

# Measure C Steering Committee

November 6, 2025

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

---

## Summary of Meeting

The Steering Committee reviewed new polling results that showed strong overall support for Measure C and reaffirmed that repairing local streets is the top priority for voters. Staff presented two allocation options, and the committee discussed the differences between a proportional option based on the earlier poll conducted among committee members and a High Priorities option informed by that poll as well as input gathered by COG. Members focused on rural equity, expectations for trails and bike facilities, and the importance of implementation guidelines for defining performance measures and protecting community priorities. After extensive discussion and public comment, the committee approved the High Priorities option and will reconvene on November 19, 2025, to begin reviewing draft implementation guidelines.

## Item 1: Roll Call

The following steering committee members were present in-person:

Adam Holt	Susana Ledezma	Dr. Esmeralda Diaz
Chuck Yeadon	Sara Montemayor	Veronica Garibay
Wendy Ozburn	Greg Garcia	Mandip Johal
Lino Mendes	Lee Delap	Pastor Joby Jones
Chuck Riojas	Artie Padilla	Nayamin Martinez
Karen Musson	Tina Sumner	Evelyn Morales
Larry Westerlund	Mona Cummings	Sher Moua
Bill Nijjer	Scott Miller	Travis Alexander
Jenn Guerra	Kay Bertken	Espi Sandoval
Joseph Amador	Sabina Gonzalez Eraña	
Nora Valdez	Dr. Justin Myers	

Note: Joseph Amador was present for the first portion of the meeting and was later substituted by Nora Valdez at 3:56 PM.

## Item 2: Meeting Overview

**Mark Keppler** - All right, so, want to get started today. We've got a lot of important business to do. I wanted to briefly go over, kind of where we've been. As you know, the group defined some general category allocations. We've taken a look at some comparisons. I'm going to bring that up on the slides, please. Alright, so we've done some basic comparisons of what's happened in 2006 and 26, and we're taking a look at different presentations on the general categories. We've talked about existing roads, public transportation, active transportation, regional connectivity, other administration. We've talked about at least the beginning of implementation guidelines as it relates to oversight, review periods, what exactly is going to be discussed in the review periods. We've talked about amendments. We've talked about the oversight committee, whether they're going to be proactive or reactive. In terms of looking at the proposal, looking back as an audit, or looking forward as to what needs to be changed. So those are all the things that we've done. So what we're going to do today, as I mentioned in my email to you, a few things. One is we're going to talk about the statistically valid poll results, kind of top-line information on that which Robert's going to present, and then we're going to go into a discussion about general category allocations, and then ultimately a vote. So, there are going to be some options presented to you for some final numbers as it relates to general category allocations. We are then going to open it up to a public comment period for about 30 minutes, and then we'll turn it back to the steering committee, asking them for questions, any questions they have, and get them answered. And then, ultimately, we'll move forward to a vote.

## Item 3: Statistically Valid Poll Results

**Mark Keppler** - So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Robert so he can talk about the, the poll results.

**Robert Phipps** - All right, thank you, Mark. Yeah, so this is going to be a very top-line version of this in the interest of time, trying to respect your time and everything we have to do today. We had told you all along that there would be a statistically valid poll of likely voters that would be added to the list of inputs that you would receive in addition to the public outreach. Everything that you're hearing from our technical advisory committee, the policy board and others, your own neighbors, everyone you've talked to in the community. So that poll was conducted between October 9th and 20th. There were 1,660 in the total sample size, with a margin of error of plus or minus 3.6, a base sample of 783 in the urban areas, with an 877 oversample in the smaller regions outside the cities of Fresno and Clovis. And you can see on the screen how that was conducted, a variety of means through which that was conducted. Here on this slide, you'll see what that representation was. The county, divided into 8 different sections, and what the sample size was for each section. And all of this should be in the packet in front of you as well, by the way. I'm going to move through these relatively quickly.

To begin with, we have a kind of a generic ballot statement. This is the statement that would appear on the actual ballot. This is just a sample of a very generic statement that reflects the general principles and concepts that the steering committee has developed during its time. This is what we've heard as effectively being the priorities. This is one of the biggest things that was tested as part of this poll. The good news is that, upon hearing that statement, we had 75% support on a county-wide basis. When you combine the definitely yes, probably yes, and undecided but leaning yes categories. So, 75%, this is extremely good news for us, and in fact, according to our pollsters, positions us as the number one county in the state right now, at least as far as those that they're working with for renewal. They're working with several counties on measures that are similar to these. They're saying that other counties would love to have results that are this high, so that this is very good news for us. In terms of the top priorities, no huge surprise. This is held consistent and is broadly, I say this in a very general sense, broadly consistent with the outreach that you saw earlier in the community outreach that both Fresno Cog and Transportation for All conducted. No huge surprise, repairing potholes at the very top of the list, the blue lines represent the number of participants, or the percentage that classified these categories or these issues as very important, with the red being at least somewhat important. So, you can see in this listing what those were in descending order. So, the number one thing being repairing potholes and going down from there in terms of their relative importance. But all the issues that you've been discussing here, again not a surprise, are well represented in this listing, and there are page after page of these. We've chosen for the sake of time to only address certain numbers of these. We will have the methodology available for public review. We would publish the entire poll, once the Policy Board has had the opportunity to review this. We can publish the entire methodology when it's ready, but these are just kind of top-line results.

For this slide, I'm not going to go through all of these, but this represents the top three statements that seem to move the needle, if you will, in terms of support. Streets, the condition of the streets when people find out the percentage of streets on a county-wide basis, jurisdiction by jurisdiction, and what condition they're in. That really is the number one factor as we've known for a while. The concern of what happens if Measure C doesn't get passed. The fact of what would happen if there were cuts to transportation funding and what that consequence might look like, and then the accountability measures that we've been discussing, and the importance of having accountability as a major factor in the measure's implementing guidelines and implementation plan. Those were the three top arguments that helped support the measures passage in the minds of those who took the survey. And finally, with both robust arguments in favor and sample arguments that were given in favor and in opposition to the measure, you see here at the far right of the page where it says total yes, 72%, both support positions and opposition statements were read. That was the final support position for the measure, 72% plus or minus, if you subtract out the roughly 4% you come up with 68% support on the soft side. Now, importantly, as a caveat, this assumes that there are no other measures on the ballot. That is to say, no competing measures. So, all of this kind of disappears, all of these assumptions, all of these statistics, evaporate if there is another measure on the ballot, it

erases, the impact of this. But, in terms of where we are as of today, the news is very good. And we do have representatives from FM3 on the line, who can help me answer any questions if there are any.

**Mark Keppler** - Not seeing any, I think we can continue. Before we go to the next part that Robert's going to do on the general category allocation discussion, I wanted to see if there are any new steering committee members that came in that weren't part of the roll call, or haven't had their name mentioned. I don't know if I missed anyone. Any new people? Okay, with that, we'll continue on to general category allocations. I want to let you know, Robert, you're 5 minutes ahead of schedule, so take your time.

