 miles total right now. I'd have to do a tally of that amount, but we have some in the Tower District, some in southeast Fresno, and of course, Barstow, Palm Avenue.

**Mark Kepler**

Do you have a cost differential between the Class 1 trails? I think you'd sent me a note earlier when I was in my other position. It was \$3 million a mile for the Class 1. What is the expenditure for a Class 4 one mile of protected bike lanes?

**Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

I would say, Class 1 trails, the cost per mile really varies depending upon the situation. You know, if there's clear right-of-way, as there was in the case of the Sugar Pine Clovis Old Town Trail construction, that tends to be lower cost, right-of-way available, relatively flat. I can tell you on the Midtown Trail, City of Fresno is at roughly \$22, \$23 million for 7 miles total, but that also involves costs like going through a freeway interchange, Caltrans improvements to realign the freeway ramps to make them more pedestrian-friendly, traffic signal modifications. And going along the Fresno Irrigation District canal banks, basically, to use one bank of the canal bank, the city also had a cost to make the other bank that the FID would use to make that one drivable. We often find they have situations where one bank is workable, but they don't really have viable access on the other. So we had a fair amount of improvements associated with it. That's I think more on the high end, if that answers the question.

**Mark Kepler**

Right. When I spoke to Clovis about this a little while ago, they said it was \$1.5 million per mile, so that might be more in line with the typical...

**Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

Yes, and I would agree. City of Fresno's done projects of that range. Midtown Trails, a more expensive one because of these other...

**Mark Kepler**

And what was the cost for the class four, like say on Barstow? What was the cost for that for a mile?

**Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

Barstow Avenue, in total was, let's see, we were over \$2 million, but we had some repaving that's really not fair to count against the cost of the Class 4. That one was... let's see, we had a total two and a half... That was around a half million, per that single one. But again, that project had a number of desirable features such as, for the cyclist, video detection, so actually upgrading, building bike boxes, setting up traffic signal video detection for them. Those are not necessarily required, but definitely desirable.

**Larry Westerlund**

So I had another question related there in the guidelines, it talks about, or in the proposed implementation guidelines, that rural trails may be recreational trails. And I didn't understand what the recreational trail was. I tend to think that, you know, this is a transportation measure, not a recreation measure. I like recreational trails, they're terrific,

but I think they need to find another funding source, depending on what a recreational trail is.

### **Robert Phipps**

Right, so there is a recognition within the guidelines and within kind of the transportation planning realm, that you have systems that are designed for connectivity to commute locations, traditional commute locations, such as jobs, schools, retail sites, places that people want to or need to get to, perhaps on a daily basis, versus a, one example I know that's been called out several times is, Lost Lake. Which, kind of goes in a circle around, but it's recreational, it's a trail. But it doesn't really go anywhere particular. It doesn't link two locations, right? And so, the trail system that you see typically in the rural areas is more of the latter, is more of a recreational nature. You typically do not see in the rural communities trail systems. Now, there are exceptions to that, you have a Parlier-Reedley trail that is being developed that is attempting to link, point A to point B, but very often, especially in unincorporated areas, the trail system is more recreational in nature as opposed to a point-to-point type of system. And so, the metrics and the performance measures, that are associated with or within these implementing guidelines are aimed at the former, at the point-to-point.

### **Larry Westerlund**

Okay, yeah, and thank you for the explanation. It seems to me that under a transportation measure It should be point-to-point, not so much recreational. I like recreational, but I don't think it's the purview of this measure to...

### **Robert Phipps**

Right, it also has the benefit of making it easier to leverage additional funds, right? Because, especially when it comes to federal funding, the feds have no interest in... there's no federal interest in recreational trails, but they do have an interest in helping to fund, point-to-point trail, trail systems.

### **Mark Keppler**

You know, I know that Mona Cummings is not here, her alternate is here, and she had sent the COG, staff, and me a note that she wanted, I think, to read into the record, so if... because she's the trails advocate, so if her alternate wants to do that, they can do that now.

### **Carlene Jackson**

Okay. Hi! My name is Carlene Jackson, and I am the alternate for Mona Cummings, and we represent Tree Fresno. I have a statement that I would like to read. Tree Fresno is choosing to serve as a voice for the urban trails, as they create cooler, safer, and healthier communities. Tree Fresno's greatest concern for this new measure is regarding its commitment by Fresno and Clovis To the urban trail system. Tree Fresno supports complete flexibility for cities outside of Fresno and Clovis. That being said, there exists a Master Urban Parkway Plan, which includes well over 200 miles connecting the Fresno

and Clovis urban areas. These trails function to get people to work, school, and important hubs for commerce. They should not be minimized, or overlooked during a time when fuel prices are rising, and usage of these trails is at an all-time high. People use safe and comfortable trails, by foot, bicycle, scooter, and in the future, maybe even transportation devices we have not seen. School safety is emphasized in the guidelines, but let's not stop there. Mom and dad still need to get to work. The guidelines say, in year 11, 50 miles of what is defined as trails will be completed. It appears as if 20% of the 50 miles can be met by routine maintenance costs. So, that could equate to only 40 miles of urban trails. In the worst-case scenario, the trail system effort throughout the urban areas would be abandoned due to costs with funding absorbed by the larger roads category. Let's look at costs. Urban trails can cost 3 to 4 times the cost of the implementation of bike lanes, due to the challenges of installing these complex facilities in the heart of the urban community. There are requirements for safe routes to school projects per year. Though critical, this program does not serve to expand the urban trail system to connect metropolitan Fresno-Clovis regional areas from north to south and east to west. Urban trails need to have their own metrics built into the guidelines, otherwise any funding available for trails will be used for routine maintenance, bike lanes, and safe routes to schools. Progress in terms of urban trails should be tied to a reasonable number of miles of newly constructed trails over the life of the measure, 30 years. The current measure obligates 3.1% of the overall budget to trails, and 0.9% is designated for bike lanes. In this new measure, we will not accept an outright budget cut for urban trails. Thank you.

### **Veronica Garibay**

Thank you, Carlene. Just a quick question on that. Did Mona suggest any, policy language to be included, or is there draft language that we could consider based on her feedback? I think it's really helpful. I'd like to see what the solution...

### **Carlene Jackson**

No, I can defer questions to her when she comes back. But I know she would like to keep them separate and not lumped into the just the general fund.

### **Veronica Garibay**

Yeah, I was just curious about, specific policy suggestions... well, guideline suggestions that should go in the draft that lays that out, based on her feedback, yeah. Right.

### **Sara Montemayor**

I have a question. I'm actually wanting to know how this affects the cities. I know that Nicole Ziba is here, and I'm wondering how these trials and these guidelines are going to affect the city specifically. Can I ask her to speak? Is that okay?

### **Nicole Zieba - City of Reedley**

Thank you Sarah, and thank you Chair. Nicole Zieba, City Manager for the City of Reedley, and I appreciate being called up here because we do have a little bit of concern as a smaller city about some of these metrics. We currently have about 11 miles of trail

facilities Class 1, 2, 3, and 4 in Reedley. And so, the metrics for us may be difficult because of the acquisition of right-of-way and some of the other things that are required. We currently have, what I would call, Mr. Westerlund, a recreational trail that links our college, our high school, our municipal service center, our library, our downtown, our river, all the way around to our sports park. It goes three-quarters of the way around our city. You can walk it, bike it, take your e-bike on it slowly please, or even horseback ride on it. We would love to connect it 100% around the city so that you can make a big loop. We have been trying this for the 14 years that I'm city manager, but the exorbitant price of right-of-way for a small city? **So**, to know that we could have funds taken away if we couldn't meet the mileage requirements, when really all we're trying to do is capture another few miles of property is a little daunting for us, and in fact, so daunting that it maybe our council wouldn't want to pursue these funds. If we knew that we would be stripped away, if we can't meet that requirement. We are also a very small city in terms of the size of staff in order to get all of these projects done at the same time, because we also have bridges we're working on, and roads we're working on, and sewer we're working on, and storm drains we're working on. We have one city engineer. And then we're required to hire consultants and right now, as it is, we are struggling even finding consultants who have capacity to take on more projects. So, add to the daunting nature of the number of miles that would be required, along with the 3-year criteria, and you may find that some of us smaller cities would not participate. Now, I had a glimmer of hope in what Mona Cummings had written, in that, she made mention of Fresno Clovis being the... I'll say the target, and perhaps that's not the right word, but maybe there could be some, consideration for cities that are under 50,000, and I say 50,000, we're 26 right now, but we're talking about a 30-year measure. So, it is somewhat concerning, Sarah. I appreciate you pointing that out. We are trying our best as a small city to get people to use the trails, the bike facilities, like I said, we even have a quarter mile or half-mile Class 4 bike lane. We'd like to do more of that. It's not for lack of will or trying, it's for lack of being a very small city, so please do keep that in mind as you do these implementations.

### **Mark Keppler**

Just for clarification, under the current measure, you are not required to build... the funding is eligible for trails, but you're not required to do it. They're excluded from the current measure.

### **Nicole Zieba - City of Reedley**

So, we just hit the metric population-wise, that now we will have specific trail money pulled out for trails only. This measure, and I'm going to ask Robert to step in, because I haven't seen the current measure language in a very long time, but cities under a certain population could kind of tie it all together and use it as needed. Now we've stepped into a different category, though. Thank you.

