



CITIZEN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Measure C Citizen Oversight Committee Meeting Action Summary

Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026

Time: 5:00 PM

Place: COG Ash Conference Room
2035 Tulare St., Suite 201, Fresno, CA

Members Present:

Donna Silva, Public-at-Large

Gail Miller, WTS

Luisa Medina, League of Women Voters

Louis Herrera, Public-at-Large

Ali Nekumanesh, Public-at-Large

Eddie Hunsaker, Public-at-Large

David Martin, Public-at-Large

Members Absent:

Shannon Avilla, First Steps Recovery

Others Attending:

Denise DiBenedetto, FCTA

Moses Stites, FCTA

Julie P. Saldivar, Fresno COG

Robert Phipps, Fresno COG

Jake Martinez, Fresno COG

Jake Martinez called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

I. Presentations

About Presentations:

This portion of the meeting was reserved for persons wishing to address the Committee on items within its jurisdiction but not on this agenda.

Note: Prior to action by the Committee on any item on this agenda, the public may comment on that item. Unscheduled comments may be limited to 3 minutes.

II. Minutes for October 2, 2025, Measure C Citizen Oversight Committee Meeting

A motion was made by Donna Silva and seconded by Luisa Medina to approve the October 2, 2025, Measure C Citizen Oversight Committee minutes. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

III. Measure C COC Local Agency Budget Form review for FY25-26 [Jake Martinez]

Denise DiBenedetto reported on this item. The Citizens Oversight Committee (COC) annually requires all local agencies that receive Measure C local transportation pass-through funds to submit budget forms outlining how they plan to use their current year's allocations. For this cycle, forms were submitted by several jurisdictions, including Clovis, Fowler, Fresno, Kerman, Mendota, Parlier, San Joaquin, Selma, Fresno County, Fresno COG, and FCRTA. However, Firebaugh, Huron, and Orange Cove have not yet submitted their required budgets despite repeated outreach.

During the meeting, members asked about carryover funds and Ms. DiBenedetto clarified that agencies may accumulate funds for up to five years, must spend the first five years' allocations by year ten, and that small agencies with limited funding may receive flexibility. All agencies are currently considered in compliance, and any reserve funds shown have been reviewed and accepted by the Fresno County Transportation Authority.

Moses Stites adds that sub-recipients often receive state or federal funds with shorter spending deadlines—typically requiring use within 12 to 18 months—so those funds must be used first to avoid returning them, while Measure C funds allow for a longer expenditure window. As a result, organizations prioritize spending state and federal dollars before drawing on Measure C or other sources. He also noted that these funding pots are sometimes small and may take years to accumulate enough for a full project, making the short timelines on state and federal grants a critical factor in planning.

The committee also discussed how Fresno County and larger cities generally use automated pavement-condition systems to rank and prioritize road segments for rehabilitation, resurfacing, and safety improvements, though staff can adjust priorities based on factors like accident history. The county is currently working on about 57 miles of roads in unincorporated areas, with Biola and the West Park area noted as recent examples. Residents can request road evaluations directly, and the county also gathers feedback through public surveys. It was also noted that smaller communities often depend on state and federal funds with strict deadlines, requiring them to use those dollars first and sometimes seek extensions because they may not yet have enough local funds—often Measure C revenue—to fully match or leverage federal grants.

A motion was made by David Martin and seconded by Louis Herrera to approve the LABFs as presented. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

IV. A Local Transportation Pass-Through Projects and Programs and Short-Term Regional Transportation Program Annual Reporting Requirements and Submittals for Measure C Extension FY 2024/25 Funds

Denise DiBenedetto reported on this item. Most FY 2024–25 expenditure reports have been received, except for Orange Cove, which was granted an extension but has still missed the revised deadline. Several audit reports remain incomplete, and any unresolved issues with submitted forms are noted. The committee discussed how Measure C allocations differ among jurisdictions: larger cities typically receive more in street-maintenance funds, while smaller agencies often see more in

flexible funds because they are not required to allocate money to bike and pedestrian facilities. In some jurisdictions, these two funding types may appear similar, depending on population and road-mile factors. It was confirmed that any reports not included in the current meeting's packet will be presented at the next meeting.

A motion was made by Louis Herrera and seconded by Donna Silva to approve the Measure C Extension Expenditure Report(s) for the fiscal year 2024-25. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

V. Measure C Extension Local Agency Audits

Denise DiBenedetto reported on this item. The committee received the status of local agency audits, and it was noted that the only audit included in the current packet is the City of Fresno's FY 2023–24 audit. Several agencies remain behind: for FY 2022–23, Huron and Orange Cove are delinquent, and for FY 2023–24, Huron, Orange Cove, San Joaquin, and Sanger are still pending. Ms. DiBenedetto explained that letters will be sent informing agencies that if audits are not submitted within the allotted timeframe, their Measure C funds will be withheld—an accountability measure previously approved by the committee and the board. While these agencies were not considered late under prior standards, they are now classified as late under the updated guideline, and FY 2024–25 audits are beginning. Delays are largely due to agencies not completing their required citywide (single agency) audits, which must align with the separate Measure C financial statement audit. Cities must complete both audits to remain compliant and continue receiving funds.