## **Item 4: General Category Allocation Discussion**

**Robert Phipps** - Okay. All right, so the general category allocation discussion. In working through this, we are fully aware that there are a million potential variations on how to arrive at general allocations terms. And that it would be, certainly feasible to mire ourselves down in discussions like this for months, if not years. We have taken the initiative to try and prepare a couple of options for you. These are options, not recommendations, and they reflect the basis of both of these is where we left off. So, we have a proportional allocation proposal and a high priorities proposal, what we're calling the high priorities allocation proposal. So as a reminder, these are the numbers based on a 30-year measure, in terms of a gross amount over the 30-year total, and an annual amount. This is where we left it back in September. These are the numbers that you came up with that did not quite get to 100%.

**Mark Keppler** - If I can just say, this is a preliminary poll. This is a preliminary poll.

**Robert Phipps** - Right. This was the first run at a general allocation discussion and poll and so, this is where we began in terms of both of the proposals that you're going to see today. This is the basis for all of this going forward. So, this is just a reminder of where we left off and how we're beginning today. So, under the proportional allocation proposal, it's pretty straightforward. It's known as proportional renormalization in statistics. You're taking each category's median score by a common factor, such that the vector sums to 100. So that common factor in this case is 1.10. That spreads the remaining 9% across all categories evenly. And this is what it looks like. So, existing neighborhood roads, 57.2%, under the proportional proposal, public transportation 19.8%, regional connectivity 11%, active transportation is at 6.6%, transportation innovation, or other category, 4.4%, administration remains roughly at 1%, for a total of \$7.3 billion, 100%.

**Tina Sumner** - Robert, can I ask a question, or do you want to save them to the end?

**Mark Keppler** - We'd like to go through both proposals, and then we can ask questions.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay.

**Robert Phipps** - Right. So, what you're going to see with both proposals is the terms of these, while not complete, these are by no means finalized proposals, there's a lot still to be discussed. So, you're going to see "subject to implementing guidelines" on a lot of these.

- What is being proposed is a \$400,000 split. This is under both proposals, \$400,000 annual floor for all jurisdictions under the existing street and roads categories. That is an increase of, fourfold, essentially of where we are today.
- An 80-20 split of population and road miles by jurisdiction.
- We would evaluate metrics from the implementation guidelines and plan at the 10-year mark.

Lee, if you don't mind writing the question down, and we'll get to them at the end, if you don't mind. So, this is what the proportional allocation would look like for existing streets and roads by jurisdiction, and how it compares to the current measure. Okay, and this has the dollar amounts by jurisdiction, as well as the percentage, and then the percentage of the current measure. Again, all of this is in your packet, so I'm not going to spend too much time on the slide deck here.

- 19.8% for public transportation. This would maintain current service levels, would include the carpool, vanpool, senior script, and micro transit concepts and includes greater coordination and connectivity among transit providers. This is the breakdown, of that 19.8% going to the transit providers, and you see the breakdown that follows the current formula for FAX, the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency, and Clovis Transit. And again, the comparison to the current measure.
- Moving into regional connectivity, regional connectivity rises to 11%, with a 1% proposed sub-allocation for the City of Fresno airports. With regional projects to be identified later through the implementation plan, as funding allows. And this is what the regional connectivity Category looks like.
- 6.6% for active transportation. Again, subject to implementing guidelines, this would include an 80-20 split population and road miles by jurisdiction. Funds would be flexible for cities under 20,000, and metrics would be evaluated based on implementation guidelines and the implementation plan at the 10-year mark. And this is what the proportional proposal would look like for active transportation relative to the current measure.
- So, same exercise for transportation innovation, or the other category. This would include investing in multimodal transportation hubs, zero-emission infrastructure, communication systems like, Wi-Fi on buses, and what we call ITS, intelligent transportation systems, grid capacity and energy storage, and zero reduced fares for special populations, 4.4%.
- And finally, administration. With the oversight committee, annual audits, 10-year review periods, technical assistance jurisdictions, public outreach, and notification for amendments and review periods, and then a project database.

**Mark Keppler** - Can we just hold here for a second? We went through a lot of stuff here. Just catch your breath, Robert, you've been going really fast. I want people to make sure they have a chance to look at this and think about their questions we're going to have after he goes through the high priorities proposal, which is next. So just take a moment, we're not going to have any questions right now. I'm just asking you just to take a moment and write down questions. I want to give you a moment to look at everything. So just take a breath, take a moment, take a look at your materials. If there's something that's concerning to you, make a note of it, so then we can go on to the next one, because we want to be able to show you, kind of, back-to-back. And then we can open up to questions, as many questions as you want, okay? Alright, this could just take a minute or two.

**The Steering Committee takes a brief intermission to review the discussion and materials before proceeding.**

**Mark Keppler** - So I'll give you another minute or so to take a look at this and think about any questions you might want to have but just hold them, if you would. Robert, you can go a little slower, too.

**Robert Phipps** - Can do.

**Mark Keppler** - And just to be clear again, these are two separate proposals. We just went over the proportion proposal. We are now going to start the high priorities proposal. Those are the two different ones we're dealing with today. Options instead of proposals, options. By the way, I want to mention this as well while you're looking at stuff. I did say this in the email that remember, this is only one half of the equation for the recommendation that the steering committee is going to give to the policy board. Once we finish this, we're not done. This is just half. The second half, which is very important, is the implementation guidelines. That also has to have 70% approval. Once those two both have 70%, now we have a complete package that we can present to the COG Policy Board. Does anybody want a little more time before Robert starts with the next presentation on the high priorities option? Not seeing any. It's yours, Robert.

**Robert Phipps** - Okay, thank you Mark, and I can slow down, that's not a problem. So, the high priorities proposal is very different, in that this one has considerably more thought and input behind it. Again, the first proposal, the major distinction between the two, is that the first proposal is essentially a strict mathematical allocation based on proportionality of the 9% that is remaining. This proposal, this option, takes into account, again, starting with the baseline of where this committee left off, we received, lots and lots and lots of input once those numbers were published. And so, we heard that input loud and clear, from city council members, from our own policy board, from members of this group, from all kinds of stakeholders, and so what this proposal represents, which you can see on the screen, is effectively a doubling down of what has been identified as

the two top priorities. As we've seen in the public outreach, that is more or less reaffirmed in the polling and has been expressed here at the steering committee as well. So, under this proposal, existing neighborhood streets and roads, goes to 65%, Public transportation is at 25%, regional connectivity 5%, transportation innovation, or the other category as it was known, at 4%, and administration at 1%.

So, again, kind of the same exercise in an effort to compare apples to apples, all of this subject to implementation guidelines. Some ideas have been discussed, but nothing formalized. A proposal for a \$400,000 annual floor under existing streets and roads for each jurisdiction. Again, that is a four-fold increase from where we are today. Right now, the jurisdictions receive about \$100,000 each year.

An 80-20 split, population and road miles, that is a difference from the 75-25 approach that we have in the current measure. This would, importantly, this includes all aspects of the active transportation program, so that is a major difference between the two proposals. This option collapses the active transportation program into the existing neighborhood streets and roads category. So, they are now one, and all aspects of that category are now included in existing neighborhood streets and roads. Performance metrics would be defined in the implementing guidelines.