### **Larry Westerlund**

Sorry, Ms. Zieba, If I could follow up, so you brought up the 3 years in that there was an exception written into, or not exception. Maybe it's the wrong language, for saving up of 6

years for a major project. Do you know, in Reedley's, in your opinion, is that sufficient time to be able to do the types of size of projects that you may need to do, with Measure C dollars is a match. Just to kind of feedback...

**Nicole Zieba - City of Reedley**

It really depends upon the project, but like I said, I've been city manager here for 14 years now and would love to connect our trail so that it's 100% around the city, and we have not been able to do that as of yet. So, for larger street projects, is a 6-year time frame sufficient? Likely, yes. For some of these other projects though, we have property owners in Reedley who have held property for you know untold decades through generations, and they believe there's gold mines underneath their property. And so that it may be difficult, depending upon the type of project. Now, since I have the microphone for one extra second, I will tell you one other thing that caught my attention in my many, many, sticky notes here. And that is on page 17 it does say that ongoing maintenance. So part of this requirement I thought we could meet by the routine maintenance. It said resurfacing of asphalt would not be included in maintenance, and so our trail that goes 3 quarters of the way around the city is asphalt and dirt off to the side. There's actually two trails that go kind of parallel. One is asphalt, and one is dirt. And so if we could not resurface that with this money, if that was the intent, then that would be very difficult for us as well.

**Joseph Amador**

Do we have a county, personnel here that can tell us about the bike lanes that have been developed in the county?

**Mark Kepler**

I think we do. Is Muhammad here? Yeah. Muhammad, why don't you speak to that issue?

**Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

Good afternoon, Mohammad Alimi, Fresno County Public Works and Planning. Yes, to answer your question, let me see. So, with regards to existing bike lanes, we have currently, 19 programmed or planned, bikeways, Class 4 bikeways. We have 240 miles planned for Class 3, and 378 miles planned for Class 2, and 218 miles planned for Class 1. As far as existing, we have 3.7 miles Class 1, 88.3 miles of Class 2 bike lanes.

**Mark Kepler**

Do you have any Class 4 currently?

**Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

No, we don't have any Class 4 or Class 3.

**Joseph Amador**

You said they're in the plan?



**Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

They are in the ATP plan, that's right. For the locations, there are a bunch of maps that if you look at the regional ATP, that COG prepared for the region and the Fresno County Board adopted it, they have those locations specified.

**Joseph Amador**

Do you know if there's any plans for, Mendota pool park over on Bass Avenue, future pipelines? That's the county road that takes from Mendota to Cantua.

**Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

Yeah, I know we did a bridge project over there several years ago, but I'm not sure about what is planned. That park, if I recall, is part of City of Mendota, not...

**Joseph Amador**

They've taken the responsibility to maintain it, to upgrade it. It's a very nice park now, but I was just wondering if there's any future county monies that is going to be available to the public out there. Just a thought, Thank you, sir.

**Artie Padilla**

Yeah, so as Mark Scott and I were looking at this, we were really pleased to see that TOD was in the local streets and roads. One thing that we were thinking about, we'd love to see as this gets fleshed out within the implementation guidelines is to see how we can include, infrastructure and other related costs to housing and multi... or mixed-use development.

**Mark Kepler**

One of the things, this kind of follows up on what Veronica was asking about Mona, if you may have suggestions on language, please share them with me and the COGS staff so they can incorporate that into the next draft. So, that'll be very helpful. This is kind of an opening conversation on what these implementation guidelines are and where we can go from here. Anybody else have questions?

**Chuck Yeadon**

This is Chuck Yeadon from Coalinga. It says existing roads and matrix, maintain and build 150 miles of bike lanes and trails by 2057. B, it says remaining cities in the counties shall be responsible for 45 miles. Realistically, I don't know if Coalinga can do 45 miles. We can build a trail to Huron.

**Robert Phipps**

It's 45 miles, collectively. Across all other jurisdictions.

**Mark Kepler**

And that is different than I think, Robert correct me, than the current measure, which does not make that requirement of smaller cities, small jurisdictions.

**Robert Phipps**

Correct, and so this is another area where we are not specific as to how that would happen, right? My best, thought on this is that it would basically follow the same formula that the, the funding would. So, for example, you have a city like Coalinga, I think is getting just under 1% of the funding, right? So, under this approach, one way you could do it, that might make sense would be, that 1% of that 45 miles would be assigned to Coalinga.

**Chuck Yeadon**

I was thinking each area had to do 45 miles. I was like, that's kind of tough. Like he said we could build a trail to Huron and still have 20 miles.

**Robert Phipps**

Right, yeah, so again, that would have to be much further delineated and specified in the strategic implementation plan.

**Lee Delap**

A couple of questions. In this plan as we see it moving forward, I have a couple of questions. Number one, on the revised formula to 80-20, who will be the jurisdiction? Or will it be a group effort who determines the formula split from the current 75-25 to 80-20, that's one. And then secondly, on the pavement Condition Index, I see we have a 3-year measurement, and I assume that'll be a one consultant that would do that, one firm that would do that, and how does that equate to what we do now?

**Robert Phipps**

Okay, so the first question, the answer is the 80-20 was part and parcel of the allocations recommendation that this body adopted at its last meeting. So, the 65% included the 80-20 formula. And then the answer to your second question, is that we would anticipate that Fresno COG right now leads, on a periodic basis, leads a pavement management system update. Approximately every 5 years, but would have to adjust for that. The funding would come out of this program under this proposal, and we would do it on a regional basis. We would do it for everybody.

**Lee Delap**

Yeah, I understand the 80-20 is a recommendation, but the question was what jurisdiction or body will make the final determination? Is that FCTA, Board of Supervisors, the Council of Governments, who?

**Robert Phipps**

Okay, so the way this will work is the recommendation comes from this body, goes to the COG next. Okay, with regard to the allocations, that was voted on here at your last meeting, that's going to the COG board tomorrow night. Okay, assuming that that is then approved, then that decision will hold, pending the outcome of the implementing guidelines. Once the implementing guidelines, which effectively is also the expenditure

plan, once that is developed and approved. Then now we have a complete package. From there, it goes out to the Board of Supervisors and to each individual jurisdiction for approval by resolution. It requires approval at the Board of Supervisors, and also at least a majority of the jurisdictions representing a majority of the population. And then it would go back to the Fresno County Transportation Authority for certification, and then it would go back to the Board of Supervisors a second time for ratification for the ballot.

### **Gail Miller**

I have a question, Gail Miller. A question about funds may be used to support infill and mixed-use development. Can you explain that? That doesn't sound transportation related.

### **Robert Phipps**

It's not specifically, but it is allowed in the measure right now, the current measure. So, I delineate these as the shall versus the may. This right now is listed as a may, so it's an eligible expense, it's not a mandatory expense. And so it allows for the potential for a jurisdiction to use funding for infill development.

### **Mark Keppler**

I think that's commonly referred to as a TOD, transit-oriented development. Transit-oriented development, yeah. It's got that word transit in it. So, anyone else have any comments, questions, on this before we open up to public comment questions?

### **Kay Berken**

I just attended a webinar the COG put on for shade and other sorts of... extreme heat analysis. And I noticed that in the guidelines somewhere, and now I can't find it, it was dropped in one section about tree canopies and climate, mitigation issues, but I don't really see any... it's not listed planting. What is listed as an eligible project is tree trimming and that maintenance as a maintenance issue, but nothing about planting. And I'm just wondering to what extent the work of that shade group, might not be incorporated in what we're doing. They're actually identifying roads that need trees.

### **Robert Phipps**

Yeah, and that may have been an omission because again, that was as I recall, that was another eligible expense. And so, that certainly should be included, so we can certainly make that adjustment to include that.

### **Kay Bertken**

And it might be interesting to include some sort of metric on that, you know, how many. I know Fresno has some ambition for number of trees that they would plant over a certain period of time to improve the tree canopy of the urban area, but it might be something to include here.

### **Mark Keppler**

I think that was included in Complete Streets. I think it was there somewhere.

**Kay Bertken**

Yeah, somewhere in there, I just couldn't find it again when I was looking just now.

**Mark Keppler**

Again, this conversation is extremely helpful for staff, but I encourage you to put it in writing, your concerns, and send it to Robert, myself, make sure that they can have a chance to kind of sit and think about this when they redraft these implementation guidelines.

**Kay Bertken**

Yeah, I was very pleased to see actually the mention of trees even, because of the COG has been doing these separate siloed studies, one of climate resiliency, there was a big study. Another one related to this, the tree canopy and shade and dealing with heat issues, and it would be nice to think that that work that the COG has been funding would be incorporated in what we're looking at here. It hasn't been explicit, but I am pleased to see that a lot of it is here. It's just kind of hidden.

**Larry Westerlund**

Yeah sorry, Larry Westerlund. So I did have a question on page 12. Down at the bottom, item number 3. So this is talking about active, if I'm reading it correctly, active projects. And there's other requirements of these active projects, and I think I've got a concern here, in terms of no more than 5% can be spent on road expansion or capacity projects. So is that 5%...

**Robert Phipps**

We're talking about the guidelines or the PowerPoint?

**Larry Westerlund**

Guidelines, sorry I didn't make that clear. Page 12 of the guidelines. So, other requirements. No more than 5% can be spent on road expansion or capacity projects, exemptions are limited to. So, is that 5% of total expenditures there in this category? Is that what that's referring to, or 5% of the project?

