

MEASURE C STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES

JULY 30, 2025

Welcome and Introductions

- Motion to approve revisions of July 17 meeting minutes: Made by Chuck Yeadon (City Coalinga)
- Motion seconded by: Nicholas Paladino (Fresno Cycling Club)
- No one opposed it.

Review of Vision, Values, and Priorities

- Committee members were asked to take a look at two proposed draft vision statements based on the discussion from July 17 and provide feedback.
 - Draft Vision Statement – Alternative 1: Measure C supports a reliable, safe, and connected infrastructure system that enables all residents to travel efficiently and safely, regardless of transportation mode.
 - Draft Vision Statement – Alternative 2: Measure C envisions safe, well-maintained roads and equitable, connected future ready transportation system that advances job creation, community health, and equitable access for all.
- **Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN):** Likes the second option better. However, she prefers some of the wording from the first version because the second one is limiting us to roads. She believes the concept we are trying to bring forward is a multi-system of infrastructure for transportation, not only roads. But the second one is stronger because it includes the word “equitable”, that being a core aspect of the vision.
- **Kendall:** Let me ask you this because it did come up in conversation: The original version of the revision was adding “connected, future ready, multi modal transportation system” because multi modal is normally how people refer to bike and pedestrian and alternative modes – would that do it for you or, do you have other thoughts?
- **Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN):** I think that would do it for me.
- **Kendall:** Okay. Other comments, questions, concerns?
- **Lino Mendes (City of Fowler):** Prefers the second option because it’s well encompassing. The purpose of it is our vision now, the readiness of our transportation system now. We don’t know what the future is going to have, we need to prepare for it, but we need to focus on maintaining what we have now, and the

second one creates that. The business are going to expand if people have ways to get to them and people are going to come to the area if they have a way in and out. So I think the second vision statement is all-encompassing of that.

- **Nicholas Paladino (Fresno Cycling Club):** Agrees with Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN). He dislikes that the the second version only focuses on well-maintained roads. We need to have a multimodal aspect. This is going to be a 20 to 30 year measure. We need to move away from the combustion engine and provide people in the future a choice of other options. So, if we change the second option to get away from focusing only on well-maintained streets and roads and revise it to include a multimodal system. I like the equitable and safe wording.
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** Prefers option one. Less is more for me. The first option encompasses everything. We understand that roads is going to be a priority. You could say “regardless of transportation mode” is the same thing as saying multimodal. Version one is succinct. It captures it.
- **Kendall:** At this point in the meeting, quick show of hands, who prefers option one?
 - 12 preferred option one.
- **Gail Miller (Citizens Oversight Committee):** Having written many environmental documents in my career along with other reports and working on RTPs, less is more, keeping it succinct. Infrastructure is all-encompassing. We don’t have to spell all that out, it’ll come.
- **Kendall:** Just for a count, how many of you prefer option 2?
 - 9 prefer option 2.
- **Kendall:** Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno), why don’t you make the best case that you can for Option 1 and we’ll have one of the folks for Option 2 make their best case?
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** Before doing that, Mark mentioned something briefly about something facilitation researches call the “groan zone.” That’s when we all have our diverging interests and we sort of figure out where we are in disagreement. We are now entering the “groan zone” and we have to be comfortable with that disagreement. Keep these things in mind. Number one is, always assume the best of people who are making proposals. Their intent, whether we agree or disagree, the intent is the same, and that is to make the community a better place. The second is try to understand people you don’t agree with. Ask questions. As we work through the groan we will see some convergence and overlapping interests and we can start agreeing on things. Encourage you to be comfortable with the discomfort and disagreement as we move to the process.

- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** I don't think I could have said it better than I said it originally and that is shorter is better. It's succinct, it's to the point, it's all-encompassing, it covers multimodal as far as I'm concerned, says regardless of transportation mode. That covers it for me. We shouldn't get caught up in the details of some general comments, there's bigger fish to fry down the line. Thank you.
- **Kendall:** Would anyone be drastically disappointed or opposed if we went with option number one?
 - Two out of thirty two still oppose.
- **Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN):** For me, I cannot agree with Option 1 if we don't include the term "equity" or "equitable." That's a bottom line for me because if we see the transportation that we have now, it's the opposite of that and if we don't include it in our mission, then we're failing.
- **Kendall:** So if we add that to Option 1 to say, "Measure C supports a reliable, safe, *equitable*, and connected infrastructure..." and actually put that word back in, would that suffice for you (Nayamin Martinez)?
 - Nayamin nodded her head in agreement
- **Kendall:** What about for you, Lee (Fresno County)?
- **Lee Delap (Fresno County):** Generally, I agree that less is better but, there's nothing like telling people what you're really doing. Most of the Measure is for roads than it is for transportation. And not everybody that reads this statement [Option 1] is in here agreeing on what we all think we understand so, there's nothing like mentioning roads in the actual statement. That is what we're doing.
- **Alexander Naranjo (Youth/FUERZA):** Think of the future, this is 20 to 30 years in the future. Making sure we have the word future or any sort of thought that this ever-evolving, that the tax is going to be funding projects way down the line is important besides equitable. Those two are very important.
- **Dr. Amber Crowell (Center for Community Voices at Fresno State):** Agrees with Alexander Naranjo (Youth/FUERZA). It's important considering how long this measure is going to be in place and Fresno County is a very changing region. The future ready aspect needs to be in there in addition to "equitable."
- **Kendall:** We have a tremendous amount of material to go through and we're going to be talking about some of the priorities, which may help inform some of this. I'm going to ask if there's interest in tabling this until we get to the Mentimeter portion and we can actually take a vote on it and have good feedback at that point. Some of the information you're going to get and some of the discussion you're going to have

about possible allocations may help inform this. You're trying to figure out how this vision is going to be and the allocations may influence big parts of that.

- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** I think it's helpful to set up the vision. I agree with Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno) and Lee Delap (Fresno County) about it being succinct and being very clear about the everyday voter and Fresno County resident agreeing about this is what we're doing, and this is where we're going. That is helpful. I also agree with the word equity. I'm an in-between-er. I would recommend a mix of both options where it's succinct and one sentence. Its "Measure C envisions a reliable, safe, equitable and connected infrastructure and transportation system that enables all residents to travel efficiently and safely regardless of mode" and that's it. Infrastructure gets at roads.
- **Wyatt Meadows (Labor Union Representation):** I don't necessarily disagree with that statement, but I think the issue is one of the options says roads and one doesn't. One of them says equity and the other doesn't. I think it's pretty simple to change the first option and make it feasible for everybody that says: "Measure C supports reliable roads to create safe and equitable connected infrastructure systems that enable all residents to travel efficiently." Realistically we all know it's got to be roads, right? And I don't know why we're getting off track with that, because it sounds like it's already happening with some of the first comments. I think by putting both roads and equity like that would work, I think the roads are creating the rest of this. The first option doesn't say that, and the second option doesn't really say it either.
- **Kendall:** Does this capture the two of you, Wyatt and Veronica? "Measure C supports reliable roads to create safe and equitable connected infrastructure systems that enable all residents to travel efficiently and safely regardless of mode."
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** My suggestion on the table was: "Measure C envisions a reliable, safe, equitable, and connected infrastructure and transportation system that enables all residents to travel efficiently and safely regardless of mode" because what we're trying to build here is a system that gets people where they need to go. Whether they're on the road, they're on a bike, they're walking, or they're taking transit. It's a system that we're talking about. That's the future component, not just roads to get to somewhere. I see it as much broader than that.
- **Kendall:** The overwhelming thing we're seeing in all our different data is that "roads" was the top priority for all audiences that was brought up in the polling, but it wasn't the only thing.

- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** We're spending too much time on this. We're 30 minutes in and we're still on the mission statement, whether we're going to be roads or equitable or any of these things. I think what people really want to know what the percentages are, and what's the split? How much are going to go to roads? How much are going to go to buses? How much is going to go to trails? What's the split going out to Mendota, to my neighbor next to me? Are they going to get a fair shake; are they not going to get a fair shake? Is it going to be roads, is it going to be miles, or is it going to be population? The second option if you break it down, what does Measure C have to do with community health? What does it have to do with job creation? We're going to create some, but they're going to be road work jobs, which are going to be probably under Wyatt Meadow's (Labor Union Representation) supervision, part of it's going to probably go under Chuck [Riojas] (City of Fresno), some of it's going to go under Darren's [Rose] people at BIA. What does equitable access mean? We already have law in place of ADA access components. I build roads and I don't know what equitable access means.
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** The problem with using roads is for example, the airport is included in Measure C. If you use the word infrastructure it captures everything. I think there's majority agreement that the majority of the money is going to go towards roads. We get that. I think there's some people that think if roads aren't in there somehow roads is going to get bypassed. No one is saying that.
- **Kendall:** I just want to make sure I'm getting this [vision statement] down.
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** It's a merging of the two: "Measure C envisions a reliable, safe, equitable, and connected infrastructure and transportation system that enables all residents to travel efficiently and safely regardless of mode."
- **Kendall:** Ok, so for you (Veronica Garibay), you're taking roads out in favor of an "infrastructure system", which is inclusive of roads.
- **Nicholas Paladino (Fresno Cycling Club):** On the mode situation, to some extent streets and roads really is not a mode. The mode is actually a single-occupant vehicle, light trucks, eighteen wheelers. Those things using streets and roads. Transit uses streets and roads, bicycles use streets and roads, pedestrians are adjacent to street and roads, emergency responders use streets and roads. Thinking about streets and roads as a mode is misleading.
- **Kendall:** I think we're going back over materials we talked about at the last meeting and in general. I think we're trying to figure out whether or not we include "roads" as a specific or we just leave it as a "transportation system" that's inclusive of roads.

That's what I'm hearing right now. The question is if we do it without the word "road" but leave "infrastructure" in and I was just suggesting that as we have our conversation later in the evening and as we start doing allocations by category, we may see things coming up a little differently. That's why I was suggesting we get through that discussion and then come back to this for refinement. That would give us an opportunity to see where people's thoughts are. Are we ok with that?

- Coming back to vision statement after the rest of the agenda items.