**Mark Keppler** - Can I interrupt for just a second? Because I think you're right, this is a very important change. What the difference is between the proportional, or traditionally what's been done, it's really been focusing on inputs for active transportation, how much money you get. This measure focuses on outputs. It's focusing on performance. So, the first one is, here's the dollars, whatever you can buy with it. The second one is, here's the performance metrics, X number of miles of trails, X number of miles of protected bike lanes, X number of safe routes to school sites, etc. Different than money, which is the previous measure, this is now performance. It's not just money, it's performance. That's the difference. Do you understand what I'm saying? Anybody confused by what I'm saying? So, the focus now is on performance. Outputs as instead of inputs. Okay?

**Robert Phipps** - And again, all of the metrics that we've discussed, being evaluated at the 10-year mark, could be changed. So, under this scenario, or alternative, this is the breakdown. Again, very much like with the proportional broken down in the same fashion for you. You have the dollar amount by jurisdiction, the percentage, and then the comparison to the current measure. Under public transportation, 25%, this would include the increased service levels, 15-minute headways, and as part of this proposal, 15-minute headways in urban areas on specific routes. It would include carpool, vanpool, Senior Scrip, and microtransit, under the transit agencies. So, this one has distinguished, all the funding going directly to the transit agencies, greater coordination and connectivity among the transit providers, and transit providers would be responsible for developing a service expansion plan within two years. Also, evaluating those metrics and others from the implementation guidelines and the implementation plan at the 10-year mark. And so, this is the breakdown by transit agency.

Under the regional connectivity program, we retain the 1% sub-allocation for the airports and again, regional projects would be identified later through the implementation plan and guidelines as funding is allowed. And this is the breakdown of the regional connectivity program in comparison.

Transportation innovation, very similar to the first proposal, 4%. Again, many, if not all, of the same investments. Multimodal transportation hubs, zero emission infrastructure, communication systems, grid capacity and energy storage, and zero reduced fares for special populations. All this subject to implementing guidelines. Metrics would be attached.

And finally, we have administration, remaining at 1%.

**Mark Keppler** - Were we going to share a chart ...

**Robert Phipps** - Yes, and that should be among the materials that you have in your packet. It is a comparison that shows side-by-side...

**Mark Keppler** - Do we have a PowerPoint for that, or is this just the handout? Oh, it's just the handout. Okay, that's... I think this handout is very important, because it summarizes...

**Robert Phipps** - We can put it on the screen if you like.

**Mark Keppler** - I would like you to, please. And if you would, Robert, maybe you could walk through this so people can understand, because they've got a lot of information. This is an attempt to summarize that information, if you could...

**Robert Phipps** - Right, so this is the table, the sheet that has the table on it. There we go, Paul's got it up on the screen. Sorry, the numbers are a little small. But this compares...

**Mark Keppler** - We have the hard copy. If you don't have it, we can get you one.

**Robert Phipps** - Yeah this compares, on a percentage basis, the two options against the current measure. It shows you what the percentages are, and then shows you, with regard to key issues, at the bottom of the table, how they stack up against each other. So total roads, if you combine the existing neighborhood streets and roads and regional programs, it's 70% under the high priority, 68.2% under the proportional. The current measure is 67%.

Annual roads funding floor for cities and county right now, \$400,000 annually for both, relative to the current measure, which is \$100,000 annually which achieves the good pavement index condition on a county-wide basis. That's defined as 70 PCI or higher. The high priority, proposal reaches that point. Proportional and current measure do not. It

allows for significant expansion of transit services. The high priorities proposal is an increase from the current transit proposal, so it checks that box. The proportional proposal and the current measure do not. Periodic review of the expenditure plan, in this case, every 10 years, is being proposed, and both of them do that relative to the current measure.

**Mark Keppler** - And I also want to mention, it's a little hard to see there. There's a very small thing that's written there talking about active transportation under the High Priorities Proposal, move to roads with specific miles per year of trails, bike lanes, and safe routes to school projects to be set in the implementation guidelines. So that's the specific performance metric that will be in the implementation guidelines.

**Robert Phipps** - That has been proposed, yes.

**Mark Keppler** - So why don't you just take a minute or two to take a look at that, because I think that's a very good summary chart the COG staff put together. Just take a moment to take a look at that.

**Robert Phipps** - And then also in your handouts, you should have further breakdowns that you did see in the PowerPoint as well, but further breakdowns, a summary sheet of each option.

**Mark Keppler** - Can I also explain this? This is a little hard to read. They look the same, but they're not. If you look at the very top of these two things that look very similar. The very first line talks about 2026 Measure C funding allocations by program, then it says, proportional proposal. And the other one says, High Priorities Proposal. So, there's two of these, they look very similar, if you look at them fast, but you gotta look at the top line. Maybe we should have put that in highlight or something to make it clear for you. But these sheets, they're actually different. So, one shows you the numbers when we use the proportional option, the other one shows you the numbers when you guys use the high priorities option. So, why don't you take a moment to look at that so you can take a look and compare the numbers. Just so it's not confusing, you might want to circle proportional at the top of the other one, and circle high priority so you know which one you're looking at. Does anybody need any more time? Alright, so what I'd like to do now, not seeing anyone asking for more time, I'd like to open up now to public comment. I'd like to give 30 minutes for public comment. I'll limit it to 2 minutes per person. You know, we'll try to get as many people in, but if you hear something or follow someone, and they've said what you would have said, you could just say, well, I agree with what Mark said. And so at least we've gotten noted for the record. We don't have to say the same thing over and over and over again, just to expedite things to make sure we get a good understanding of what the audience, the public is concerned about. So, if anybody wants to step up to the mic, to make public comment, we can open up to the floor now.

## Item 5: Public Comment & Break

**Mohamed Alimi - Fresno County Public Works and Planning** - Good afternoon.

Mohamed Alimi with Fresno County Public Works and Planning. Thank you for the opportunity to present my opinion on this expenditure plan. What I just looked at is that the formula that's presented for roads is based on 80% population, 20% road miles. That really puts the county in a bind, and with having the largest road miles in the state. We need more allocation to repair our existing roads, not less and this plan is reducing that. The current expenditure has a 75-25 formula, and we felt even that's not adequate, you know, but increasing the percentage for population-based formula is even worse than what it is right now. Any questions?

## Item 6: General Category Allocations Vote

**Mark Keppler** - Thank you. Anyone else for public comment? Please state your name for the record so we have that. Alright, so I am not hearing any, so I'd like to then turn it back to the committee for questions and answers for the committee. No motion yet on what we're gonna vote on. We're talking right now about if you guys have any questions about any of this, and I think Tina had mentioned, maybe starting from the beginning, if you have questions, kind of work your way through the document. So, that's an organized way to do it, so let's do it that way. So, let's see if anybody has any questions that we can have answered by technical staff.

**Tina Sumner** - Robert, I have a question on the first page, the decision of what to do with that 9%, the proportional allocation proposal, and there's probably some statistical reason, I just need to understand it. A decision was made regarding when you put together the high priorities proposal, that the existing Neighborhood Roads and public transportation were the high priorities. And so, why in distributing that 9%, wasn't that 9% just distributed to the high priorities, rather than distributing it to all of the other categories as well?