**Robert Phipps**

5% of the allocation of Measure C dollars in this category by jurisdiction.

**Larry Westerlund**

Well, maybe that could be expanded upon and made a little bit clearer, because it's not clear to me. And then, down in subsection D, where it says new roads constructed, so this is under the exceptions, limited to new roads constructed or reconstructed in a whole or part with measure funds shall include sidewalks, protected lanes. Now, I get sidewalks on both sides for new roads constructed. But for reconstruction of roads, there are going to

be roads that need to be reconstructed, that there is just no legal or possible to put sidewalks on both sides, if it's a currently built in an urban area. So I think that probably ought to be reconsidered and perhaps struck.

**Mark Keppler**

Well, one of the things that they've done in the past, say, where possible.

**Larry Westerlund**

Okay, or language that says where possible, but this is a shall moment, not a where possible, because I mean, as Scott Mozier indicated, going to get the right-of-way to put sidewalks in in people's front yards is, takes a project that should be a year project into a five-year project, and millions of dollars, so that was another question I had. Unless I'm reading that wrong. Am I reading that wrong.

**Robert Phipps**

No, that is the requirement.

**Mark Keppler**

Again, what Larry did there was very, very helpful. As you go through the guidelines, you'll point out page 12.3, under blah blah blah. It just then focuses the staff, as opposed to just a general comment about something. So, the more specific you can get, you can even take this document, I suppose, and do edits to it and send it, I'm sure Robert and Paul would enjoy that, edits to it with your comments, and say, okay, here's what I'd like to see in there, and here's why. That might be very helpful to staff. They can go through each section with everybody's comments. I'm sure they'll enjoy looking at 30 comments per section.

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, where there are big disagreements though, with regard to the metrics, that probably should be addressed today so that there's clear direction, you know, because you could have conflicting comments.

**Mark Keppler**

I think certainly people can talk about it. I'm not sure, and I don't want to speak for the committee, but I'm not sure they're ready to make a decision of 150 miles of Class 1 and Class 4, whatever that number is, for whatever these metrics are. I think they can submit that over the next week or whatever, and have a conversation, and then perhaps when we meet next, that number then can be brought up and say, okay, these are the proposals, what do you guys want to do? I'm not sure... I don't want to speak for the committee, but I'm not sure they're ready to make a decision on those numbers.

**Lee Delap**

I think your comment is very valid, considering when we got these, the length, the detail Etc., plus comments that may be shared to get us to thinking about issues.

**Mark Kepler**

I guess the idea is measure twice, cut once.

**Pastor Joby Jones**

The implementation process, is it based off city project or community need?

**Robert Phipps**

It's an attempt to balance both.

**Pastor Joby Jones**

Yeah. So let me give you an example. So right now, on the West Fresno, from Jensen to church is being rebuilt, right? That street. And I know that's basically because the new community college is right there. Our community benefits, and that's great, but then there's still so... on the other side of Jensen. That whole street over there is still messed up, right? So going out towards North and Washington Union, that whole area's still messed up, so... and that's what I mean.  So from this part to this part, we see the change. But then, on the other side, maybe because it's not a priority, or the school's not there, they get left behind. So how do we kind of, like you just said, bridge that gap? We see these parts need to be built up, but also, we still see the need on this side of the street, too. Does that make sense?

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, I completely understand, there would be an element of that that could be addressed through this process in terms of, like we were talking about, the metrics that would be assigned and the requirements to report what was being done. That would be a very public process in terms of the amendment and the review process, the auditing and the performance auditing process. But, in addition to that, there would be the potential for direct appeals to the jurisdiction.

**Mark Kepler**

The other thing I would mention too, Pastor, is that you look at the guiding principles, first thing it says there is fix what matters most. So, you can latch onto the guiding principles and say, this is a project that needs to be fixed.

**Pastor Joby Jones**

And then here's another There's a bus stop. In the middle of the street, like... there's no lane for the people off to the side. The bus stop is right on the side of the street. So the bus stops in the middle of the street to pick the individuals up, and I don't think that's safe, and we're talking about, I see the safety right, for safe passages, traffic for school kids and all that stuff. So that's not very safe either. So, just a couple things that I see on a day-to-day basis.

**Robert Phipps**

Sure, sure, sure. And, so we do have what's known as the unmet transit needs process that occurs annually, in which comments like that could be submitted and are evaluated by the transit operators, the three transit operators. To determine whether they are, quote, reasonable to meet in the language of state statute. And so that's something that could certainly be submitted through that process as well.

**Mark Keppler**

The other thing I remember is, I think I recall this correctly, about transit that they want to improve the bus stops. Well, that certainly would fall into that category.

**Artie Padilla**

Since we're talking about language, like in page 13, number 10, which I love the dig once model with construction. But it says, should adopt. Each jurisdiction should adopt. Does that mean they have the option to or not, right? So we can't force anyone to do anything. Which is too bad.

**Mark Keppler**

The difference between should versus shall, so...

**Artie Padilla**

Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, because that... I mean, I was facilitating a broadband working group last year and they brought this up. you know, that...

**Mark Keppler**

Yeah, that's a really good point, Artie. When you see words like shall, or should, or you might want to say, hey, I think this should be a shall, not a should. The only thing I also mentioned, I think I mentioned this earlier before, is Chattanooga, Tennessee has gotten national, if not international recognition, because when they did their roads, they specifically incorporated the internet as part of that, and they're now probably one of the most well-connected cities in the United States. So that's something to get a bigger bang for your buck. That's something to certainly think about. Maybe that should be a shell.

**Carlene Jackson**

In this expenditure plan, it just says 150 miles bikes and trails, just together. Bike lanes are less expensive to build, so how do you... Designate enough money to trails.

**Mark Keppler**

I think, again, that's a conversation that's going to continue on in the next iteration of the draft implementation guidelines, and so if Tree Fresno wants to make a suggestion along those lines, I think Veronica had mentioned that very point, make a suggestion of what you think it ought to be. And I think it's a conversation among the steering committee as to what's appropriate, certainly with city staff input.

**Larry Westerlund**

So, I had a question on the audit. So, it's an annual audit. How much does it cost the Measure C... I'm sorry, I'm forgetting the name of it right now. Your organization to audit on an annual basis? What's that cost run?

**Robert Phipps**

Roughly, yeah, so approximately \$80,000.

**Larry Westerlund**

And how long does it take to do the audit?

**Robert Phipps**

Oh, that takes... it's at least a quarter? Takes about 3 months? Because they're auditing the jurisdictions as well. So it depends. The answer, quite frankly, is it depends, because in order for the Measure C funds to be audited, the jurisdiction has to have its single agency audit completed. And so assuming that that is up to date, then the Measure C audit can proceed. But if it's not, then they can't. They can't audit for the given year if the single agency audit is not up to date. But I would say my general understanding is it would probably take about a 3-month process at a minimum to complete that, assuming the single agency audits are completed.

**Larry Westerlund**

Right and thank you, I appreciate that. You know, I guess my... thought is, and I'm all for accountability, I'm not interested in not having accountability, but every 12-month audit process seems to be a very fast cycle.

**Robert Phipps**

Now, that's the, we're talking there about the financial audits.

**Larry Westerlund**

Financial audits. Right. And so, would there be anything that made sense to make that a 24 Month audit cycle instead of an annual? I don't know what kind of administrative burden it is, but projects don't always come out that fast.

**Mark Keppler**

Well, perhaps we can look at other COGS and see what they do. Do they have an annual or two-year cycle, or whatever it is.

**Veronica Garibay**

Just to point that the Public Utilities Code that authorizes Fresno County to have the sales tax requires an annual audit.

**Larry Westerlund**

Is it? Okay. All right, well, that answers that question.

**Mark Keppler**

There you go. Any other comments before we open up the public comment?

**Lee Delap**

Yea also different allocations, different fiscal years, even though the project may run on multiple fiscal years, so... The more you delay it and try to commingle funds, the more complex it gets.

**Mark Keppler**

Anyone else will we open up to public comment?

## **Item 4. Public Comment and Break**

**Mark Keppler**

Is there anyone in the audience, in the public, that would like to make some comments about this first half of the implementation guidelines that we're discussing?

**Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

With regard to these guidelines, I have some questions or maybe, that needs maybe some clarification. On page 9, items 4 and 5, States Fresno County will reduce vehicle miles traveled. And also, Fresno County residents will have increased access to jobs. Is this referring to Fresno County as an agency, or Fresno County as a region?

**Mark Keppler**

Could you tell me what line you're looking at on page... you said 9?

**Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

Page 9, items 4 and 5.

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, it's intended as a regional, not targeting County of Fresno.

**Mark Keppler**

So we should say county-wide, as opposed to saying Fresno County, because then people are going to think it's specifically...

**Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

Region, maybe.

**Mark Keppler**

Yeah, something like that, so it doesn't say specifically target the counties.

### **Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

Because that to me reads as, like, Fresno County as an agency.

### **Mark Kepler**

No, fair point.

### **Mohammad Alimi - Fresno County Public Works & Planning**

The other question is, like, item 4, Fresno County vehicles mice traveled being reduced. Every agency is, by SB743, required to set a threshold, and every agency may be different. So, what is the purpose of trying to really go beyond what the law requires the agency to comply with this measure. So, I think some of this needs to be stricken out. It really doesn't belong in this guideline.