Overview of Outreach Results

- **Kendall** gave a brief overview of the combined outreach efforts of FCOG and Transportation for All (T4All).
 - Kendall showed three maps depicting which zip codes FCOG reached out to with their survey, which zip codes T4All reached out to with their survey, and the zip codes reached out to from the combined efforts.
- General outreach is showing some consistencies between both efforts.
- Polling on this measure has not been conducted but polling was conducted last year in summer of 2024
- **Dr. Pacheco-Werner** gave a presentation on community outreach conducted by T4All.
- **Dr. Pacheco-Werner:** Fresno State was hired to help analyze and collect data around community engagement in a transportation measure vision and priorities.
 - Fresno State's approach was an iterative process.
 - Phase 1: We asked people what they wanted and where they wanted it.
 - Phase 2: We took what they said they wanted in Phase 1 and asked to prioritize categories and projects more in-depth.
 - Phase 3 (current phase): As we are doing an iterative process, we are going back to people and saying "here's what you said in Phase 1. Here's what you said in Phase 2. Here's what we came up with in terms of these values you have around how you want investments to happen. Is this approach you want? How do you want the approach to spending to happen?"
 - When asking people about their investment values, where they want to see money allocated, definitely priority on investment is around road, highway, and street projects followed by public transportation, sidewalk projects, and active transportation projects. In terms of how these percentages [on the screen] are to be interpreted, these are percentages in terms of how people value these investments, not directly apples to oranges around some of the

percentages you've seen or will see. You should think about this in terms of proportionality of where people want these investments to go.

- Majority of Phase 3 respondents want a balanced approach to allocation of resources.
- Local Streets and Roads T4All outreach results summary was given.
- Public Transportation T4All outreach results summary was given.
- Regional Connectivity T4All outreach results summary was given.
- Active Transportation T4All outreach results summary was given.
- **Kendall** presented preliminary results on the survey that is on the Measure C renewal website (conducted by FCOG).
 - Key takeaways were given from the community outreach conducted. Fairly consistent with feedback received by T4All outreach efforts.
 - Final numbers will be ready after the end of the survey period, which closes at the end of the day on August 6, 2025.
- A summary of the Summer 2024 statistically valid polling was given.
- **Lee Delap (Fresno County):** When we talked about North vs South Fresno [Key Takeaways slide] and perception, where the population is, etc. it sounded to me like we neglected the subject of 'rural neglect.'
- **Kendall:** That's actually one of the things that came up repeatedly. Rural neglect, outlying communities, specifically areas that might be in the unincorporated areas and a couple incorporated cities, that do have some challenges with their local road systems – places like Huron, Orange Cove, parts of Parlier. They all have similar issues and the challenge of, which we'll be talking about next month, as it relates to the allocation formulas.
- *(Starting at 01:11:53 of the recording)* **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** The values that we talked about in the investments in neighborhoods, but particularly public transportation. "78% of the respondents selected expanding buses and public transportation services as very important." That means 3 out of 4 people said "let's expand buses." I don't know anybody that wants to expand buses. As I pulled the data, it shows that ridership is down. And as I'm talking to people in my own community, the kids are saying "I'm not riding that bus to work, I'm going to uber." Who did we pull for this and what was the question that promoted 78% of the people to say "I want more public transit"?
- **Dr. Pacheco-Werner:** When we think about this question it's what people think is important. We asked a number of questions like "do you think fixing our roads is important?", "do you think public transportation is important?", etc. In your

electronic files, it shows you all the questions that people answered. When we talked about public transportation with people, the first round of surveys that over 600 people responded and that was shown on the zip code maps, shows that expanding bus and public transit services were very important. We also asked people if they don't use public transit, why not? All of the detailed answers and questions are available to you in that electronic file.

- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** I get that but, I would venture to say that this room is probably the most diverse group of 40-some odd people that you're going to get. I don't think anyone's going to disagree with that. Not one of us rode the bus here.
- **Kendall:** I want to make it clear that none of the surveying done that we are talking about today, with the exception of the RTP survey, are statistically valid. I think that's where you're (Brooke Ashjian) going with this.
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** What I'm saying here is that the verbiage says 78% of the people who responded want to expand public transit.
- **Dr. Pacheco Werner:** This 78% was from our Phase 1 data where we had over 600 people and, in terms of the who, you can see it on the map that has our zip codes so you can see all across the County. We asked "how important are the following public transportation improvements to you? Rate each one from not important to very important." Included in those question were expanding bus and public transit, improve commuter support, expand regional transit services. So we asked these questions in just the context of public transit. We asked our questions in Phase 1 within the context of each subject: just roads, just public transportation, just active transportation, just sidewalks, etc.
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** I understand that and I appreciate you providing the exact question. I think that it would have been closer to the truth if we would have said "do you ride the bus?", "do you need more services and would you like to see it expanded?", because if they say "no, I don't ride the bus" you're out. Because if you don't ride the bus, you don't really know what people riding the bus needs.
- **Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN):** I think that if we are just going to throw our own perspectives out here and say "I don't ride the bus, therefore no body rides the bus." I lived in a city with good public transportation, that's Mexico City, and I used the public transportation every day. Since I moved to Fresno, I am not able to because it doesn't take me, I don't have routes, I don't have anything. I don't think it's accurate to state that "Oh, well, people don't have it. It sucks. Therefore, we don't need to do it." When we talk about public transportation, it's not only those big buses that take you from point A to point B. It can be a modality of other sources of public

transportation. Meaning that you don't need to own a car. I wish you could have been in some those rural communities, where they can't afford to buy cars and they have to rely on public transportation, not necessarily the big buses but a public means of transportation.