**Robert Phipps** - Because the baseline of where this group started, the short answer to that question is that the proportional allocation proposal represents most closely to where this group left off, and following that median approach that was taken in the first place. So, in other words, mathematical consistency. It was kind of the logic. And so, hewing to the categories that were already established. That was the logic. Now, the difference, again, between the two is after the initial numbers were released, we began getting all kinds of input and among the most significant input aside from the, priority issues, was also the flexibility issue, and the need, and the desire for flexibility in spending, and also getting the number of the roads category up. And so, the solution to that, at least one solution, was to collapse the ATP category into roads, because a lot of the projects in the ATP category are road-related. And so, it made a certain degree of logic to do that, and that provided a lot of the flexibility within that roads category. So, in

essence, it got us a couple of different things in one fell swoop. Collapsing the category raised the number for the roads program while also providing much greater flexibility to the jurisdictions, which is what they were asking for after the steering committee had already addressed the question of a specific flexible category unto itself and had chosen not to provide that.

**Mark Keppler** - Can I also add that it's very important. When they say collapsed active transportation roads, it's not the elimination of active transportation.

**Robert Phipps** - No, not the elimination.

**Mark Keppler** - Because now we're focusing on performance metrics. So, it's still going to be done, it's just under the category of roads. So, X number of miles of trails, X number of miles of protected bike lanes, X number of school sites that have safe routes to school, so it's still being addressed. I don't want there to be any confusion that we're dropping that, not at all. And that's going to be discussed in the implementation guidelines, what exactly those performance metrics are going to be.

**Tina Sumner** - But that's kind of not my question. My question is last time we left off with the vote and the medians and the extra 9% that wasn't distributed, we were kind of led to believe, maybe I was the only one that thought that we were going to have an opportunity as the committee to talk about how to distribute that 9%. And now I see that a decision was just made to distribute it evenly between all of the categories, as opposed to the committee having an opportunity to talk about that. And so that's really my question, is there a reason why we're not able to do that. You know, you had said that this whole thing of putting it evenly in each of the categories, is that a statistical requirement that you do that?

**Robert Phipps** - No, it's not a statistical requirement. Again, as I said at the very beginning, there are a million different variations of how that could occur. There's nothing that prevents this committee from starting over, if it wanted to. But the issue is, given the size of the committee, the various interests that are involved, the timing, the amount of time that it takes versus we have, the thought was that framing the issue might be helpful. And so that was the thought process behind...

**Tina Sumner** - So that was a staff decision that was made today?

**Robert Phipps** - More or less, yes. Again, in consultation with a lot of input and stakeholders.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay. I was just trying to understand why the change.

**Robert Phipps** - And we position these as options. They are not recommendations. We're not coming to you recommending either of these or any of these. These are options. We

thought it would help frame the discussion, put them out in front of you. We think that they are, again, parsing through all the input that we've received, which is considerable. There was a lot of discussion if you've been following the board meetings, our committee meetings, you've heard that this has been the talk of the transportation town at least. And so there has been a lot of discussion about this. It's been in the media quite a bit. This, to us, addressed the two major, in particular, the high priorities proposal effectively doubles down, right, on those two areas, and the reason was because that's the input we received.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay.

**Mark Keppler** - Any other questions? Okay, over here.

**Sabina Gonzalez Eraña** - Thank you, Robert. I'm hoping you can just confirm my understanding of the two options that we have. So, the proportional option is basically just the result of an informal, straw poll, like I put my finger up in the air on any given day. And that's the proportional. That's essentially what it is. It's just an informal poll. The second option, the high priorities one, seems more thoughtful, intentional. There was thought put into considering community priorities. There was thought put into the two highest priorities that everyone has identified. And it seems like more time and effort went to doing that, is that right?

**Robert Phipps** - I would not characterize it like that. The proportional retains the mathematical consistency that we used to arrive at the initial vote or poll in the first place. So, the point was that we took very careful steps in the original go-around to use median numbers as the product of that poll, or vote, whatever you want to call it. And so, in order to maintain consistency, the mathematical consistency of that approach, we came up with the idea of using median proportionality to allocate the remaining number, the remaining percentage. And so, it was a mathematically consistent manner of doing it. And so, very objective, right? But it does not necessarily reflect all of the input that we received after the numbers were released.

**Nayamin Martinez** - I just want to chime in. So, before that 9% allocation was done using that, statistical analysis, those allocations came off a poll that was taken, in September?

**Robert Phipps** - It was September 18th.

**Nayamin Martinez** - So it's not like, the poll of the COG data, the transportation poll, it was here, but what is true is that that was in September. That was way before we had the results of the poll that were presented today. That's when we were still trying to understand all the data that was being collected by the different parties. So I think that, you know, in my opinion, it was just based on what we knew at the time. And now, I think where we are is, for me, it's like a no-brainer. It seems like the one that we are seeing today makes much more sense, not only because it really reflects the analysis of the data that has been collected, plus I mean, even just that last table, and thank you, this was

amazing to see it. I mean, if we go with the proportional proposal, we wouldn't be able to achieve the payment condition index, which has been a major point of discussion here, let alone even maintain the public transportation, you know, services, so... But that's what those Results are.

**Larry Westerlund** - Thank you. So, I did have a question. So, I wasn't with the committee when it initially started, and I know you reviewed... I believe you reviewed older poll results. And so, I'm really grateful to have the numbers from the most recent poll in place, because I think that's got to be our guiding light. But expand a little bit on... I want to make sure that the new poll is consistent with the other polling that we have seen historically on this, where 75% or higher on repairing the streets that are in front of people's houses that have been neglected for...

**Robert Phipps** - Right, and so to provide a little bit more context on the polling, it was our intent originally to conduct the... and again, I may not have made this point earlier, when I say statistically valid, statistically valid of likely voters. So, I don't remember if I made that point earlier, but this is likely voters, which is defined as those who have voted in the last two elections consistently. The difference between this and the public outreach that we've done is that this is a random sampling, okay? So that's what defines it as statistically valid, is a completely random sampling of likely voters throughout the county, oversampled in the smaller jurisdictions and unincorporated areas. And yes, broadly speaking, it is consistent with the outreach. In terms of the priorities, it is consistent with the last, probably at least 10 years of data that we have, from multiple surveys that we've done. Not only for the measure, but also for our regional transportation plan, okay? Because we asked very similar questions for the Regional Transportation Plan. We had intended to do this much sooner because it was our original thought that we would have allocations by this point to test. But because we did not, and because the holidays were approaching, and it was going to be much more difficult logistically to get the poll done, we decided to go ahead and test priorities, although we had a suspicion, a very strong suspicion, that we knew what the answers to the priorities were going to be. And that, of course, was affirmed, as you see the results in front of you.

**Mark Keppler** - Can I interrupt for one second? I think Mendota's gonna have a handoff here so, if you could please announce your name for the record, if you would, please.

**Nora Valdez** - Nora Valdez

**Mark Keppler** - That's representing the City of Mendota.

**Tina Sumner** - Robert, so for the bullet points that are under the topic, so, like, under existing neighborhood roads. In both the proportional and the high priority, those are really the same bullet points. In voting for one or the other of the proposals, or of the scenarios, are we also voting for these bullet points as well? Because my two questions about the existing road neighborhood road, bullet points are, number one. How did you come to the

\$400,000 for the small cities? I know that funding... base funding for the small cities has been an important topic, and that... but increasing it by 400% is a big jump, and I'm just wondering, you know, how did you land on that \$400,000?

**Robert Phipps** - Inflation is the short word.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay, so it's based statistically on the difference between \$100 and \$400.