### **Mark Kepler**

Again, this is a first draft, and anybody who's written a paper realizes they don't hand in their first draft as the final draft, so this is going to take some iteration. So, again, is you have comments like that, please submit them. I think you can take this document, like I said, and just make your edits on it and submit it to COG staff so they can look at everyone's comments on the various sections. Anyone else in the public like to get up?

### **Scott Mozier - City of Fresno Public Works**

All right, good afternoon again, Scott Mosier, City of Fresno, Public Works, just have a handful of comments. One, committee was having some discussion about, complete streets, sidewalks and such, if it's helpful, our city council did adopt some years ago a complete streets policy. So, City of Fresno does implement that, but it does have exceptions. That perhaps would make sense for the implementing policies. There are exceptions that were made by our council where, for example, if it is a developable parcel. If a street is being... and the policy applies regardless for us of funding source. It could be SB1 gas tax, whatever it may be. But if it's a wide-open, developable parcel wherein, when that develops, they will have the requirement to install curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street lights. We have an exception in that policy, because we're trying not to put public dollars into something that would be, an imminent developer obligation when that property goes in. The other exceptions made deal with, basically as a percentage of the project cost. Occasionally you could have, well, to put that sidewalk in. Maybe it's a full take. Maybe it's a full take of a house that was allowed to be developed decades and decades ago that kind of sticks out like a sore thumb into the street right-of-way, and... true that that's standing in the way of putting the sidewalk in, but do we say, well, you cannot repave that road unless you're going to buy that house and take it out? Or, sometimes, utility poles that stand in the way. Those are just some points. A few just more, minor items on, definitions. It looks like on page 10, there could be a little bit of clarification between maintenance and reconstruction. For example, sealing of roadways, is really not reconstruction, that's maintenance. Overlay is a term that's used in there. Overlay is one type of treatment, perhaps the guidelines should say rehabilitation, which is a broader term. Sometimes it's overlay. There are various levels of that. We want to be clear. I don't

think the intent is the policy is just to prescribe that one method. We have that. Something we noted, as City Manager, Zieba had noted, from Reedley about, trails maintenance and ensuring that the pavement maintenance is included. We also noted, watering and electricity bills are not clearly called out in that. That would be a concern if that were excluded. Ability to pay the water bill for trees along a trail, that's important to be able to do that, or if there's lighting. Again, the ability to pay the power bill. Would be important on that. One last item, that we noted, on pages 15 and 16 of the policy, there's a call-out, with eligibility for labor, materials, and equipment for day labor. The equipment's good, that's fairly broad. That could include things like a paver, a roller, a milling machine. It does not clearly say vehicles, but vehicles are part of that operation. You'll have things like a dump truck, so again, just clarification, I would expect the intent is that they are today. Vehicles are eligible for repair, replacement, if they're part of a maintenance operation. But that's just a comment, kind of getting down in the weeds, but I know that's why we're here today, so thank you.

### **Mark Kepler**

Thanks, Scott. One of the things, again, I really think it would be helpful to staff, when you make your suggestions of edits or changes, that you add a comment. Why are you suggesting these changes? And so, for example, like what Scott just said, vehicles are currently covered under the measure, so he would change that, add vehicles, and explain **Why**. I think that explanation is very, very helpful. And at some point, maybe there's something we can do, we can talk with COG staff about how we put this together, so everybody can see all the suggested changes and then decide what they want to do going forward. Kind of like that Q&A thing we did on roads, to give people information on roads and transit. Any other public comments? Oh, sorry, go ahead.

### **Nicole Zieba - City of Reedley**

Thank you, Chair. Nicole Zieba, City Manager for the City of Reedley, and since Scott brought us a little bit into the weeds, I'm going to do that just really quickly to add some food for thought, because it's the unintended consequences that I think, non-experts may need to know about. And so, this, again, an item in the weeds, and we will provide this in writing, so you don't need to remember it, but hopefully it'll start you thinking in a different way on some of the other things as well. On page 12, item number 4 under other requirements, where we talk about adding in elements for heat and increased precipitation, flooding, wildfire. The City of Reedley will provide a note to say that, We would prefer it to say that we would consider and try to do those things, but the trail between Parlier and Reedley was brought up. If we tried to put trees there, we'll have to drag a trunk line for water, we'll have to add the irrigation, we'll have to have irrigation design for a considerable segment that, would be very expensive, and so what would end up happening is we would suck up so much money in Measure C to fund just the tree part of a trail project like that. So we would want some flexibility, because if we were required, right now the language is written that it's very firm. If we were required to do that, that project wouldn't occur because of just the water and the electrical needs alone. For the

trees. So, we'll provide some of that language, so that the committee can consider that to give us a little more flexibility in some of these situations so that, we can have more trail.

**Mark Keppler**

Could you make it, like, a percentage of the overall cost of the project? Perhaps that's a way to address that. It'll exceed no more than in order to put trees in, if that's cost prohibitive.

**Nicole Zieba - City of Reedley**

Oh, like, we would do an analysis on putting...

**Mark Keppler**

Yeah, if the project costs you, let's say, a million dollars, and half a million of that is to putting in trees and they say, well, it's not...it's cost prohibitive to put trees in this section for that reason, whatever the numbers are.

**Nicole Zieba - City of Reedley**

I would certainly think on that, or I'll certainly think on that, but we have some areas of our town as well in our city, where we'd like to put the trail in. We obviously want to have shade, but the trail is more important to us for the connectivity piece right now, and adding the shade later. I will also say that as a small city, tree trimming budget is very, very difficult for us. It's very, very hard. To come up with that money, and so we just had a situation where a couple trees went over because of the rains. It cost us almost \$10,000. Very expensive just to repair those trees. And as a small city, I will say, and this is something that we... put up with and do with as best we can. But our major liability in a small city is trip and fall claims from sidewalks that are lifted from tree roots. We do our **best** to go in high-traffic areas and shave down the sidewalks as frequently as possible, trim the trees as frequently as possible, but the more trees we have, the more that budget gets sucked up for that, rather than the connectivity piece to put your feet on the sidewalk itself. So, just some food for thought, and we will provide our comment.

**Mark Keppler**

I'm hoping that Tree Fresno comes forward with some suggestions on how we can do it with less root-invasive trees and ways to deal with that, and trees that don't need as much water, etc.

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

Good afternoon, Moses Stites, General Manager, Fresno County Rural Transit Agency. If you don't mind, go ahead and go to page 18 in the implementation guidelines. And I've spoken to you folks before on some of these issues. Unfortunately, some of these things have gotten into the implementation guidelines, and I think they're good in general. However, I think you really need to go back and vet some of these things, especially in the rural areas. I can't speak for the urbanized area, City of Fresno FAX, and I can't speak for Clovis, but I can tell you, specifically for the rural areas. It's very different operating a

public transit system in the rural Fresno County area. You have 6,000 square miles. You've got 13 incorporated cities, excluding Fresno and the city of Clovis, and you have approximately 39 unincorporated communities. And just follow with me for a moment, and then you can think about some of these comments.

**Mark Kepler**

Could I interrupt just for a second, Moses? We were doing half of the implementation guidelines, then we're going to take a break, and then we're going into the second half. My thought is that the transportation, I think, is in the second half. You can make your comments now if you want, but it might make more sense to hold them till after they go through the guidelines, and then make your comments so it's organized so people can follow them a little more easily if you can.

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

Yeah, I was just thinking at the time if you're going to get through them, but... and we'll submit written comments, but...

**Mark Kepler**

Why don't you go ahead and make the comments now, but then we'll...

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

Okay, sounds good. No, I appreciate it. And, anyway, if you looked at page 18, Take a look at number 3, just for example. For rural areas, comparable travel times to personal vehicle use. Keep in mind, you've got 30-foot buses, you've got 24-foot, cutaway passenger buses. They're ADA lift equipped. You can't compare those to a personal vehicle, okay? I'm trying to put it in a context where you can rewrite some of this, but be realistic when you're comparing apples to oranges, okay? That's one example. Enhance accessibility by reducing the average distance or time it takes to get to a bus stop. You may not have a bus stop out there. There's no curb, gutter and sidewalks, okay? They have to rely on other connectivity or walking in between unincorporated communities. So there's a lot of gaps in between here, just as an increase. Enhance connectivity by minimizing the number of transfers required for common routes and reducing transfer wait times. You've got demand response systems in the 13 incorporated cities. That's where you have 1 to 4 vehicles, real-time dispatching, which is very rare. You can actually call an 800 number, request a ride, and within 15-20 minutes in Reedley, Sanger, Selma, get to your destination, okay? Fixed routes, you have them from the outerlying communities of Kingsburg to Fresno, Firebaugh to Fresno, Orange Cove to Fresno, Coalinga to Fresno, okay? So these are things that you need to take into consideration. Reduce travel time by reducing the average trip duration, how am I going to reduce the travel time from Coalinga down to Fresno, okay, with 17 stops along the way for a fixed route. You tell me which communities that you need to eliminate. These are things that you need to take into consideration when you're looking at these. And the last one. I'll leave you with is maintain and expand transit services and programs for those with special needs. Students, veterans, all those. That's excellent, okay? And it can be done. That's one example where

you've delineated that, or in front of you for consideration, it's delineated. But some of the others, I think, are going to take a little more vetting, and you really need to consult with the technical people that operate some of these programs. Thank you.