- **Dr. Pacheco-Werner:** Just so you have the full thing and know where to reference in the other slide deck that's available electronically to you [the Steering Committee], it will be Slide 20. The question was "If you don't use public buses or transit, why not?" Thirty percent said, "I prefer using my car or another form of transportation" but, as mentioned before, forty nine percent mentioned other systemic barriers such as either "it takes too long to get to where I need to go", "public transit does not go where I need it to", or "there is no easy way to get to or from a bus/train stop from my home or destination."
- **Wyatt Meadows (Labor Union):** It doesn't sound like there was an option for "this doesn't matter to me" on the questions, like they were forced to answer the question.
- **Dr. Pacheco Werner:** They could write "not important to me". The options for the categories were "Not Important", "Somewhat Important", or "Very Important."
- **Kendall:** You'll get a chance to look at all those. I don't want us to get too far down on this. I want to point out again that the data are snapshots that relate to these types of segments. They're not necessarily the preference. They're not saying that 78% the people said that's how much money should go to transit. But it is what people said was important to them of the people they surveyed.
- **Dr. Amber Crowell:** I'm hoping we can put this particular discussion to bed because even in the statistically valid survey people ranked bus services as 7/10 on importance. Even with the data that is more valid, we are still seeing that this is a high priority for people. Maybe not as high as roads but, nobody is saying that their data came out higher than roads but, it is important to people.
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** I agree with Nayamin. Their point is very well-taken. We have to think about it in a more global context of public transportation, not just buses. I think that's a good way to think about that.

Updated Measure C Revenue Forecast and PCI Analysis (Paul Herman, Fresno COG)

- Measure C Revenue has grown at an average 4.6% annual growth rate between 2007 and 2024.
- \$7.25 Billion over 30 years without interest, after tax receipts it will land at about \$7.3 billion (estimate).

- 30-year Measure C revenue forecast (2007-2057) at 4% annual growth rate.
- An updated pavement condition index (PCI) analysis was given based on the following five Measure C scenarios:
 - No Measure C
 - 30-year Measure C with 40% allocated to street and road maintenance
 - 30-year Measure C with 50% allocated to street and road maintenance
 - 30-year Measure C with 60% allocated to street and road maintenance
 - 30-year Measure C with 70% allocated to street and road maintenance
- *(Starting at 01:06:43 of the recording)* **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability)**: On the PCI analysis, is that only based on Measure C revenue or does it take into account other sources of revenues that cities and counties and the COG receives for local streets and roads? Does it include an analysis for streets and roads based on other cities that have a separate roads and streets tax on their own? Are all those different sources accounted for? The chart implies that this is just Measure C.
- **Paul Herman (Fresno COG)**: There are other revenue streams accounted for. The percentages are just the Measure C portion but the three main revenue sources are SB 1, STBG, and Measure C. I'm not 100% sure if that includes the separate roads and streets tax some other cities have but I will double check that and get back to you.
- *(Starting at 01:21:36 of the recording)* **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno)**: I'm a little confused about something. The most recent allocation, it works out to about 30.1% are available to local communities for potholes, basically for roads. There's 15.3% for potholes, 14.8% for flexible funding. So if a local community wanted to, they could spend 30.1% of the money on potholes/roads. What was the PCI in 2006? We're at 65 now. My understanding from reading the annual report is that there has been a significant improvement over time under the current measure (from whatever it was to 65). How is that trendline going up? I just want to put it in context. The numbers don't seem to work in my head. Second, to jump from last measure's number of allocating 50% to roads (which was not successful) to get to a PCI of 70 to today's number that spiked 10% to get the same PCI of 70. Why was there a big spike?
- **Paul Herman (Fresno COG)**: For the first point on the 2006 number, I'll have to pull that. We don't have that today here. Generally, the road conditions were in the upper fair condition. We've never been in the very poor and we've never really been in the above 70 range. Regarding your second point on the cost, I had similar concerns,

that spike is driven by inflation. When I talked to the consultant about this particular concern, the numbers came up to an increase from \$28 per square yard to \$41 per square yard for road maintenance. Before that time, we had never seen that kind of increase.

- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** I work in roads, and I have not seen this increase. What road are we talking about?
- **Paul Herman (Fresno COG):** This was an analysis that NCE had done throughout the state of California. This is using square yard maintenance cost across the state.
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** The roads in San Jose are not the same roads we have in Fresno. In Fresno you are paving straight roads. And you're usually doing the overlays, so they're extremely cheap and reasonable in Fresno County. The costs of inflation have not jumped that much in Fresno County. Does this include labor, trucking, etc.? Is that where these increases are coming from because I haven't seen it.
- **Paul Herman (Fresno COG):** I'm not an expert in asphalt or material costs. I'll have to get back to NCE on how they made their assumptions but this was provided to us by our pavement management consultant that does this full-time throughout California. In capital costs of projects there have been massive increases over the past five years. **Lee Delap (Fresno County):** I was involved in the 2022 effort and the PCI at that time was 57 and now it's over 60. What happened to make it go up so much?
- **Paul Herman (Fresno COG):** I don't believe it was 57. I believe it was 62 or 63 but, we have the 2021 report and that's something I can share with you.