**Robert Phipps** - Well, and the costs of materials, you know, what we've seen, especially in the recent past and what is projected going forward in terms of materials costs, labor, we're accounting for with specific regard to, say, transportation costs, there are variables, okay? There are variables. For example, a mile of road reconstruction in the city of Mendota is more expensive than a mile of reconstruction in the city of Fresno, okay? I'm not sure by a factor of how much, but certainly transportation, labor, plays a role in that, right? Because Mendota is further a field of materials supply than Fresno is. But, broadly speaking, the issue is that the costs are, while there are variations in that cost, are largely the same. So, you know, \$100,000 as a baseline just doesn't make sense in today's world, because it doesn't buy anything for the smaller cities, and yet the expenses are roughly the same or more.

**Tina Sumner** - Yeah, I was just curious why 4? Why not 3 or 6 or 8? You know, what was that decision point?

**Robert Phipps** - Yeah, and the other factor there had to do with that flexibility issue, was it provides room for growth, room for being able to actually do something. So, just to be very clear in both proposals, when we talk about the floor whether it's \$100,000, \$400,000, whatever, that comes off of the top of the allocation, so if you look at the total amount, say, on an annual basis, it comes off of the top, and then the formula kicks in.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay. So, also then, in those same set of bullet points. I'd like to know why are we talking about a 20-80%? When it's been acknowledged that the county, even with the current percentage that we have in this measure, is still a, you know, given the number of road miles, is problematic. And so, what was the decision process in, you know, kind of making that even increasingly difficult.

**Robert Phipps** - And this was also a reflection of discussion at the city level, primarily, in terms of needing more funding on a jurisdictional basis. If you look at the handouts, Fresno County receives, under the high priorities proposal at least, receives over a billion dollars. It does have a smaller share of the population than the city of Fresno, and the road miles, we do understand that that is an issue that historically, the road miles have been split, or the formula has been 75-25. This reflects, you know, a desire on the part of the jurisdictions to see that number changed, and to put more money into the population formula, which does favor the cities. However, there are also discussions that revolve around, minimum expenditures, nothing that has been finalized or even close to that. But

discussions around protected amounts of money for unincorporated communities to ensure that they receive either a percent or a dollar amount on an annual basis from the county share.

**Tina Sumner** - So the bullet points in all of these, are these locked in when we approve, when we recommend the implementation guidelines? Is that where, or are these numbers, the 400,000 floor and the 80-20 split, are these already considered a done deal?

**Robert Phipps** - Well, none of it... again, these are options, so I would say none of it is a quote, done deal. This is what is being proposed based on the input that we've received. And so, I think, conceptually, it is our understanding that, yes. By approving one of these today, you would be including that in the implementation guidelines, but the implementation guidelines, again, as Mark mentioned, there's a lot of details left to be worked out that would have to be addressed in the implementation guidelines.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay, thank you.

**Kay Bertken** - Just a question about the county allocation, again. The percentages are way higher under both proposals for the county, but on an annualized basis, even at the 80-20, are they getting more money or less money? Somehow?

**Robert Phipps** - Oh, yeah, and again, if you look at, we don't have the dollar amounts to compare from the current measure, but you can see in the high priorities scenario, Fresno County, 14.67 for the high priorities versus 9.3.

**Kay Bertken** - Right, right. Okay. I mean, the 80-20 split may lower that, dampen, what it would have been with 75/25, but they are still profiting rather largely, it looks like, by these increased percentages?

**Paul Herman** - Yeah, it would be a significant increase to what the county currently receives on a percentage basis, and as a dollar amount. Their budgets for spending on existing road maintenance would be significantly higher, yes.

Kay Bertken

Okay, that's my assumption. Okay, thank you.

**Lee Delap** - Yeah, a couple of questions here. If we go forward with this formula, so you're going to say to COG, which then goes to the Transportation Authority, then the Board of Supervisors that we agreed to change the long-standing formula that was 75-25? There's a question. And secondly, Under the existing formula, which everybody has been using for the last 39 years. What would be the county's share in dollar amount? Has it gone up or down? Because that wasn't the exact question that was answered, I don't think. I've got more questions after that. So, just deal with those right now.

**Robert Phipps** - I don't have the dollar amount for the current measure, I only have it expressed right now in the percentage terms, but under the high priorities scenario, the county would be receiving over a billion dollars, \$1.085 billion over 30 years.

**Lee Delap** - Yeah, and the question was at 75/25, how much would they get?

**Robert Phipps** - Yeah, and we'll have to get that information.

**Mark Keppler** - Lee, is it alright that Wendy asks a question, we'll come back to you?

**Lee Delap** - Yeah, go ahead. Okay, I got time.

**Wendy Ozburn** - I was just wondering, looking out for Firebaugh for the airports, is that allocated just for commercial, or is that for rural farming, flight line?

**Robert Phipps** - Right now, the only sub-allocation that is proposed is for Fresno Air Terminal.

**Wendy Ozburn** - Thank you.

**Mark Keppler** - Paul just came back in. Paul, Lee had a question for you, so let's follow up on that. He was wondering, do you know the actual dollar amount difference between a 75-25 split for the county versus, under the high priorities proposal, the 80-20 split. What is the exact dollar? We know that's over a billion dollars in the 80-20. Do you know what it is under the 75-25?

**Paul Herman** - I don't have it at the top of my head, but I can run that right now during the meeting and provide that number for the group. I can do that.

**Mark Keppler** - Any other questions, Lee?

**Lee Delap** - Yes, I do have other questions.

**Mark Keppler** - Paul, you better stay here. Lee may have other questions he wants you to calculate.

**Robert Phipps** - To clarify the request, is the 70... are you asking to compare 80-20 versus 75-25 under the high priorities, or are you asking under the current measure?

**Lee Delap** - Well, the current measure is 75-25.

**Mark Keppler** - Yes, under high priorities, what is the difference between 75-25 versus 80-20?

**Lee Delap** - But the formula is the same for the proportional and high priority proposal. Both are 80-20.

**Robert Phipps** - Yes, that's correct.

**Lee Delap** - And, in 2022 when the split was changed at the last minute, before it went to the Board of Supervisors, that was only a 3% shift, and this is a 5% shift.

**Mark Keppler** - It was 78-22 in 2022, right?

**Lee Delap** - That is correct. And we covered that previously, so that's even more of a shift. So, then the question that comes to mind for me is who actually has agreed to that. And I've heard Robert say the city, but we have 15 cities in the county. That's a plural. And was the county part of that? Because they're the ones that gives the most ground, potentially, but we're waiting to see the number.

**Mark Keppler** - I want to just reiterate, this is a recommendation, exactly what Lee said. Your recommendation is going to the policy board. They have the right to do what they're going to do with this recommendation and then et cetera as it goes up the different boards and policies. So, in that sense, I guess you could suppose that number is not static, it could change. This is a recommendation coming out of this committee, based on these numbers. So, that was a separate discussion or issue that this committee did not address, but we need to have some baseline to develop some numbers for the group.

**Lee Delap** - And then, you want to go to the next questions, or should we answer those first?

**Mark Keppler** - While Paul's getting the numbers, let's continue on. Do you have any other...

**Lee Delap** - Okay, under the current proposal for roads, the allocation's about 67%. So, under the proportional proposal that would rise to 68... Yes. 57 plus 11 is 68, the way I add.