**Mark Keppler**

Well, I hope, Moses, that you then make some of your comments so the steering committee can consider those when they're looking at the next draft.

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

You know, I will, but I wanted for you to hear it so that you can understand, as an operator, what you're dealing with, especially in rural Fresno County.

**Mark Keppler**

Thanks, Moses, appreciate that. Okay, with that, Robert, are you prepared to go on to... is there anybody else in the public that'd like to make a comment before we go on to the next section? Not seeing any, I guess you can continue. Robert, you want to pick up? By the way, I will mention this, there are some cookies and whatnot over there for folks. Just go up and get something to eat. We don't want to take it home, so...

**Robert Phipps**

It's up to you. We can continue, or we can take the break that's agendized, so...

**Mark Keppler**

Yeah, we're supposed to pick up at 4.30. We could take a 5-minute break. You want to take a 5-minute break, everyone? A quick 5-minute break, okay. Thank you.

**Steering Committee takes a brief intermission.**

**Item 5. Review Draft Implementing Guidelines - Presentation and Discussion**

**Mark Keppler**

Okay, we're going to start. Robert, are you ready to go? By the way, before we get started again, could I have your attention for a moment, please? You know, there is such a thing as something called a hot mic. So if you're not talking, please turn your mic off. I think that'd be helpful, just a word of the wise. With that being said, Robert, why don't you pick up on the conversation?

**Robert Phipps**

All right, thank you, Mark, and Moses actually provided a nice segue into our next topic, which is the public transportation category. So, following the same format here. We start with the purpose, playing an essential role in advancing equal opportunity in Fresno

County. Specifically through increased, frequencies, quality service, improved routes, public transit programs will encourage people to minimize single occupancy vehicle trips, provide enhanced mobility options, and improve air quality in our region. And in an effort to expand and continue quality transit service, it's important to, continue zero or low-cost transit service for special population to reduce financial burden on riders, and, also to provide more real-time information to make trips easier for transit users. Some of the metrics, as Moses, touched on, increased public transportation ridership by 2047, 15-minute frequencies in urban areas. For rural areas, comparable travel times to personal vehicle use. Enhanced accessibility by reducing the average distance or time it takes to get to a bus stop. Increase in micro-transit and on-demand transit services across the county. Enhanced connectivity while minimizing the number of transfers required and reducing transfer wait times. Other metrics, enhancing reliability and efficiency by improving on-time performance, measured by the percentage of trips that run on a schedule, reducing travel time by reducing the average trip duration. Improving transit supportive infrastructure by increasing the number of bus stops that meet accessibility standards. Increase accessibility of schools, population centers, employment centers, and other services with multiple modes of transportation. Maintaining and expanding transit services and programs for those with special needs, as we mentioned before. Okay, and in terms of the implementation. This would follow the formula that is in place right now, in the current measure, which is 70% of the funds going to, Fresno Area Express, 20% to the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency, and 10% to Clovis Transit. Allocations to update the regional long-range transit plan would be reimbursed to the agency, considering actual costs of staff or consultant time and expenses. Public transportation projects shall be included in the local agency capital improvement program, or an annual budget or resolution, very similar to, the roads projects. Or a resolution approving an eligible project or a list of projects, at a public hearing. We've spoken about this before, by January 30th, 2030, each public transit agency should have adopted a service expansion master plan that promotes system connectivity and accessibility, closes service gaps, and improves and expands service levels. Public transportation agencies are required to host public meetings and allow for public review and comment prior to plan adoption. The final plan must explicitly address how community input was integrated. Public efforts must ensure translation and interpretation, meetings held at accessible locations and at convenient times, as well as any reasonable accommodation to enable robust participation. Okay, so that is the public transportation program. Moving on to, regional connectivity. The purpose of this program is to provide funding for priority regional multimodal street, road, and highway improvement projects. Projects of this program are of regional significance, so that is to say those projects that are used by the residents of multiple jurisdictions. Eligible agencies would include the 15 incorporated cities, Fresno County, the Fresno Council of governments, FCTA, and Caltrans. Projects in the Regional Connectivity Program are to be identified after Measure C is renewed, and may be approved for funding by Fresno Cog and FCTA following a robust and timely public outreach process. Projects are generally on the state highway system, as those facilities are regional by nature. However, projects can also include those that are on major arterials that serve more than one city or area of the

county, and we did talk about, the sub-allocation 1% for Fresno, Yosemite International. In terms of implementation, Fresno COG and FCTA would conduct biannual regional connectivity program reviews and updates to include projects from prior measure iterations. These reviews would determine project delivery status as well as funding availability. Adjustments to delivery schedules and funding contributions may be necessary as part of those adjustments. And no later than June 30th, 2028, Fresno COG and FCTA will develop and conduct a comprehensive public engagement process to help guide the effort to establish the list of projects to be funded and identify eligible projects for the first 7 years of the Measure C Renewal Program. No later than June 30th, 2034, they would repeat the process to identify projects for years 8 through 15. And then a third public engagement process no later than 2041 to guide the effort to establish a list of projects through the second half of the measure. No later than 2042, June 30th, 2042. They would adopt a list of urban and rural projects to be funded during the second half of the Measure C renewal effort. The FCTA Board may consider bonding of future revenues if the project needs and deliverability exceeds the cash flow. Each agency would request project funding from FCTA, which would be provided through a cooperative funding agreement. All funding agreements reimbursed implementing agencies for funds expended. The agreements do not provide agencies with advanced funding. Access and innovation. This is the fourth category. To respond to the state's goals of greenhouse gas reduction and improve air quality in the Fresno region, this program addresses these issues by providing funding for projects and programs that would increase vehicle electrification rate, enable new technologies, and facilitate, non-single occupancy vehicle travel. Eligible agencies for this program, again, being the 15 incorporated cities, Fresno County, Fresno Cog and FCTA. However, in this case, private sector nonprofit organizations or other government agencies may also apply through a sponsoring local government agency where the project is located. All projects and programs under this program, under this category, are competitive. Specific implementation policies and guidelines would be developed for each project type or program under the implementation plan, following the measure renewal approval. Eligible projects, would include clean energy projects like charging stations, zero emission vehicle readiness and implementation plans, clean vehicle power, supply facilities, microgrids, solar EV battery charging, autonomous vehicle infrastructure, wireless connectivity on buses, micro-mobility hubs, broadband infrastructure for telecommuting and education facility purposes, and other future technology application and improvements. For administration, the fifth category. Grant application process would be developed for all programs and will include monitoring where they're appropriate. Would include monitoring and reporting requirements, independent contractor audit processes, and performance indicators. And here you see a listing of the measures as proposed. With an independent financial audit, citizens oversight committee report, performance assessments, Comprehensive performance review, maintenance effort adjustments, and implementation plan updates. Some of the key responsibilities would be an annual work program and budget, an allocation, program requirements and focused studies, biannual implementation plan, project prioritization, independent audit annually, public outreach and communication, bond issuance. Revenue allocations to local jurisdictions, support for the regional

communities, via technical assistance, and comprehensive searchable database, as we mentioned.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay, thank you. And some of those things under administration are some new things, Robert, that you generally are not doing right now. Can you just point this out real fast?

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, that reflects the input of this steering committee, so specifically, technical assistance, the comprehensive searchable database, and then in terms of the expanded outreach and communication, requirements relative, especially relative to amendments, reviews, and, and changes, as those are proposed.

**Mark Keppler**

Thank you, Robert. Okay, opening it up to the steering committee if you have questions about any of this. Let's start over here first.

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

I have a comment and then also a question. The comment is on the public transit, the service expansion master plan. I'm sorry, that's page 19 of the draft right after master plan requirements, right in that heading. It says that they need to develop that service expansion master plan by 2030, which is 10% of the way into the funding period. Is there any reason why it's not sooner? I guess that turned into a question. I think it should be sooner, but is there any reason why it's not?

**Robert Phipps**

It's 3 years. I mean, the measure would not take effect until 2027? So it's roughly 3 years. Seemed like a reasonable...

**Mark Keppler**

You know, perhaps we can ask, you know, we have people who are from FAX, they could maybe comment on that as what is reasonable in terms of creating a plan, a timeline that they would need.

**Gregory Barfield – FAX**

Hi, Gregory Barfield, Director of Transportation, overseeing Fresno Area Express. Yes, because the measure does not go into effect until July 1st of 2027, having a robust process of roughly a year and a half does make sense, and for some of us, we may need to have it ratified by our jurisdictions. Not all of us do something like this. We typically call it a short-range transit plan, which shoves in everything, so I don't know if we're going to try to do that within the short-range transit, or if we're going to do it separate. And again, not everyone does, this on a regular basis.

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

Thank you. And then the second thing I just wanted to point out is that the zero or low-cost fare for special populations, I thought was supposed to be an access and innovation, and in some places it is, but then it appears in the public transit category in the draft. And so there's a little inconsistency there. The zero low-cost fare for special populations. In some places, it appears under access and innovation, but then it appears under the public transit metrics.

**Robert Phipps**

Right, simply emphasizing the imperative, essentially.

**Mark Kepler**

I think the point Amber is making is you want to keep it in one category. Is that it?

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

Right, and it doesn't appear in the Access and Innovation section at all, which is, I think, where it's supposed to be.

