

**KERN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
KERN REGIONAL BLUEPRINT VISIONING PROJECT
PLANNING DIRECTORS ROUNDTABLE FORUM #1 MINUTES**

**KERN COG CONFERENCE ROOM
1401 19TH STREET, THIRD FLOOR
BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA**

**FRIDAY
JULY 28, 2006
11:30 A.M.**

Mr. Ball called the meeting to order at approximately 11:45 a.m. A “sign-in” sheet was distributed.

I. ROLL CALL

Self-Introductions:

Jerry Forde	McFarland
Paul Hellman	Bakersfield
Wayne Clausen	Shafter
Rick Iger	KCWA
Issac George	Taft
Mike McCabe	Delano
Ted James	Kern County
Keith Woodcock	Wasco
James McRea	Ridgecrest

Staff:

Marilyn Beardslee	Kern COG
Darrel Hildebrand	Kern COG
Robert Ball	Kern COG
Linda Urata	Kern COG
Robert Phipps	Kern COG
Michael Heimer	Kern COG

II. DISCUSSION SUMMARY FROM JULY 14, 2006 MEETING:

Recapping highlights from the last meeting, the key things that Mr. Ball pointed out were that the Blueprint process is voluntary. It is a visioning process and not a planning process. The committee discussed several incentive opportunities that were long range. According to the governor’s bond measure, he stated that he was told they had over \$400 million set aside for infrastructure for regions that have adopted a regional blueprint.

Mr. Ball stated that the Blueprint document is not a mandatory document. The Blueprint resources and efforts are focused on primarily on public outreach with a lesser amount targeted for technical analysis and modeling tools. This roundtable forum is critical to ensure that the funding assists the local communities with their required public outreach efforts for their General Plan Processes. Doing this should avoid the potential of creating another layer of planning processes in addition to General Plans and Zoning.

Mr. Ball stated that the bullet items listed on the agenda were suggested topics from the eight-county group. They are suggested topics the Kern Blueprint Planning Roundtable should be sure to address. Each of the roundtable participants should be asking themselves what is their vision of the eight-county region.

Mr. Hildebrand discussed the activities of the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley (CPSJV). The Partnership was established in 2005 by the governor to look at long-term planning issues in the SJV. The CPSJV sub-committees are starting to prepare draft reports that are posted on the great valley center website <http://www.greatvalley.org/sjpartnership/mtgmaterials.aspx>. He stated that Mr. Ball sent the committee drafts from the Land Use Transportation Committee by e-mail earlier in the week. Final reports needs should be released by September or October 2006. Mr.

Hildebrand indicated that the CPSJV met today and they will meet again in September 2006 to review the reports. The committee wants to have the reports submitted to the governor by November 2006. He stated that the ultimate goal is to develop recommendations that will be significantly used by the Blueprint Committee in their local process. Mr. Hildebrand re-emphasized that wherever there is a general plan being reviewed or updated, this Blueprint project could be used to offset the public outreach facilitation of a general plan update.

III. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS:

Mr. Ball stated that the committee needed to review the Kern Blueprint Organization and Citizens Participation Plan. There were copies available to review at the meeting and information could also be located on the www.kerncog.org website. He indicated that was to send out copies of a revised version of the sub-regional map and request any final adjustments that were also available to pick on the front table. Mr. Ball mailed out two copies of the map, which reflected most of the changes that the committee had from the last meeting. He stated that Mr. Hildebrand has copies of the Request for Proposals (RFPs) for the Public Outreach Consultant. The idea is to receive feedback because the consultant process is critical to the review.

IV. RFP CONSULTANT CONTRACT:

Mr. Hildebrand handed out copies of the RFP and indicated that the committee could review the RFP references, the Project Organization and Citizens Participation Plan that the Kern COG Board adopted in May 2006. The Board is looking for professional facilitation services to help organize and conduct meetings in all of the nine sub-regions. He stated that they would be looking a variety of technologies. Mr. Hildebrand requested to have a contact person and address of a firm that is affective in rendering the services he would include them on the direct mailing list. **Mr. Hildebrand's action was to recommend a review subcommittee for the proposals to assist with a more detailed evaluation and to recommend firms that are affective in rendering facilitation services.** He added that his objective was to get the proposal out to the community by August 4, 2006. He invited the committee to review the 16-page proposal and give him comments by Wednesday, August 2, 2006 so he could incorporate them and make adjustments. Mr. Hildebrand stated that if the committee gives a recommendation he would issue amendments to the RFP for any material items after its initial release.

