



2035 Tulare Street, Suite 201  
Fresno, California 93721

Telephone: (559) 233-4148 • Fax: (559) 233-9645  
Website Address: [www.fresnocog.org](http://www.fresnocog.org)

## FRESNO COUNTY SB 375 TASK FORCE MEETING NOTES

**Date:** Wednesday, February 10, 2010  
**Time:** 10:00 a.m.  
**Place:** COG Sequoia Conference Room  
2035 Tulare St., Suite 201, Fresno, CA

### ATTENDANCE:

Keith Bergthold, City of Fresno	Mike Prandini, BIA
David Brletic, City of Reedley	Scott Tyler, City of Fresno
Ryan Burnett, City of Clovis	John Wright, Regional Planner
David Fey, City of Clovis	Mike Bitner, Fresno COG
Ralph Kachadourian, City of Sanger	Kristine Cai, Fresno COG
Mohammad Khorsand, Fresno County	Kathy Chung, Fresno COG
Dwight Kroll, City of Clovis	John Downs, Fresno COG
Greg Martin, City of Selma	Suzanne Martinez, Fresno COG
Renee Mathis, City of Clovis	Barbara Steck, Fresno COG
Luis Patlan, City of Kerman	Clark Thompson, Fresno COG
Terry Schmal, City of Kingsburg	Jamesine Rogers, ARB (on phone)
Patrick Smith, Harris Ranch	

The meeting was called to order by Luis Patlan (Kerman) at 10:14 a.m.

### I. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

This portion of the meeting is 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.**

There were no public presentations.

### II. ACTION / DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### A. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Mohammad Khorsand (Fresno County) and seconded by David Fey (Clovis) to approve the January 13, 2010 minutes. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

#### B. Land Use Scenarios for Target-setting Process

Kathy Chung (Fresno COG) gave a presentation on land use scenarios for the target setting process. She presented population growth maps that separated growth between 2005 to 2020 and 2020 to 2035. Ms. Chung highlighted differences in the various alternatives.

John Wright expressed concern regarding the illegibility of the maps, particularly in response to the numerous lines on the maps for the Fresno/Clovis and Sanger areas that impede legibility. Following discussion, it was agreed that the maps would be provided to all committee members via email so that the members could enlarge them personally.

Keith Bergthold (Fresno) suggested that committee members be given time to study the various maps. Ralph Kachadourian (Sanger) asked that staff also provide the mapping for the SR180 freeway.

**Member Agencies:** The cities of Clovis, Coalinga, Firebaugh, Fowler, Fresno, Huron, Kerman, Kingsburg, Mendota, Orange Cove, Parlier, Reedley, San Joaquin, Sanger, Selma & Fresno County

**C. Target Scenarios and Modeling Results**

Kristine Cai, Fresno COG gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Target Scenarios and Modeling Results. Ms. Cai explained that Alternative One (1) is the revised general plan and Alternative Two (2) includes more aggressive corridor and activity center planning. Ms. Cai noted that general plan updates made by five (5) cities have been included in both Alternative One (1) and Two (2). Ms. Cai discussed the various transportation projects that would be included in the scenario, including Blackstone/Ventura BRT, Shaw Ave. BRT, and car sharing, among others.

Ms. Cai discussed the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and explained that Fresno County is not responsible for pass-through trips through Fresno County and only responsible for 50% of the trips that leave Fresno and arrive in Fresno. Ms. Cai confirmed that staff is still trying to work on calculating internal/external trips to and from Fresno County. Ms. Cai suggested her support for the effectiveness of Alternative Two (2) and asked for input from the Committee.

A discussion took place regarding the reasoning behind why the VMT increased higher than the baseline under Alternative One (1). Ms. Cai explained that the VMT would increase in Alternative One (1) between 2020 and 2035 because the area has a projected outward growth, which would equate into longer and further trips. Committee members asked that a write-up that includes a more extensive explanation for the VMT discrepancy between Alternative One (1) and the baseline be presented at the next meeting.

Renee Mathis (Clovis) expressed concern regarding the possibility of presenting an ambitious alternative to the Air Resources Board (ARB), and then be left in a position where the ARB requests even more.

David Fey (Clovis) questioned whether ARB staff had the opportunity to research the status in terms of the interaction at the state agency level. Further discussion ensued concerning apprehension that many committee members had regarding submitting land use plans to ARB that could potentially be used later as a mandate. Jamesine Rogers (ARB) explained that the information would be used as supporting documentation and analysis behind the GHG percentage target that would be presented to ARB. Ms. Rogers stated that the information was for informational purposes only and would not mandate the jurisdictions to any land use policy presented within the submitted information.

Ultimately, the Committee asked that an authoritative representative of ARB attend the next meeting to confirm Ms. Rogers' statements. The Committee asked that ARB put this guarantee in writing, along with an explanation of how this information will be used. The committee also asked for a letter from COG that explains what is being done and why, what it all really means, and how it was developed.

**D. Recommending Target Scenario – Approval**

There was Committee consensus to delay approval of the target scenario until the questions raised during the meeting can be resolved.

A motion was made by Dwight Kroll (Clovis) and seconded by Keith Bergthold (Fresno) to continue this item to the next meeting so that the maps can be updated, a representative from ARB can be contacted to attend the next meeting, and an explanation can be drafted that explains the increase in VMT in Alternative One (1) from the baseline. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

**E. Other**

**A. Items from Members**

There were no items from Members

**B. Items from Staff**

There were no items form Staff

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristine Cai, Planner III

\sмм