**Mark Kepler**

So just concerned about duplication, I suppose.

**Robert Phipps**

Oh, I thought it was.

**Gregory Barfield – FAX**

Let me just speak to that. In the previous measure, we all believed that this was something public transit could do. It was not. We actually, after starting a reduced fare program for seniors, we're told we needed to discontinue it by the FCTA legal counsel at that time, and so we did. We've done it other ways, but I think if you put it in both sections, you can address some of that, because not every jurisdiction may want the same level of service, or reduced fares to certain populations.

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

That makes sense. It's just I saw it under Access and Innovation on page 4, but then it's not in the actual detail.

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, it's supposed to be in there. I guess that's our omission. That should be in there. Thank you.

**Larry Westerlund**

Yeah, a couple of questions. Larry Westerlund.  So, you mentioned administration, and about bond issuance and accelerated delivery. To my knowledge, and correct me if I'm wrong, Measure C, this organization, has never done a bond. It's always done at the city level, or county level. You're not contemplating anything different going forward.

**Robert Phipps**

Well, first of all, they're the same general... we didn't call it out in the neighborhood, streets, and roads category, but that would also be an eligible potential, activity under the neighborhood streets and roads by jurisdiction. And in fact, I think it specifies that it's encouraged to consider that. But with regard to bond issuance the deal here is, with the regional connectivity program because it has been reduced to the 5%. There may be that potential. No one has discussed it. It's simply in there as a possibility.

**Larry Westerlund**

But you're thinking that might be a possibility for COG.

**Robert Phipps**

not... well, it would be more for FCTA, because FCTA would be administering the regional program.

**Larry Westerlund**

Okay, so, and your role would be limited to assisting FCTA if they wanted to go down that path on a bond?

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, because COG, as the transportation planning agency, COG does not build anything, effectively. Potentially, FCTA could.

**Larry Westerlund**

Okay, but you're not contemplating any role in...

**Robert Phipps**

Not with regard... no, not with regard to bonding, yeah.

**Larry Westerlund**

And then in the current measure, your administration is at 1.5%, correct? And in the current contemplated one, it's 1%, so there's less money allocated, but more responsibilities contemplated. Does that sound right?

**Robert Phipps**

Right. Again, the allocation is a reflection of all of the input that we received. It's not something that, you know, quite frankly, that thrills us. We had argued that there might need to be more administration revenue for that, but what is true is a reduced regional program could lessen that to some degree. So, I think it's yet to be seen, but yeah, we are concerned about the administration.

**Mark Kepler**

He might have said Al, but, I think the other point that should be made is the maximum that you can ask for administration is 1.5, correct? That's the max for administration that is allowable?

**Robert Phipps**

Right.

**Mark Kepler**

Any other questions from the steering committee? Go ahead, Gail. Comment.

**Gail Miller**

Comment, this is Gail Miller. So, are we setting you up for failure?

**Robert Phipps**

I hope not. I don't think so, you know, we understand that this was again, from the administration standpoint, this was the consensus of the input that we received. Quite frankly, the 2022 measure also contemplated 1%. For administration, and so, it wasn't entirely a surprise. So, you know, we understand.

**Mark Kepler**

Robert, what's the current expenditure right now? Are you at 1.25, 1%? Where are you?

**Robert Phipps**

It's 1.5.

**Mark Keppler**

No, what you're actually spending. Is it one and a half?

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, I mean, well, there are reserves, but the reserves are designed for the end of the measure. There's a limited period of time once the measure ends in order for FCTA to close out its term and then, hand over to a successor agency to complete the projects and there would be no revenue during that closeout period. And so, you know, it's simply prudent, fiscal management to have reserves. but, yeah, I mean... So, evidently FCTA has bonded, so 168, State Route 168 in the 90s.

**Mark Keppler**

Okay, so... Are there any other questions going around the... Sarah, go ahead.

**Sara Montemayor**

My question is for Moses, if he can answer something about the public transportation. I want to know, in your expert opinion, how this affects the rural communities. 68% of our student body at Reedley College uses the public transportation system, because 80% of them don't have vehicles. I'm wondering how this, in your opinion, will affect Reedley and other surrounding communities. As I'm interested in what you have to say. How do you feel about how this is written out?

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

You know, I think the way it's written, I think it's effective, number one. And just to expand on your specific, reference to the college students there at Reedley, we currently have a route that, two routes that go to Reedley College. One from Kingsburg to Reedley College via Selma, Fowler, Parlier, then to Reedley College, and another route from Sanger to Reedley College. If the routes were not funded by Measure C, those routes would not be in existence. And currently, we're probably transporting between 25 to 40 students per day, so if you divide that in half for round trips, that would be, you know, 15 students to 20 students per day from those communities, and they would not have access to Reedley College specifically.

**Sara Montemayor**

In its current measure, do you see any places where it's lacking? Like, are there students that need more need, or are there people that are riding the public transportation? Do they see more need, and that hasn't been addressed here yet?

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

There are gaps out there, you know, from Huron to Coalinga. From some of the other West, communities in West Fresno, specifically Cantua Creek, San Joaquin, El Porvenir, Tranquility. Possibly going to the, Firebaugh North Campus. We did do a couple of demonstration routes out there at one time, but they were not cost-effective. We work with the colleges very closely. They offer a \$35 a month bus pass for the students, which is very reasonable. And we partner with the colleges, but oftentimes we do not get the ridership to sustain those routes. So one, is there a need? Two, can that need be met, that is cost-effective and efficient? And you can still have that need, but you don't have the ridership, even if it's subsidized with those bus passes.

**Sara Montemayor**

So, in these new guidelines, it says 15 minutes, per ride, is that what you're seeing as needed?

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

No, that's for urbanized area. There's a difference between urbanized areas, like City of Fresno and Clovis, but for the rural areas, I think that the metrics probably should be a little different. One, the expansion of service. Two, covering those gaps that I referenced, just one example of West Fresno, you know, West Fresno County. So, yes, the measure would cover those, however, you have to look at the type of ridership and also the subsidy. Currently, right now, just to elaborate a little bit, because you talked about free fares and the free fares in different components of this measure. FCRTA offers subsidized fares. I can't say they're free, because Measure C pays for them. For all the 13 incorporated cities, whether there's one demand response vehicle or four, we offer subsidized fares through Measure C currently for seniors, disabled, and veterans. We don't do it for the fixed routes because the PUC has policies where you can't subsidize the fares or eliminate them because of the over-the-road coaches, even though they don't operate in Fresno County. Orange Belt Lines, Greyhound, Trailways, some of those aren't even in existence. So, the PUC still has regulations that prohibit us from having free fares. But the fares are very reasonable. You know, round trip from Coalinga to Fresno, \$9, okay? So there are those instances where we can continue to subsidize the fares for those individuals that I indicated, or sectors, and also the students. \$35, I mean, for a monthly pass is very reasonable. We've even implemented monthly family passes for affordable housing complexes, which we're currently working with. So, there's some other innovative things that we can do that are not part of your metrics here that are probably more realistic.

**Sara Montemayor**

So you're suggesting maybe family plans for, people that aren't low-income, maybe we could put something together like that.

**Moses Stites - FCRTA**

Whether they're at, affordable housing complexes, whether they're, you know, Fresno housing, What's the other one? Anyway, Affordable housing, we've done a couple, one in Coalinga, one in Sanger, we just finished, Newmark Village, and we've just recently applied for three, one in the City of Fowler and one in the City of Huron. So we're working with communities to, collaborate with these affordable housing complexes, because we realize the importance of home to work, home to school, home to doctor's appointments, and without public transportation, especially in rural areas and unincorporated communities, you don't have that connectivity, and you need that to have an effective, seamless transportation system countywide.

**Larry Westerlund**

Larry Westerlund. I did have a question heading back to page 13, and Fresno County is annually required to spend a minimum of \$5 million per year for local allocation in an identified DUCS, Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities, as defined by the government code, and I know Mr. Mohammed, I think, was here, Mr. Nerland might be as well. I just wanted to kind of get the county's thoughts on that level of allocation? I mean, I certainly understand the unincorporated communities have a hard time sometimes getting heard out of things, and getting investment, but sir, I'm just curious what the county's thinking of that provision.

**Mohammad Alimi – County**

I mean, I can look at the past few years, see how much money we have spent in unincorporated communities, and roadways are one aspect of it, but we have also invested in the water and wastewater treatment plants and many other aspects of community improvements. We have built, you know, a stormwater system for them. So, I think \$5 million per year, for the whole county, unincorporated communities is not a huge target that we can meet, but I have to research to see exactly. Right now, we're doing work in Cantua, we have done work in El Porvenir, we have done quite a few projects in Biola. So, where we'll be doing or designing some work for Eastern, Caruthers, I mean, all those communities have projects that either have been constructed or under design right now.

**Mark Keppler**

You know, since this is a transportation measure, I think we need to focus on transportation, so I think the number that's really relevant here is the transportation dollars spent in those unincorporated areas on transportation issues specifically, so if you can get that out to the group, that would be very helpful.

**Mohammad Alimi – County**

Well, when we say transportation, when we put sidewalks, we have to put curb and gutter. When we put curb and gutter, if they don't have a storm drain system, we have to put the storm drain system. So all those are components of the transportation.

**Mark Kepler**

Right, but if it's a water treatment facility or something...