V. APPROVAL OF DISCUSSION SUMMARY: There were no changes requested.

VI. ROUNDTABLE DECISION MAKING PROCESS:

Mr. Ball stated that it is the intent of the Blueprint Process to use "informed consent" for decision-making. Developed by Dr. Hans Blieker of UC Monterey, this citizens participation method runs by the rule that if one is quiet or absent and disagrees with a decision being made by a larger body, then they have given their informed consent to the decision even though they may not fully agree with it. This allows the group to move on even though there is not a full consensus. In addition, it is much easier to achieve informed consent than consensus because it allows opposition to be fully expressed and exist with in the process. Decisions that receive intense opposition are modified to address the issue or are postponed until informed consent can be granted by all parties. Mr. Ball indicated that an informed consent has the added bonus of streamlining meetings since votes are not taken. He stated that this was the process we just used to approve the summary of the meeting notes from the last meeting.

Mr. Hildebrand added that the informed consent process is designed is recognize that some committee members go along with the decision even-though they disagree with it, but often sacrifice their interest for the sake of the meeting and process to move forward.

The process is not to be paralyzed by opposition. It is to allow opposition to be expressed with out being responsive but responsible.

VII. SUB-REGIONAL BLUEPRINT PLANNING AREAS MAP:

Mr. Ball discussed the boundaries of the sub-regional blueprint planning areas on a handout that was circulated to the committee. He stated that the primary purpose of these regions is to develop modeling values for the UPLAN land use model. He stated that at the last blueprint meeting, the committee agreed to move the boundaries to include West Tejon Ranch in Frazier Park and the water shed for the Sierras in Indian Wells Valley. A discussion about breaking out Wasco as a separate sub area resulted in a decision to reconsider this option once the model results were in. There was a discussion among the committee and Mr. Ball answered each question and concern.

Mr. Hildebrand stated that the blueprint process is not designed to address land use decisions. It is designed to provide a policy framework and a conceptual vision framework. He added that intention is to eventually evolve out of Uplan and move into other more sophisticated models that address local concerns. Mr. Hildebrand indicated that because the sub-regions are so different, the concerns and values are different. They are looking to get a more accurate reflection of community values.

Everyone in attendance gave their informed consent to the Sub-regional Planning Area Boundaries with the provision that the committee may need to revisit the boundaries based on the output from the land use models.

VIII. INITIAL 2050 FORECASTS:

Mr. Ball discussed a handout, which he circulated to the committee. He stated that the Uplan model is focused on the blueprint committee providing the input for the year 2050. The current figures have been calculated through 2030. Kern COG is in the process of updating all the general plan data and build out analysis for all of the sub-regional planning areas. He indicated that they have most of the information except for the Cities of California City, Arvin, and McFarland. Mr. Ball will be able to distribute a 2050 growth based mostly on capacity to those regions. There are two methods that he discussed on how to go about forecasting the 2050 growth. One method is to extrapolate existing adopted growth rates and he discussed this process further with the committee. The second method is to use the general plans full build out which each plan area. Whichever method is used, the existing general plans and any pending amendment areas must be compiled and mapped digitally to allocate the growth to the sub-regions. Secondly, Mr. Ball indicated that a number could be determined based on the build out. The alternatives could result in a 2050 extrapolation number of 1.7 million or a full build out number that may be over 2.2 million or roughly triple the current population. He stated that during the next meeting he was going to use the current 2050 forecasts unless the committee decides to up their sub-region to a full build out analysis.

IX. DATA/PERFORMANCE MEASURE REQUIREMENTS:

Mr. Ball discussed two sets of data input assumptions that he circulated to the blueprint committee. He stated that he put in some defaults as that Uplan uses. There assignment is to mold their local general plan land use designations into very restricted and limited categories. There was a discussion among the blueprint committee and Mr. Ball and Mr. Heimer answered each question in detail.

X. PUBLIC OUTREACH / REVIEW OF PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Mr. Ball stated that he would be providing a presentation regarding public outreach and strategies that they would like to use. Mr. Ball invited the committee to take a copy of the

Public Outreach contract RFP to review and submit any changes to him by Wednesday, August 2, 2006.

XI. HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE AND THE REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS PLAN

Mr. Ball stated that he would also be discussing implementation and coordination of the regional housing needs update.

XIII. SUMMARIZE ACTIONS ITEMS:

He asked the blueprint committee to get the public outreach forms back to him by Friday, August 4, 2006.

The next Kern Regional Blueprint Roundtable Forum would convene on Friday, August 25, 2006 11:30 a.m. at .

XIV. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at approximately 1:30 p.m.