**Mark Keppler** - It's about 68 versus 70%. It's 70% under the high priorities proposal, if you add regional and local roads, and it's 68...

**Lee Delap** - And then under the high priorities proposal it comes up to 70. Okay, which I've been advised by the County of Fresno who I interface with, they would like a minimum of 70% to go for roads. So, the high priorities proposal does that on the surface, but at the same time, we shift active transportation into that percentage, which then reduces the actual buying power. So, the only person that really gains, the group that really gains is public transportation, and they gain 6%.

**Mark Keppler** - I want to caution you on a few things. Number one, this is a weighting of many different interests. Number two, in terms of active transportation there are federal and state dollars. If you have a performance metric, let's say 3 miles of trails, it doesn't have to come out of Measure C. You have to perform the metric, you have to perform that number. You could get that from state and federal. That means you don't touch Measure C money for trails, you use that for roads. So, that's not quite accurate to say that because active transportation is in roads, that it's going to result in less money for roads. What it does is encourage the county, for example, to go out and get grants, or federal and state dollars, to take care of that active transportation?

**Lee Delap** - I understand, but the statement was also made that active transportation was being folded into neighborhood roads. Was it not? Yes, it was.

**Mark Keppler** - Yes, but there's funding for that. It doesn't have to be Measure C dollars. The goal is the metric.

**Lee Delap** - No, I understand. So, the 70% level under the high priority proposal does satisfy the county's minimum request on the surface. And the Board of Supervisors, those 5 people, are gonna have to approve this measure.

**Mark Keppler** - I think Paul has the numbers.

**Paul Herman** - Okay. So, the difference between the 75-25 and the 80-20 split is over 30 years, \$70 million, for the Fresno County share. And dividing that by 30, it's about \$2.3 million annually averaged over 30 years less.

**Kay Bertken** - Well, it's more of a statement than a question. The whole idea of folding the active transportation into the roads, I just think is just brilliant. From the very beginning, whoever it was that was representing the bike coalition talked about "Well, that's roads. You know, the trails are roads, the sidewalks are roads, you know, the buses travel on roads". So, the whole idea of, and safe routes to schools, that's Roads and sidewalks, and if we really are committed to whole streets, the total street concept, the complete street concept, with sidewalks and lights and all the things that streets need, I just think that's a great idea.

**Larry Westerlund** - Yeah, thank you very much, and I appreciate everybody's questions and thoughts on it. I had a chance to go out to Cantua Creek today, and Three Rocks. And Three Rocks just got, the little neighborhood that is Three Rocks, just got new roads. And it probably hasn't had new roads in, I don't know, 50 years, probably? 60 years? Cantua Creek needs some new roads, but I really appreciate the county's work out there, and I think they've got some **ARA** dollars, to do that. So, and with the idea that the guideposts being what the voters will actually approve. And Lee, your comments about the minimum of 70%, I'd prefer there be more dollars for the streets, because that's what I heard most when I was active in politics. But I think as a whole, the high priorities proposal is a

working, good compromise on that, so I'd like to go ahead and make a motion to approve the high priorities proposal.

**Mark Keppler** - Before we do that, though, I want to make sure everybody has a chance to ask questions. I want to give people... I appreciate the enthusiasm, but let's go around...

**Larry Westerlund** - Well, could you come back to me once we're done with...

**Mark Keppler** - Absolutely, absolutely. You have first dibs on making the motion. Thank you.

**Sabina Gonzalez Eraña** - It's more of a procedural question. Should I wait? Is it about voting? Should I wait until people...

**Mark Keppler** - Yes, let's answer the questions on these proposals first, please.

**Mona Cummings** - I'd like to say something, specifically about trails. Because obviously with the current transportation tax, we have a total of 4.0 percentage split between, trails is 3.1%, 0.9% for bike facilities. I don't want to lose sight of trails within this. Like, I'm very supportive of it being actually part of roads. I think it is a really good move. It maintains that flexibility for the smaller cities to be able to utilize that funding for what they choose, which they were already doing, under the Active Transportation. But understanding that in the guidelines and in the outcomes of what's really great about this, right? So here, in comparison of key issues, we don't have that as an advantage even listed here. I think it is an advantage, and I think, utilizing funding in the way that we're both very understanding that there typically is funding to actually expand trails. It doesn't matter where the funding comes from, whether it comes from Measure C or this, but it obligates the communities to do something for their community members who need trails. And I think the future sees more trails and connectivity as part of the big picture. So, and I was a little, I will say, a little disappointed in the survey that there's not even a question about trails. So, I see the safe, you know, safe routes to school, and, you know, who doesn't agree with that? But just asking the public because often they say that trails are a priority.

**Lino Mendes** - So, as to that questionnaire for some reason, I was one of the ones that got picked to be part of that questionnaire, and it did address trails in the questionnaire, it did. Apparently, it wasn't a high priority for the questionnaires, it wasn't brought up, but there's also a lot more... right, Robert? There's a lot more to that thing that he hit the high parts. So it was addressed in that questionnaire, I can attest to that.

**Mark Keppler** - I'm gonna go back to people who already asked the question, but let's get people who haven't asked the question. Chuck, go ahead.

**Chuck Yeadon** - I don't know if this is the time and place to ask this question, but the subject of airports came up. We're one of the small communities that actually do have a city-ran airport, and are any of these funds available for our airport?

**Robert Phipps** - At this time, the only sub-allocation that has been discussed is for the Fresno airport. That can be further negotiated, again this is not the end of the line, this is only the first half. And this recommendation is subject to further discussion and negotiation at the policy board, but...

**Mark Keppler** - In addition, just let me follow up on that. The implementation guidelines, that could be addressed in the implementation guidelines.

**Robert Phipps** - Potentially, yes.

**Mark Keppler** - Go around the table here. Anybody, any questions over here? Around here, Tina, we'll get to you, and we'll get to Lee. Anybody else? Okay, Tina, go ahead.

**Tina Sumner** - So Robert, kind of based on what Mona said and some of the other questions about the implementation guidelines, then. Having bike facilities, cycling facilities, whether it's trails, or bike lanes or safe routes to schools, depends on the implementation guidelines. What is the process for those implementation guidelines to come to be. So that we make sure, it's critical then, if active transportation is going to be eliminated as a category on its own, it's critical that those implementation guidelines fully address it, and so I'm wondering, how are we going to do that?

**Robert Phipps** - Right, that's a great question, thank you for asking it. So, the process that we've conceived, very much like the way that the high priorities proposal was developed, is absolutely hearing you, hearing the concerns, specifically over trails and bicycle pedestrian facilities. We're taking this input in. We would be drafting guidelines that would be brought back to this committee. If we get a vote today, we probably would not see you for at least a couple of weeks, but we would be in communication with you. And we would be providing you with drafts, hopefully, at least by the time of the next agenda you would have a draft of the guidelines that you would be marking up. And then, this will probably push us into December at this point. But at least two whacks at the implementation guidelines. Before it gets back to...

**Mark Keppler** - Specifically to your question performance metrics, number of miles, that is going to be implementation guidelines, that's something that has to be negotiated or agreed to by 70%, whatever that number is, has to be agreed to by 70% of the committee. But yes, specifically a number.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay.