Funding Pipelines – State and Federal Funds (Robert Phipps, Fresno COG)

- A summary of Federal, State, and Local grants was given.
- The modes funded by these different sources and programs included: bicycle, pedestrian, multi-mode, transit, road maintenance & operations, grade separations (roads & rail), freight corridors (roads & rail).
- Award types included formula and competitive based grants.
- **Kendall:** Funds that have been collected for SB1, the Gas Tax that you pay at the pump, have been steadily declining in the last several years. Some of that is due to more electric vehicles, less driving, etc. but, the forecast is that those funds will continue to be reduced. This means that the reliance on Measure C funds will continue to be increased.

- **Lee Delap (Fresno County):** This was covered in the Townhall last week from Lori Wilson (assembly chairperson of the transportation committee) mentioned soft revenue from the State side. I'm assuming it would impact all these programs or maybe just some of these funds.
- **Robert Phipps (Fresno COG):** The majority of the state side ones would be impacted because of the SB 1 (fuel tax).
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** The State is not just going to accept the fact that they are losing money. They will come up with another way to have a revenue neutral approach. As EVs become more popular, there's probably going to be a shift of taxes away from a gas tax to a vehicle miles traveled tax or an EV fee. The state isn't just going to let that money go away so to say that we are going to have to rely more on Measure C is a misnomer.
- **Kendall:** You're absolutely correct but, the legislation that's out right now is probably 5-10 years out from seeing that.
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** I respectfully disagree.
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** I agree with Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno) that the State is looking at other options to quickly replace the tax revenue loss from SB 1 (gas tax). On the funding side, does the analysis include both the federal and state side the projected budget deficits and how that impacts several of the programs outside of SB 1? Some of the competitive grant programs at the state level have been reduced in the last couple of years, ATP (active transportation program) being one of them, and the other potential programs. Obviously, everyone knows that there's a big cap and trade negotiation underway that also impacts a greenhouse gas reduction fund that pays for programs like the TIRCP and the LCTOP programs that fund what we're talking about. And then at the Federal level, do you have an analysis of the impacts of the Reconciliation Bill on the Infrastructure Jobs Act and what we can expect in the upcoming transportation bill that will need to be negotiated at some point by Congress and what do we expect to see from that?
- **Robert Phipps (Fresno COG):** On the sources of funding, the answer, essentially, is no because the presentation I gave was simply listing the categories of other funding streams and not necessarily the state of those individual sources. You're (Veronica Garibay) absolutely right. State and Federal budgets are continually influx and as administrations change, policy priorities change. These things rise and fall with those kinds of events and all we were attempting to do was to identify the major state and federal funding sources that Measure C matches.

- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** Thank you for that, because from our analysis of state and federal funding we are starting to see some trends of where resources for which type of programs or funding programs are either going away or are being deprioritized. Depending on the winds of the political environment, but also the ending of need to renegotiate a new transportation package at a federal level. Given the State budget issues, we've seen a decrease, overtime, for some of the projects that we've heard of as priorities at the community level. So, it would be helpful to see some trends, so that Measure C can help fill in some of the gaps.
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** If they're going to reduce roads and the money is going towards roads and Measure C is diminishing here, wouldn't that make more sense to be putting more money, uploading more money into roads because the federal government is taking away roads and the state government is taking away road money? They're not taking away trail money. If it's 15% trails and 85% roads, 85% of it is going away from roads. So, the majority of money that's getting reduced is roads. So, in this committee, I would hope that we would really focus on pumping that up knowing that exactly what she just said that it's diminishing on the Federal and State side with SB 1 being either going away or getting robbed from our local and state funds.
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** The survey [outreach results] that we are receiving tonight, was in Fresno land before it got to us, is there a reason why that happened?
- **Kendall:** They read the agenda for the board meeting tomorrow.
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** It would be helpful if we were the ones to get it first if we're the ones steering this committee so Fresno land doesn't steer the discussion. It's not right that the public got it before we got it.

Allocation Exercise/Discussion (Mentimeter)

- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** Before we get started on this, I did want to comment about the general priorities and look at all the data. On balance, if you go back to the green zip code map with all the outreach efforts, what struck me based on the presentation of all the different efforts, there seems to be consistency across Local Streets and Roads in neighborhoods and existing communities being a priority and consistency on priorities for public transit and the importance of looking at different modes of public transit that will look differently for each community. There's also a lot of consistency around safety, accessibility, trails. It seems to be that there are a grouping of themes to think

about. In terms of regional connectivity, getting people connected to places between and across cities and communities in the region. Not just from, for example, Huron to Fresno but also Huron to Orange Cove. Give people a real choice as to how they choose to travel. There seems to be already some grouping of themes and categories that we have a rough idea of what people want. Is that where you're (Kendall Flint) going with this?