**Mohammad Alimi – County**

Well, that's different.

**Mark Kepler**

So yeah, but if it includes part of a transportation product, that's a legitimate expense. I think we need... the committee probably needs to know that, how much is being spent currently.

**Larry Westerlund**

Well, and kind of my thought was, and I appreciate, you indicating, you know, water and sewer services and the investments in that. Which I think are absolutely needed and appreciated. But, you know, going forward for the next 30 years, that money wouldn't be counted towards this \$5 million. It would have to be, you know, asphalt, gutters, curbs, sidewalks, transportation, and so... that was what I was asking.

**Mohammad Alimi – County**

And we use our measure money as a leverage for other grants, like ATP, so this \$5 million should not be only accounted from Measure C, it should be the total amount of investment in that community.

**Larry Westerlund**

Okay, but the county's position, you're okay with this provision, not a problem?

**Mohammad Alimi – County**

Yeah, I think we can do that.

**Joseph Amador**

You know, after you're talking about Cantua and Tranquility, some of these unincorporated areas, and what we've seen in Mendota, where we're going to redo a street, our water lines are so old, And the cost to replace those. you know, we've got to start considering... I patrolled out there, and you think we have a bad in Mendota? Go to Three Rocks, go out

there. But anyway, we had to consider that, too, the transportation, the water lines about these cities out there, too. Underground. If you're going to replace a road out there, and you see that your water lines aren't any good, why not replace them? Right? There needs to be a consideration.

**Mohammad Alimi – County**

You know, I mean, for the county, the unincorporated communities have their own water system, you know, it's not like City of Mendota, and a lot of those communities don't have the resources to pay for those type of improvements. We have really sought out funding outside grants to improve their water system.

**Mark Kepler**

You know, your comment, Joseph, it kind of is along the lines of item 10 on page 13, talking about the dig once construction. It's the same basic concept, but for water lines.

**Espi Sandoval**

There's gonna be, I mean, for this... let's just talk about the city of Mendota, since you were just talking about. piping needs to be fixed. Are monies flexible from Measure C for them to be used for that, or just for pavement?

**Mark Kepler**

I think it's a transportation measure, so you'd have to find other funds to do that. But the point being of fixing it all at once makes, obviously, a lot of sense, right? You don't lay the roadway and then have to go up and rip it up to fix the pipe, so that needs to be thought through a little bit.

**Sara Montemayor**

Is that where leveraging the funds from Measure C would come in to get that?

**Robert Phipps**

With regard to transportation projects...

**Sara Montemayor**

So, if he's building a road, he finds out his water lines are shot can money be leveraged against Measure C to help pay for that new pipeline like, funding anywhere else.

**Robert Phipps**

Not for water lines, no. No, but there may be other funds, yeah, there may be other funds available for that, but no, the Measure C funds would not be eligible for

**Sara Montemayor**

So you wouldn't be able to leverage those funds against another grant, or anything?

**Mark Kepler**

In other words, to get a grant for the water lines, could you use Measure C funds to leverage that?

**Robert Phipps**

No. Other transportation funds, yes. So, like, like Mohammed mentioned, ATP, Active Transportation Program Funds, yes. That would be an eligible match. Surface Transportation Block Grant, congestion mitigation air quality funds, these are all transportation-specific related funding programs. Yeah, Measure C would be and is currently used routinely to leverage those kinds of funds and others. SB1, you know, yes

**Sara Montemayor**

I'm just clearing it up. Thank you.

**Mark Kepler**

Any other comments before we open up to public comment? Go ahead, Lee.

**Lee Delap**

Yeah, I just have a major concern, and that is, I think we have insufficient priority directed towards regional connectivity. This is a 30-year measure. It's currently funded at 36%, taken it down to 5. Historically, that's where significant leverage dollars have come from. And, I don't have a vision of how that's gonna work out in front of us.

**Mark Kepler**

Robert, do you want to comment on that? I mean, I know some of the regional stuff was the highways. That's not the only thing, obviously, is interchanges, but can you comment on that at all, about that number? Because it is significant.

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, we as staff, we've expressed similar concerns, and we have made that point, but again, the consensus of feedback that we've received, generally has not supported that position. There is, you know, the significant needs of the individual communities that we've heard reflected both, from our elected officials, but also in terms of the public outreach. The regional connectivity portion of it is, as I think you're referencing Lee with regard to the highways and the freeways specifically has been kind of a secondary issue in terms of our outreach and our polling. And so, while that, you know, is a long-range

planning agency, we have expressed similar concerns. That, you know, that has not been met with a great deal of enthusiasm.

**Espi Sandoval**

I have a question, for the connectivity of Caltrans. What's the responsibility of the Caltrans? I mean, do they assume more responsibility because that's connectivity?

**Mark Kepler**

So, for example, one of the discussion points was the interchange on 99 and Shaw Avenue. What's your comment on that?

**Robert Phipps**

Yeah, so I think that the general, consensus, I will say, of position on that has been that, there seems to be a thought that, you know, that is a state highway. And there have been concerns expressed about that, quite frankly, through all three or the two, and as we move along the process, you know, but the entire time, it's like, why are we putting money on the state system, right? Why are we putting local money on the state system? And the answer, historically, has been because that's how these things are done. Caltrans generally is concerned with the main line. Interchanges have historically been viewed as kind of a local issue, or at least a partnering issue. Caltrans will put some funds where they're available, but we know that the state's financial fortunes rise and fall. And so, you know, they see interchanges as being a secondary or you know, lower priority issue for them. And I think, you know, Gail has experience with this. We have other people in the room who may wish to comment on this, I don't know. But I can tell you right now, as we sit here today, 58% of highway and freeway improvements in the state of California are funded by self-help counties by funds just like Measure C. And so, that has been the basis of our concern at Fresno Cog, but like I said, that has been trumped by the rising concerns, the counterargument has been, yeah, but in the meantime, our local roads have taken the hit for that. And so we are sensitive to that as well.

**Mark Kepler**

I would like to get to public comments at some point, so, Lee will get you, and then Larry, and maybe can wrap it up.

**Lee Delap**

Just... being awake. Very first meeting we had those two chairs right at the end of the north-south line of tables were Caltrans representatives. I asked them about improvements to intersections, improvements, and so forth, and their answer was... They

didn't say exactly in these words, not my job. But, they said, bring local dollars, and that's how those get done. So, exactly what Robert's telling us.

**Mark Kepler**

Is it as a match, or as leveraging, not expecting local dollars to pay the entire cost?

**Lee Delap**

I took it to interface with the need and move a project forward if you want to improve take, for example, McCullen 180, we're at 5 o'clock, you can stack up traffic about 2 miles just through one cycle of the red light.

**Mark Kepler**

The question I have is, when those improvements are made, do they expect the local jurisdiction to pay for the entire amount, or a portion of them, and if so, what... how big a portion?

**Lee Delap**

I think that's open for negotiation, but it takes local money. That message was clear.

**Larry Westerlund**

Yeah, a comment. A few years ago, I had a chance to sit on the Citizen Advisory Committee for Clovis Unified School District on their bonding. And this was not the last bonding, but the bonding before that. And I thought they made a smart, strategic decision. So... one bonding session, they went to go build new schools. They had the demand, they had a requirement, they had to build new schools. In the session that I was in, they had come up with this idea, and I thought strategically it made sense, is, look, we need to spend most of the NICS bond Fixing our 20- and 30 and 40 and 50-year-old school. So, like, 80, 90% of it went to go fix Kasner and Valley Oak and all the other ones, in the middle of Fresno or in the east side. So, that's how I look at this. Okay, so we've gone out and we've built a great, or good, section of interstate, not interstates, but highways, and we've done our best on that. This is now taking care of our local folks. Let's get our local streets back up to where they should be, because when I was walking the streets and talking to people, there was always... they weren't really concerned about Highway 180, they were concerned about the asphalt in their front, Right? They drove out every day on the way. So, anyway, 30 years from now, I hope I'm around, I'm not sure I'm gonna be around, but my kids, whatever, they can then build out the next section of highways and fix the stuff that backs up for 45 minutes at 5 o'clock, so anyway, that's my thought, and why I'm supportive of this effort to do it local.

**Dr. Amber Crowell**

Sorry, mine is super quick, although I do want to also express concern with Caltrans being

an eligible agency and us paying for what they're supposed to be doing. **But** the small thing with me is, that rideshare and car and van full programs are under Access and Innovation, and I think that's supposed to be under public transit. Those are the subcategories that we approved. That's on page 25, at the very, very bottom.

### **Mark Kepler**

Okay, we will check that, and if that's the case, we'll hopefully put it in the right category. I do want to open up to public comment, if there's anybody in the audience that wants, I guess Gail is just dying to make a comment.