**Robert Phipps** - But again, there's gonna be a lot of people with a lot of opinions on all of these issues, right? It's trails, bicycle facilities is a big one, no doubt, public transportation. As Mark mentioned, there are metrics that are going to be desired for many aspects of the measure, and so we're going to have to look at all of those and try and address as many as we possibly can within the confines of what is capable of being tracked and reported accurately.

**Lee Delap** - Yeah, I was curious if the Payment Condition Index had been projected for both of the proposals. Yeah, that's on the table page that you have. So, we don't express it as... actually, on mine it does. For PCI, does it achieve 70 PCI? But not for proportional. Right. This is the table page.

**Mark Keppler** - And if you will recall, there's another...

**Robert Phipps** - I actually have two versions, but I think the one you have may express it as achieves good Pavement Condition Index Countywide that equates to 70.

**Mark Keppler** - I have a summary of all the PowerPoint slides of all the presentations, and somewhere in these notes, I remember there was the graph that said if you give 60% of the money to roads, it'll get to 70 PCI, and if you give 70%, it'll only get to 72 PCI, and... remember that chart? So that... yes. And so that's why they came up with the answer, is yes, it does get to 70 PCI under high priorities, it does not get there under proportional.

**Artie Padilla** - So, it sounds like Mark said at the beginning, the implementation guidelines is really important. We're gonna be talking about the airports question, trails. Would the splits be in that conversation, too? The 80-20, 70-20? Would that...

**Robert Phipps** - Yes, absolutely.

**Artie Padilla** - What else are we looking at?

**Robert Phipps** - Well, again, where we think the emphasis is going to be is on the metrics. What are the metrics associated?

**Mark Keppler** - I think I'd have to disagree with you, Robert. I think that we're going forward with 80-20, and if the COG Policy Board or something else, if that changes, that's a recommendation from this group. That could change. We didn't really address that issue. We needed that number, those numbers, to come up with a calculation. That's a separate conversation. But the implementation guidelines are going to have specific metrics on trails, on safe routes to schools, that's the intent. On a variety of things. All right. Any other questions?

**Greg Garcia** - I just want to thank everybody for increasing the Existing neighborhood roads number from the current by more than 20% in both proposals. That was kind of my priority when I got here, and I'm really happy with it.

**Karen Musson** - I'm sorry, I don't think Mona's point was as received as she intended, so I'm going to try. I believe the high priorities proposal looks really great, but what it does is it actually reduces the number of roads, because it includes active. Which was her point, that trails are important. So if you want trails included. You're putting it under pressure of the highest priority of item, which is roads. Even in your survey, roads always comes to the top. It's the highest rated thing. Better roads, more, you know. Better condition of roads, safer roads, roads, roads, roads. So while it looks like, under the high priority, you're giving 65% to existing roads, you're actually not. You're only giving 60. So, for 70, you're only giving 65%.

**Mark Keppler** - That's actually not quite accurate, because as I just said, you can get that money for trails from other sources. You don't have to use Measure C money, as long as... if I could finish.

**Karen Musson** - Because I had a long conversation earlier today about that. And it's subject to the cities coming up with the matching money, so the roads can... the trails can be built, but they can't be maintained. Measure C does give them a small portion that's not available any other place, so...

**Mark Keppler** - Can I also suggest, that's also in the implementation guidelines. You can decide, for example, the performance metric could be a lower number of miles of trails. So, that's also up for negotiations. Your very point. Whether it's 1 mile, or 2 miles, or 3 miles, whatever it is, right? That affects the number.

**Karen Musson** - Well, I'd just like to see a higher proportion for roads, particularly if it's going to include active trails, okay? So, to me, the 70 doesn't make it for me. It'd have to be 75 to have it address the trail needs.

**Nayamin Martinez** - Well, even if we take the 4% that we're thinking on for active transportation, that still gives you 61% just for roads, versus the proportional that it was giving you, 57. So, I think that, you know, yes, that was a priority, but there are two top priorities. And it's not only... roads is the number one, but it's not the only one.

**Karen Musson** - Can I answer that? Can I repeat what's been said a hundred times, and that is... They want 70% to go to roads, so the more you erode away that number, the... Well, the Board of Supervisors says the threshold is 70 for roads. That's what they are asking. And they've made it very vocal.

**Mark Keppler** - Okay, would anybody else want to make a comment?

**Espi Sandoval** - You know I just want to make a comment about, everything here. I really liked roads, because, you know, personally, I'm from the west side of Fresno County, and we've been forgotten for years. Look at the city at 715 PCI, it's like, 25%. You know, and I'm looking at these numbers here, this is great. We're actually looking... you were in Cantua, that's my hometown. And Three Rocks, you know, that's where I grew up in Tranquility, in that area. We're neglected over there, and I'm looking at this, this is really good, you know, compared to what we were getting before, and then I'm looking at the voters, because I'm going to push this Measure C, if we all come to the consensus of the right thing to do. Because at the end, the voters are the ones who are going to decide. And if we form a coalition and come up with a plan like this, the next step is not gonna be the supervisor, it's gonna be the voters, you know, that are going to decide. So we have to understand that we have to be all together. If we're not all together, it's not gonna pass, and we need it. So, I'm looking at... this is really great for all our communities, rural communities.

**Mona Cummings** - Yeah, and I want to add what you mentioned before, because on the existing Measure C, there's a significant amount of funding that goes to the rural areas for the rural cities that it's actually used for sidewalks and roads. And that's within active transportation. So, otherwise, I probably wouldn't be such a huge fan of it, but I think it's nice and rolled in here to where we can set a number of miles, and we do know, there's consistently funding out there for, to be able to secure for expansion of trails.

**Mark Keppler** - I had no idea trails were so popular. Anything else? Any other comments?

**Veronica Garibay** - No, I think I have more just comments. We've heard a lot about the importance of the implementing guidelines moving forward, and how that will be critical and require everyone's watchful eye. So please, I would urge everyone to engage with staff and others moving forward to make sure that the implementing guidelines sort of align with the vision that we have discussed here, with what we've heard from community input, and what the recent poll results showed. And we talked a lot about metrics for trails, bike, safe routes, you know, incorporating that in the existing roads. You know, there's important metrics that will go to all categories, but I'd also like to talk about other important, components that I expect to see in the implementing guidelines from discussions at this committee, which included the importance of fixing the worst first, making sure that communities that have been neglected for a long time see investment in their neighborhood and their community. Larry, I'm glad you were out in Cantua. The money actually came from the state and federal dollars, 2 million from the state, two from the feds to see that happen. So that'll be important. We've also talked about containing sprawl and growth, and making sure that this version of the measure really benefits existing communities that have been paying into this measure since 86' and have not seen the benefits of that. So, I just wanted to make that comment and really appreciate everyone's work. Thank you.

**Mark Keppler** - Am I missing someone? Okay, go ahead, Larry.

**Larry Westerlund** - Can I make a motion now? I'm thinking I'm gonna go ahead Mark, and make a motion. Yeah, I would like to go home at some point here.

**Mark Keppler** - Go ahead, make your motion.


**Larry Westerlund** - I've got to go out to Mendota tonight.

**Mark Keppler** - Hey, that's a positive. I've been out there, it's nice.

**Larry Westerlund** - I'd like to make a motion that we approve the high priorities proposal, with the bullet points as listed, and I'd make that motion and see if there was a second.