- **Kendall:** That's exactly where I'm going with this. We are going to try to get some broad numbers tonight.
- Steering Committee Members were asked to rank the following types of projects in order of importance:
 - Local, neighborhood roads
 - Transit/bus service
 - Sidewalks in neighborhoods
 - Safe routes to school
 - Larger regional projects
 - Bike lanes and walking paths
 - Other
- **Kendall:** I want to be very clear on this; this is a snapshot of tonight. I have every belief that this may change but this was the cleanest way I could count 35 people's votes at the same time. It's just a snapshot. It won't be the end all, be all.
- Steering Committee Members were asked:
- What % of Measure C Funds should go to local neighborhood roads?**Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** It's too early to vote on this. I think this is a major mistake on how you're handling this. This is a process and we're running to a conclusion. With all respect to my colleague Brooke [Ashjian], who wants to get to the answer because he's a business guy, and I get that, but in my opinion, this is going to be really problematic.
- **Kendall:** I understand what you're saying and I'm going to ask you to bear with me. I'm going to remind the group that we are getting direction from the board and there was a schedule that was set up and we were asked to do these meetings with these specific topics. No one is going to get held to this at this point in time but we're trying to figure out, in general, an idea of where people are at.
- **Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN):** I would like to know how this data is going to be used before I rank or vote on anything.
- **Kendall:** The idea here is to get a snapshot in the room of sort of where people [the Steering Committee] are at. If we're all in agreement, for example, that roads are a

top priority. Then the question is, approximately what percentage should we start talking about because that is something that this group is going to have to do. We're not walking away tonight with hard numbers but we are going to know where people are at with this. Because if we don't have that conversation and move to next week's topic, which is the allocation by agency, then we're getting into implementation. We're on a fast track that was requested by the merge and then approved by the board to move at this pace. Our original plan was to take this out through the end of year. Mark [Keppler], I one hundred percent agree with you. That schedule was not the original one we brought to the board.

- **Robert Phipps (Fresno COG):** This is a schedule that the board agreed to as part of the collaboration and the intent is to have an expenditure plan roughly by the end of September.
- **Kendall:** Mid-September was the date that was requested. I'm not going to disagree with you, Mark [Keppler]. It's challenging.
- **Wyatt Meadows (Labor Union):** When you say that was what the board agreed to, bringing everybody else in, does that mean that was their idea, everybody that came in here, not the board's idea, to fast track everything? If that's the case, what's the reason?
- **Kendall:** When the smaller group of electeds, including the chair and vice chair of the Fresno COG and from staff, the FCTA board, and some other folks met with the T4All folks over the period of a month, there was series of negotiations that went ongoing and one of the things that was requested from the T4All group was an accelerated schedule and the additional seats of the board. This was presented to the board, and the board was provided with a new negotiated schedule, and the board gave us direction to move with that schedule at that pace.
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** How is it that twelve got to dictate to the twenty-four? How did that happen? How did T4All get to dictate the speed and the direction of this Committee with the COG board?
- **Wyatt Meadows (Labor Union):** What's the purpose?
- **Kendall:** As we understood it, we had two potential competing measures going on at the same time. The concern was if both of those measures moved forward, they were less likely to pass. The board gave direction at its April board meeting to meet with T4All and others to see if we could find a path. The question was that, if we don't reach an agreement, there would still be time to go our separate ways.
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** That's not entirely accurate. The original COG timeline had the COG itself not delivering a full

Measure to the public, city councils, and board of supervisors, until Spring of next year.

- **Kendall:** That's not accurate.
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** It was going until March or April. From an electoral calendar, if you don't have a final measure and you want to convince voters to support a measure and do community education around how they will benefit by voting 'yes' on a measure, that's late. T4All, we started our process and community engagement in late April of this year through phases. It was an iterative process that builds on one another and now we [T4All] are asking people about implementation guidelines. That whole process led us into looking at what is the best way to get Measure C passed in Fresno County. One thing we can all agree on is that Measure C should exist. We all believe that there are a lot of benefits that stem from Measure C if we do it right and, there's broad support for it. But, in the current environment, it will be really hard to pass a Measure if there is no community buy-in or support for a Measure. That was the intent and that is what was talked about with COG representatives and FCTA representatives in that room around being able to develop a public process that helps shape a measure that allows all of us to talk through it to deliver a plan that then goes to city councils and the county board of supervisors and the COG. One of the things we heard loud and clear from elected officials since the failure of the 2022 measure is that electeds want to have a say and want to be engaged every step of the way. So, we built a process that allows the Fresno COG policy board to get a report out at every stage of this measure. What is the vision, electeds get to weigh in. What are the categories, electeds get to weigh in. So, they don't get a final plan at the end of the process without having had the opportunity to weigh in. That's why the structure and timeline was put in, in that way.
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** When does the COG consider the drop-dead date to have time to educate the public about what's in the measure?
- **Kendall:** In the original timing, the COG process would have lasted through December of this year and we would've gone through and updated all the agencies.
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** I think the confusion here that I'm seeing is, it's fine if we have a compressed timeline, it just means we have to meet more. This is a multi-billion-dollar effort going over multiple years; we might want to put a little more effort into it. We shouldn't rush this effort; we should put the time in to create a thoughtful measure.

- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** All due respect to Mark [Keppler], what I'm hearing is, correct me if I'm wrong, we're going to get this done in four or five or six weeks so that they [T4All] have time to put their measure on the ballot if they don't like whatever comes out of this group. She [Veronica Garibay] brought up 2022. Let's make no mistake about it, your group [T4All], sunk 2022 along with David's [Rivas] group that put in a \$100,000 to sink Measure C. You guys put in \$300,000 and sunk Measure C. This is the last straw for Measure C. My point is, the reason this got expedited is so that they could have time to put a measure up. This group [original Steering Committee before the merge] didn't get consulted and I think that's part of Mark's [Keppler] frustration, even though he can speak for himself. The truth of the matter is they want to peak behind the curtain and in six weeks go "yeah, we don't like that. We're out and we're going to do our own measure."
- **Kendall:** I want reiterate that we're going to start having these conversations and my opinion, and my hope, is that we'll at least entertain the conversation tonight. We may not agree and we don't have to come to an end as this is not the end all, be all, but need to have some place to start. There's been an incredible amount of outreach that's been done on both sides and we'll continue on. What I'd like to do is get back to this [allocation exercise] and just see where we're at, then we can continue to discuss it.
- **Espi Sandoval (Higher Education for All):** I've been listening and if we're going to be coming in with assumptions of "oh, this group did this and this group did that", that is wrong and that is bad leadership. There has to be some respect. Everybody comes with a different perspective. I come from Mendota, that's where I grew up – Tranquility/San Joaquin – and I would love to see those streets paved. That's my priority. The point is we have to be open-minded. If we're going to be in a box then we're going to stay in the box and we're not going to go anywhere. If we're going to be accusing people of doing wrong things, then we're not going to get anywhere and that is wrong. I expect everyone here to be cordial and respectful if we're going to get something done. If we keep bringing up the past, we're not going to get anything done. Let's be cordial. Let's move forward.
- **David Rivas (NorCal Carpenters Union):** I just want to address a little bit the hypotheticals that keep coming out. Let me tell you right now, from our perspective, the intent was not to come back on the ballot and throw an eleventh-hour plan. There's no way the Carpenters Union is going to sign off on that. No way we're going to dump millions of dollars on that. Being in those rooms, remember, Buddy had a lot to do with the acceleration too. We had more meetings and he didn't want to do

them. We all agreed; it was a compromise. There were two trains going on two different paths and it was a compromise to come together with the two steering committees to respect each other and go forward together. It's accelerated but bottom line is we just have to do the work. To Mark's [Keppler] point, we have to do the work and we have to get it done. There is no alternative mode. I'm going to put that to bed right now, there's no way the Carpenters Union will back an alternative measure right now if we know we'll fail. That's the bottom line. Did we oppose it in 2022? Yes, absolutely, because we were told "take your crayons and sit in a corner." That's what we were told. Now we're not there. Now the focus is to get this one plan together on that ballot and get it passed. There is no ulterior motive and when all is said and done, I will stand by that, our organization will stand by that, so we need to stop going back to hypotheticals.

- **Kendall:** I understand the pain and the groan on this but, I'd like us to come back to these questions [allocation by percentage exercise] and answer them to the best of your honest ability tonight just to see where people are at.
- **Mark Keppler (Tree Fresno):** I feel extremely uncomfortable doing this. Would you allow for some of us who feel uncomfortable to refrain from voting at this time?
- **Kendall:** Sure but, be prepared everybody because at some point you're going to have to weigh in on this.
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** Who directed that these be the categories?
- **Kendall:** They've been the ones that the COG has been going from but we can add others in without a problem.
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** So do you have a definition for the category Local, Neighborhood Roads?
- **Kendall:** Local streets and roads are the smaller, in-your-neighborhood roads, roads going to your schools, etc. Not the larger connectors. Just so you know where I'm going with this. Let's say, for whatever reason, we have a percentage here then the next question becomes, "within that category, what does that look like?" It gets more and more refined as things go down. But we have to start someplace on this in order to get there.
- **Kay Bertken (League of Women Voters of Fresno):** I'm just concerned that whatever comes out of this right now doesn't become a public document. There should be some preface to this indicating that this is a very tentative approach to developing some percentages based on a very early discussion. Somehow numbers tend to take on a life of their own and become wedded in people's minds as "this

was the decision” or “this is what Measure C looks like” and I would hate to have that be the message.