A motion was made to unanimously approve the Local Agency Audit Reports. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

VI. Measure C Renewal Update from Staff and sitting member(s)

Robert Phipps, Executive Director of Fresno COG, reported on this item. The board voted 9–3 to stop all further activity on Measure C after the Fresno County Board of Supervisors declined to place the measure on its agenda, signaling continued opposition. Under state law, Measure C required both approval from the Board of Supervisors and approval from a majority of cities representing a majority of the population. Because county approval is mandatory, board members concluded the process could not move forward. Many viewed the county's refusal to agendaize the item as a delay tactic rather than a good-faith request for additional city support, given the county's year-long public opposition to the measure. As a result, the existing Measure C process was effectively ended.

The county's opposition stemmed largely from concerns that Measure C was overly city-centric. Changes to funding formulas favored population over road miles, benefiting cities—particularly the City of Fresno—while reducing the county's relative share and flexibility. Additionally, the implementing guidelines were highly prescriptive, placing strict limits on how funds could be used. While the county would have received more total funding over time in absolute dollars, formula changes and spending restrictions meant it would effectively lose control and leverage over how

those funds were spent. These issues, combined with disagreements over collaboration, allocations, and trust in the process, led to an impasse.

Although there was discussion about renegotiating the measure, those efforts were viewed as coming too late due to ballot deadlines and the risk that renegotiation would require cities, especially Fresno, to give up funding with no guarantee of county support. With time running out, the board determined there was no viable path forward. Measure C, as structured, is now legally over. Any future effort would likely take the form of a citizen-led initiative, which would require signature gathering and voter approval under a lower threshold but would be legally distinct from Measure C. If no alternative measure succeeds, the region faces the loss of transportation funding, elimination of regional projects, potential layoffs, reduced contracting, and broader negative impacts on transportation services throughout Fresno County.

Action: This is an information item. No action is needed from the Oversight Committee.

VII. Items from Members

- A. The committee inquired about the Annual Report. Ms. Avila was not present to provide a status update; however, it is believed the report is finalized. Mr. Martinez will follow up.
- B. Several committee members indicated they will be unavailable for the February 5th meeting.
- C. The committee discussed concerns regarding member attendance and continuity, noting that some members have not been regularly attending meetings. Members reviewed the existing attendance policy, which allows for potential removal after three consecutive missed meetings, though it has not been consistently enforced. The discussion emphasized the need to formally re-present the policy at a future meeting, improve attendance tracking, and ensure accountability, particularly given the compensation and representative responsibilities associated with committee service. Members also acknowledged challenges in enforcement due to the committee not being required to meet more than once annually, despite choosing to meet more frequently. The committee agreed to further evaluate meeting frequency, identify critical meetings requiring attendance (such as plan approvals, audits, and budget matters), and consider potential changes to enforcement, scheduling, or meeting times at a future meeting.

Action: This is an information item. No action is needed from the Oversight Committee.

VIII. Items from Staff

A. Upcoming 2026 COC meeting dates – please reserve these dates from 5-7:00 pm

- February 5
- March 5
- April 2
- May 7

- June 4
- July 2
- August 6
- September 3
- October 1
- November 5
- December 3

A motion was made by Luisa Medina and seconded by Donna Silva to approve the upcoming 2026 COC meeting dates. A vote was called for and the motion carried with corrections.

B. Items for the next agenda

The committee discussed the importance of continuity and suggested adding a Vice Chair role for future consideration. Members raised questions about the existing attendance policy, which allows for potential removal after three consecutive missed meetings, though it has not been enforced. They emphasized the need to re-present the policy at a future meeting, renew awareness among members, and improve attendance tracking. Challenges with enforcement were acknowledged, as the committee is only required to meet once annually but has chosen to meet more frequently. Members noted that, despite this, they have accepted compensation and representative responsibilities, reinforcing the need for accountability. The committee agreed to review which meetings are essential—such as those involving plan approvals, audits, and budget matters—and to revisit meeting frequency, possible policy changes, and adjustments to meeting dates or times at a future meeting.

C. Upcoming Meetings/Events of other related Boards/Committees

February

- Fresno COG Transportation Technical Committee – Friday, February 13, at 8:30 AM in-person at Fresno Council of Governments Sequoia Conference Room
- Fresno COG Policy Advisory Committee – Friday, February 13, at 10:00 AM in-person at Fresno Council of Governments Sequoia Conference Room
- Fresno COG Policy Board – Thursday, February 26, at 5:30 PM in-person at Fresno Council of Governments Sequoia Conference Room

Adjourned

Meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.