**Nayamin Martinez** - second.

**Mark Keppler** - Do we need a second second? I think I'd said that.

 **Chuck Riojas** - Just in case, I'll do it. Yes.

**Mark Keppler** - Here we go, we got Chuck. And Sabina, so that was Plenty of them. Okay, with that, I think we'll do is, we'll do a roll call of the people that are steering committee members that are in attendance. And then we can take the vote and just say, read in the names and say yes or no to the high priorities proposal, okay?

**Lee Delap** - Was there gonna be any discussion on the motion?

**Mark Keppler** - We could have discussion on the motion, yes. Do you want to have a discussion?

**Lee Delap** - Larry, does that include the 80-20 formula?

**Larry Westerlund** - Yes, it does, it does. As written, so...

**Mark Keppler** - All right, now, do the roll call, please, and people can express their vote.

**Artie Padilla** - And I'd like to note that, that yes is also dependent on the performance metrics that are... we build out in the implementation plan.

**Denise Flores** - So the majority passes... That's about 93%.

**Mark Keppler** - All right, congratulations, everyone. That was a very, very big milestone, so thank you very much. I think we'll take a 5-minute break. All right.

## **Motion Summary**

Motion to approve the High Priorities proposal, including the bullet points as presented.

**Motion made by:** Larry Westerlund  
**Seconded by:** Nayamin Martinez  
**Second Seconded by:** Chuck Riojas

**Vote:** Yes – 28, No – 2 (Dissenting: Karen Musson, Lee Delap)

**Outcome:** Motion passes

**Steering Committee takes an intermission.**

## **Item 7: Next Steps**

**Mark Keppler** - Okay, guys, can we reconvene here first? Can we reconvene? That was a little more than 5 minutes. I've got a present for you, the most valuable present a person can give you. Time. So, here's the deal. We're not going to meet next week, because staff need to kind of put together some implementation guidelines. Our next meeting will be on the 19th. And we'll start discussing implementation guidelines. This is going to be an iterative process. One of the things I think you can do, to assist staff, I would encourage you to send them some ideas as they put this together. You can take a look at existing polls that are out there in different counties and give them some ideas so they can start to work at putting this together. So, we're going to, after Robert makes a comment I think, we're going to end the meeting today. We will reconvene on the 19th. And we're going to give, the COGS staff... you might want to mention, Robert, when you think you might have the first iteration of the draft guidelines.

**Robert Phipps** - What we're going to commit to, so the caveat to this, of course, is it does have to undergo legal review. We do have attorneys now, effectively on retainer. Or at least under contract, expressly for that purpose. We will be working feverishly over the next couple of weeks to put out a first draft, please be patient and gentle with us. It will be a first draft. It's not going to capture everything. We already know that. We are also very cognizant that you have provided considerable input to date. If you'll recall, there was an exercise earlier, part of a homework assignment where we asked you to send us your thoughts on implementation guidelines, at least kind of an initial cut at that. By all means, we welcome additional comments on that. The Lord knows we'll be getting plenty of input on that, because that is the next step. Again, through this iterative process, just as we did with the high priorities proposal, we expect to hear from a lot of stakeholders on this, okay? So, we're going to do our best to cobble something together by Monday, what would that be, the 16th? Yes, so the point at which we send out the agenda, we would also attach the draft guidelines to that. We will get as far as we can, that's all I commit to you, is we will get as far as we can by that point, so that you have an opportunity to review it. Also, to point out, these are guidelines it will be followed, upon passage of the measure. It will be followed by a considerably larger implementation plan. Now, that will probably require consultants to help us draft that, because that goes into minute detail. Guidelines versus an implementation plan. And so, like I say, just be patient with us. It will be a

slightly iterative process, two bites at the apple. We expect to have a special meeting in December for the policy board to adopt the entire package, but we will be bringing this recommendation today to them in November this month, for their consideration and hopefully approval. So, thank you again, thank you for your fortitude. Because of the holiday, we're having to push the board meeting up, so it'll be November 20th, is the board meeting.

**Mark Keppler** - But we are meeting as a steering committee on November 19th. And so, remember, guidelines now are an iterative process. You can use emails, and I would suggest you do. I think you have emails about other committee members if you want to share that, or if you just want to send them to the COG staff. But this is an iterative process, so as you see things that you want the COGS staff to consider, send the emails. We don't have to meet; you can send the emails as they work this out. I want you to give them all your comments and help draft the implementation guidelines. Now, I understand there's one person that wants to make a public comment, and since it's on the agenda, we should do that. Is that person here? And if you could just state your name for the record at the podium, please?

**Laura Gromis - USGBC Central California** - Yeah, hi, Laura Gromis. I'm leading the U.S. Green Building Council at Central California. I'm also the chair of the Active Transportation Advisory Committee in the City of Fresno. I'm also on a lot of other boards, chair, committees for COG, the county, the city, a lot of them transportation-related or sustainability-related. I wanted to comment on an item that you guys discussed a couple of meetings ago, and I'm sorry, I joined the RTP committee before there was recruitment for this committee, so, you all deal with a lot of interesting things, but one of the things was the composition of the oversight committee. And I've... you hear me? I wasn't born here, but I've been a member of this community for 17 years. I'm still representing the 21.3% of residents in the county of Fresno that are not citizens, and yeah. My engagement speaks for itself, and I really hope that there is an agreement that residents can serve on the Oversight Committee, and that more than 20% of the population is not excluded from that chance. Residents, they pay their taxes, they go to schools here, plenty of them are legal, so I'm a legal immigrant, there's plenty of legal immigrants, and legal immigrants should have the chance to provide input on decisions made, money spent, in the areas that they live in. So, I hope that you're not bogged down by all this discussion about immigration and status and all these different things. Legal immigration is real. We are a nation of immigrants. If you talk about centuries ago, right, there's I don't know if there's anybody whose people are buried here in the ground centuries ago, maybe some are, which is great, but we are a nation of immigrants and let that be reflected in Measure C in the new iteration of it. Thank you so much.

**Mark Keppler** - Actually, and you also make a very good point that I should also stress. The Oversight Committee is also part of the implementation guidelines, so when you're thinking about the guidelines, you should be thinking about the Oversight Committee and their responsibilities and composition as well, so thank you.

**Tina Sumner** - Mark, I have one question before we leave. What is the expect... what is the COG and your expectation of the committee for that meeting on the 19th. What do you expect to happen at that meeting?

**Mark Keppler** - Well, I would expect that COG will have produced draft implementation guidelines. I don't know if it'll be the entirety of it, but I would expect the vast majority. And then there's going to be a conversation among the steering committee, how do you feel about this? Does this need to be tweaked? What's important? We'll maybe take some votes, see what's really important. If one person has a problem, maybe that's not as big a problem as if 20 people have a problem with something, so we'll just... it'll be a conversation by the steering committee about the implementation guidelines. I will expect you to have read those draft implementation guidelines, that you'll have comments to make, and see how other members of the steering committee, as we get together, how we feel collectively, how you feel collectively as a group.

**Tina Sumner** - Okay, thanks.

**Mark Keppler** - With that, meeting adjourned.