- **Kendall:** This is more of an exercise so you’re not going to see these numbers come out, in terms of a document.
- **Pastor Simon Biasell (Woven Coalition):** In the future, it would be helpful to be prepared for these kinds of exercises ahead of time. I get that this is just an exercise, which would be fine, if this wasn’t already a media circus. This is just another opportunity for people to make a big deal out of something that’s not done yet. If we can have a better process leading up to it, it would be helpful.
- **Kendall:** That’s fair.
- **Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN):** You said this is an exercise but what if we, after discussing everything that we are reading from the feedback of the two processes, see that these might not be the right categories, how are we going to scramble to do this re-vote? Based on the meeting materials from July, I don’t think this was an exercise requested by the COG and was very surprised to see this in the [board] agenda for tomorrow. I thought we were just getting a consensus on the vision and then move forward.
- **Kendall:** We agendized this and promoted the discussion but, I understand your reluctance. Scott [Miller], what are your thoughts?
- **Scott Miller (Fresno Chamber of Commerce):** I think people in the room are pretty educated on the topic and it’s okay to have preliminary opinions at this point.
- **Pastor Joby Jones (Stop the Violence – Fresno):** Today is wild. This [allocation by category exercise] is kind of throwing me off too but, I voted because I’m here for the process. I think there’s some past trauma and hurt in the room but I think we just have to get on the same page because we want the same thing. I think we can make that happen.
- **Nicholas Paladino (Fresno Cycling Club):** I tend to agree with what others said about liking to have gotten these materials and exercise questions in advance to have time to digest the material. There’s a tendency that whatever happens now gets frozen in concrete to a certain extent. Concerning the schedule, I dislike it, intensely. But I would definitely like these materials in my inbox four or five days in advance so I have a chance to digest it and be aware that I’m going to be asked to vote on something like this realizing that these things tend to become precedent for later votes.
- **Kendall:** That is an excellent point. Let me suggest something that I think might help us. Our team has to meet with the Facilitation and Synthesis Team which isn’t giving

us enough time to get an agenda out. I would suggest, and I'm open to anyone's thoughts on this, to move this discussion to our meeting on August 14 to give everyone more time to look at this material and ask questions. It will give us time to put the questions out to everyone so you're more prepared. Then, if we need to call an additional meeting, we can.

- **Lee Delap (Fresno County):** We only have so many moving parts. We've got roads. We've got transit. Etc. It would help me to have a reference to where the current measure is when we start asking the question. We're tweaking what's already taken place. We're not creating a whole new measure.
- **Kendall:** We are creating a whole new measure.
- **Lee Delap (Fresno County):** I understand that but, we still have roads, mass transit, etc. It gives you a reference as to where we are. Another thing I asked previously, the flow chart. You just made reference to the Facilitation group. What is that? Never heard of it. We work for the COG, don't we? What is this flow chart and what are these other groups? We have no key for flowchart, it's just there.
- **Kendall:** To address that, we'll provide the updated schedule and amend it to provide a little more time for these things and questions. And just so everyone knows, what we were going to do tonight was take a look at bike/pedestrian, transit, other, and regional projects to get a range of places where you kind of think the money might go. Not the specific. Just kind of where you're thinking it might go. Then, we would have discussions about that. If we pick up this whole discussion and move it to August 14, does that make people feel more comfortable and give people more time to assess the information?
- **Lino Mendes (City of Fowler):** My concern, personally, this is volunteered time and when I asked my employer to have time off for this, it was based on the original schedule. Keep in mind, when we move forward with these meetings, that we are all volunteers.
- **Kendall:** I totally understand. We are going to have to have these discussions about percentages at some point and we're not going to be able to stretch that out over six to eight weeks.
- **Kendall:** Today's discussion will be continued on August 14th at the next steering committee meeting.
- **Kendall:** We will provide the schedule updated and amended to give us a little more time on these things. We'll provide the potential questions you'll be asking.
- **Veronica Garibay (Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability):** That works. I would just like to make a suggestion, and Brooke [Ashjian] actually

mentioned this earlier. Putting out the numbers to the policy board before it comes here [Steering Committee] I think undermines the process so, I ask that in the future we respect that process so it allows us to have a conversation before going to the policy board. To Simon's [Biasell] point, it does become a media circus when that starts to happen.

Draft Priorities and Mission Statement

- Committee Members were asked if the Mission Statement and Priorities presented were acceptable for the time being.
- Draft Priorities developed during the Steering Committee meeting on July 17 that received 32 "for" votes and 2 "against" votes:
 - Support Community Health & Resilience
 - Enhance Public Safety
 - Ensure Accessibility and Access for All
 - Make Equitable Investments
- **Kendall:** Does anybody disagree with these priorities?
- **Brooke Ashjian (City of Fresno):** Measure C is for roads. It's a tax for roads, whether you're on a bus or riding a bike. "Support Community Health and Resilience", we're not a community hospital. "Enhance Public Safety", it's not a public safety tax. "Ensure Accessibility and Access for All", any business, any city, any county has to have ADA accessible, handicap ramps, path of travels etc. all the way through so it's mandated by law not by Measure C. "Equitable Investments" means equitable roads, in my opinion.
- **Kendall:** You weren't at that last meeting so I don't know if you saw it but the subheading of each of those priorities was to prioritize local roads. Every single one.
- **Nayamin Martinez (CCEJN):** I think we all understand very well, maybe with the exception of Brooke [Ashjian], how all this is connected to public health. What do we have on these roads? A lot of cars, cars that are polluting the air. We live in the most polluted air basin in the entire United States. That leads to a lot of health problems. The thing is he said those are not priorities for him [Brooke Ashjian] but this is about the whole process. We need to take that into consideration and that we are not only talking about roads. This is about public transportation systems, not just roads.
- Steering Committee members were asked to review the Draft Vision Statement developed during the current Steering Committee:



- “Measure C envisions a reliable, safe, equitable, and connected infrastructure and transportation system that enables all residents to travel efficiently and safely regardless of mode.”
- The majority of committee members voted yes. 27 for, 5 against.

Next Steps

- Reconvene on August 14th.

DRAFT