### **Gail Miller**

So, the state highway system, the main line, is only Caltrans' number one... that's where they can spend their money. They don't do interchanges. That's not... that's an economic catalyst. That interchanges... local agencies do interchanges because it provides new revenue sources, or it needs to serve a purpose to get somewhere north and south, east and west, across the highway. We are not allowed to put our money, our funds. We get 25% of the state revenue, the sales tax. Other 75% goes to local agencies. So we have a very small pot that has to be spread from Madera to the bottom of the grapevine and our main... line... And to keep it safe. That's where they can't do... and I know, Lee, you talked about intersection improvements, like you got 180 or 168, and there's an intersection that backs up. If there's a safety issue, and I mean it has to be documented with data that there's been fatalities, and that there is a safety issue, we have to fix it. We can't let it go. We'd be liable, we'd be sued. So and if they want, the local agencies want to put money into that. That's great. Anytime anybody wants to put money on our system, It's great. out of all the self-held counties, Fresno Cog, Has put the least amount of money into our system. Tulare County is the biggest donor. And they have gotten more of a piece of our pie, or anybody's pie, state, federal, than anybody, because of the fact of the way they leverage their money. Madera has been very generous and also helped put money on the system, but when we're improving the system, that's when they come in with their interchange. It's their opportunity to add the interchange to it. But by law, you can't. You can't take our STIP funds and use them on an intersection because it backs up. That's just an inconvenience, it's not a safety issue, and it is strictly mainline.

## **Item 6. Public Comment**

### **Moses Stites - FCRTA**

Moses Stites, Fresno County Transportation Authority. under administration, I think you've got some, great, directives there? But I think the reduction from 1.5% currently to 1%, with the added responsibilities and accountability that you're requesting, and that you

deserve, and so do the voters of the entire Fresno County. I really think that, to provide the support for regional committees and technical assistance, the last bullet points, if you could put that slide back up. The last two bullet points, I think if you really want, robust information, even with the AI and computer-generated information, state-of-the-art, [redacted] really think that the 1% is very modest. And I think maintaining it at the 1.5 would probably get you better value, return on investment. And also, too, you've got technical assistance. To what extent does that technical assistance is needed? Consulting, type of analysis, whether it's engineering, whether it's, data analytics, metrics, other things. There's how many jurisdictions in Fresno County, not to mention special interest groups, NGOs. It's quite extensive, and I think you're really selling yourself short by 1% versus the 1.5. Also, if you look at the second bullet, allocation program requirements and focused studies. If you want focused studies that are going to provide you the analysis that you need, recommendations, findings, and possible alternative funding sources to augment the Measure C, you really need to invest in that, and that's where the ROI comes in, return on investment. So basically you get what you pay for. 1% versus 1.5. Thank you.

### **Erin Haagenson - Fresno County**

Erin Haagenson Fresno County. To back up Muhammad's, the discussion about the 5... and the answer to the \$5 million per year, so just to be clear, our revenues would maybe be, I project, like, \$18 million in the first year, and then they go up to \$60 million in the 30th year. So if you're saying \$5 million to disadvantaged communities. [redacted] That's a lot of our allocation in the first beginning, and it's very little at the end, so I would, if you're gonna have that, have maybe a percentage allocation, a percentage of our allocation to disadvantaged communities. That seems fair, so otherwise, the investment would go down over time, and at the beginning, it would be, might be, really difficult. And then, I think, you're saying allocation, but the other question is yes, could we... if we got other grants, would that be okay? Could we meet that requirement in other ways? Or does it have to be the Measure C dollars? So, that would really help the county if we clarified what the committee wants and how that'd be written in the recommendations.

### **Sandra Celedon - Fresno Building Healthy Communities**

Hi, Sandra Celedon with Fresno Building Health and Communities, and a resident of an unincorporated community, [redacted] I would say that \$5 million set aside is not enough. For example, in 2023, there was a project in Cowa, which is a very tiny, unincorporated community, at the cost of \$7 million. That's just for that community. So, now let's think about how many unincorporated communities there exist in the county. So clearly, right, like, that's gonna be barely enough for one project in one community, right, per year. So I would actually encourage to look at additional dollars for disadvantaged unincorporated communities. Because these are also the communities that have no other representation outside of the county, and so their projects are not going to make it to any priority list unless residents themselves are advocating, right, on their behalf, and the county's

actually listening. And so I would highly encourage to make sure that We... because these dollars are local, that we keep them local and focus them in disadvantaged communities, and then encourage the county to seek other dollars from either the state or the federal government for other projects outside of those docs. So I just wanted to, to really elevate that. The other piece that I wanted to elevate is, around the administration. I think that there is, as a taxpayer, I will say this as a taxpayer, that Fiscal responsibility is really important, and I track all of the contracts that go through the COG, and I can tell you, and I'm happy to share my spreadsheet with folks that there's a lot of room for savings. And so I think this is really about responding to what residents and taxpayers have said, which is that they want their dollars spent wisely. And so I think 1% is more than enough as long as we're maximizing, right, how we're investing our dollars, who we're contracting, and how we're deploying resources. And then my last point that I want to make is that, around congestion, I've heard congestion, congestion, and Just want to encourage folks to read the, congestion con report by Transportation for America, which really highlights the fact that widening lanes or freeways do not actually reduce congestion. They actually just create more traffic. And so if we're actually serious about addressing congestion, we need to make sure that folks aren't having to travel so far to get access to the resources and the things that they need. And so this is where I really encourage the investment in public transportation, right? The focus around complete streets, so that folks are able to use other alternatives beyond driving. I can tell you that, You know, I am a driver because I have to, but if I could actually get to work using public transportation or even riding my bike, I absolutely would do that every day. And so it's really about reducing congestion, is getting cars off of the road. And then, just a final point is that I do think Caltrans has a responsibility to maintain, right, the highway system, that that's not a local tax responsibility. And that, in fact, there are projects that they do push in terms of interchanges and other similar projects that many residents, in fact, don't actually want. And so, I'm really encouraged by seeing the focus in this draft around... that highlights the priorities that folks have elevated throughout this process about focusing on our neighborhood streets, making... increasing and making public transit better. And I would also encourage including in the special population category for zero fares Students, because as we've heard, right, like, students as somebody who graduated from Fresno State, think because I could get there on the bus. I know how important it is for students to have access to public transportation, and so I would encourage that we include them as well in that population group.

#### **Gregory Barfield – FAX**

Just following up on your suggestion there, Mark, that the agencies, the three transit agencies, will get together and make some comments back and funnel them back, and

thank you for opening up the door, because we were... we didn't quite understand, even though we're the technical folks, how to do that. But much of what we saw in the program for urban and public transportation, we do. And so we want to also make sure we're syncing up some of the language, like I said, Dr. Crowell, we don't all do a strategic service analysis. FAX does. Clovis just finished a major re-rehab of all of their things, but anytime we do any change, we're trying to make coordination better, so we will, again, address that in the ways that we already do it. And then all of the public outreach things, we are required by the feds to do all that stuff, and some of it is done in conjunction with COG, And the two staffers that I share with COG, Jeff and Todd, and then some of it is done on us, but we all have to roll it up into our federal Title VI elements, so we will make sure, again, that we get you the right comments, and we appreciate your time and efforts. Thanks.

## **Item 7. Next Steps**

### **Mark Keppler**

Is there anyone else that want to make a public comment at this point? Okay, we're actually ahead of schedule. We've got 5 minutes here, right on schedule. Let's talk about where we're going after this, the next steps. The plan deadline for written comments, I guess I didn't realize the deadline for written comments from the steering committee is the 25th, which is right before Thanksgiving, I believe. So you can enjoy your turkey, having gotten these comments off your desk. Now remember, don't wait to the last minute, if you can, take a look at this, take a look at the implementation guidelines. I'm guessing that some people are going to focus on things that they really care about, but take a look at the whole document and make your suggestions, and then why you're making the suggestions. I think that's very important, so staff understands why you're actually making. Maybe there's more ways to get to point B than maybe just one proposal, so please do that, and do it by the 25th. The plan right now is to have our next meeting together on December 4th, where hopefully we'll be able to vote on the implementation guidelines. Now remember, this is an iterative process, so there should be a conversation going on over the next couple of weeks with COG staff about, different things that need to be included, and I'm hoping that we get this done before Christmas. We're hoping we get this done on December 4th. May have to have a meeting on December 11th, we're hoping not. I will say this, because I just found out about this on December 4th. I'd mentioned this to Robert, that I do have a hearing, where I am the arbitrator. Well, we could do it to the 11th, but we can talk about that. Right now, let's do it the 4th. I'm gonna try to see if I can... Well, when you're the judge, you can force the parties to start early and end early, so I can see what I can do about that, but... Right now, we'll shoot for the 4th. If we need to push it back to the 11th, we can do that, but just be flexible on that. But I think I understand this correctly, that we're going to try to wrap it up at the next meeting, so we can then forward the entire package to the COG Policy Board.

**Mandip Johal**

Mark? Sorry. Can we do the 3rd? Instead of pushing it back by a week.

**Mark Keppler**

See, I really did foolishly think this was going to be done by Thanksgiving, so I have cases scheduled. I have a case scheduled on the 3rd. So, at mediation, again, I have to be there, so I can't really skip it. We'll work with people and see if we can get a schedule. I understand your point. Sooner rather than later is your point. Okay, and are people... well, we'll send out a note and see how flexible people are on the other days of the week, see if we can do that, okay? Anything else before we close down?

**Pastor Joby Jones**

Mark, I wanted to say something right here. I was looking at the last, where it says project priority. Can we make sure, that those are not buddy projects? Like, buddy projects? Like, project priorities? Can we make sure that they're not influenced by people who don't really have the communities benefit in mind?

**Item 8. Adjournment****Mark Keppler**

Put in language that you think is appropriate to address that concern and why you're doing it, and the staff will do their best to address that. With that, I want to note, we're done 2 minutes early. I want credit for that. Thanks, guys.