

**KERN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
KERN REGIONAL BLUEPRINT VISIONING PROJECT (Joint Meeting)
PLANNING DIRECTORS ROUNDTABLE WORKING LUNCH NO. 9
And COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS
ROUNDTABLE NO. 4 MEETING MINUTES**

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

**FRIDAY
JUNE 29, 2007
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:

| | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Karen Northcutt | California City |
| Jim Movius | Bakersfield |
| Paul Hellman | Bakersfield |
| Mike McCabe | Delano |
| Ted James | Kern County |
| Lorelei H. Oviatt | Kern County |
| Mike Lee | Taft |
| Eddie Quintero | Taft |
| Bud Rice | Taft |
| Matthew Alexander | Ridgecrest |
| Dennis McNamara | Wasco |
| Rick Iger | K C Water Agency |
| Derek Abbott | Tejon Ranch |
| Andrew Daymude | Tejon Ranch |

Staff:

| | |
|-------------------|----------|
| Robert Ball | Kern COG |
| Darrel Hildebrand | Kern COG |
| Troy Hightower | Kern COG |
| Becky Napier | Kern COG |
| Linda Urata | Kern COG |
| Karen Snow | Kern COG |

- II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:** This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons to address the Committee on any matter not on this agenda but under the jurisdiction of the Committee. Committee members may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed. They may ask a question for clarification; make a referral to staff for information or request staff to report to the Committee at a later meeting. **SPEAKERS ARE LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD PRIOR TO MAKING A PRESENTATION.**

III MEETING SUMMARY / MINUTES (ATTACHMENT 1) – ACTION: CONSENT APPROVAL granted:

Mr. Ball reviewed the action items.

IV. RECAP OF THE KERN BLUEPRINT: WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT ISN'T.

Mr. Ball went over what the following bullet list:

- Visioning Process not A Land Use Plan
- Complements Local Plan Updates not Compete or Confuse Them
- Voluntary not Mandatory (Provides Incentives not Legal Mandates ...so far)
- Think Global and Regional not Just Local (yet)

- Educates not Advocates Recent Development and Planning Trends (Alternative Growth Strategies)
- Balancing Issues not just one Issue
- Seeks “Informed Consent” not Necessarily Complete Consensus
- Incorporates Technology Tools and Visualization not Simply Written Goals/Principles

V. PRELIMINARY SUMMARY OF TOWN HALL VISION AND VALUES – Phase I. – MIG Consulting – Action: Information/Discussion/ Make Adjustments: (ROBERT BALL)

Mr. Ball gave a PowerPoint presentation to the committee regarding the preliminary summary of town hall vision and values blueprint process. He said the last blueprint meeting was Thursday, June 28 in McFarland and they are still waiting to incorporate the results of the last couple of meetings. The Metropolitan Bakersfield Vision 2020 meetings summaries were not ready for inclusion in the summary yet either. He circulated the summary results from the outlying community sub-regions that are broken down by community. He stated that some of the results are preliminary and some copies are final. The results were also e-mailed out to the committee. Mr. Ball stated that they would all receive another set of copies for the outlying communities. He discussed the summary results in detail with the committee along with his PowerPoint presentation. He indicated that the blueprint committee is on a schedule to have the valleywide blueprint summit in the fall of 2008. There are two windows for the second round of public-outreach that take place in Fall or the Spring. They would like the phase two process to be completed no later than November 2007.

A summary sheet of attendance for the first round was passed out. Over 700 people attended 17 meetings throughout the County.

Mr. Hildebrand stated that the 1200 person random survey was performed for the county, which has been broken down into four sub-regions. This data will provide a reality check to the results from the Town Hall meetings. He stated that there is a perception of air quality being an issue in the mountain communities. Mr. Hildebrand stated that during the surveys, traffic congestion was not considered as big of an issue as road maintenance. Mr. Hildebrand explained that the survey results show high numbers about expanding public transit.

Mr. Ball stated that in the Town Hall outreach process, the blueprint committee strived for a grassroots approach, which includes a 3000 name contact database. Meetings have been conducted throughout the cities, the county, and community organizations and with various chambers of commerce. Mr. Ball circulated a spreadsheet showing a summary of the metro data survey results. Mr. Ball discussed in detail some of the common concerns that were addressed at many of the outlying communities. He stated that there were not a lot of surprises on the economic side. There was a discussion among the committee and Mr. Ball answered each question in detail.

VI. 2007 RANDOM COMMUNITY ISSUES SURVEY RESULTS – Similarities and Contrasts with Phase I. Blueprint Input: (DARREL HILDEBRAND)

Mr. Hildebrand discussed the purpose of the survey as the committee followed along looking at a map that was circulated. The map shows the four sub-regions the county was divided into. The reason there were four sections is that if there were any more, the amount of interviews conducted would need to increase. He explained that instead of sampling all eight of the blueprint regions, they created the west side of the central valley, the Valley, the Mountains, and Desert regions. Mr. Hildebrand stated that the survey could also be found on the Kern COG website at www.kerncog.org. He stated that there were 1,200 interviews conducted, 600 within the central valley zone, and 200 in the other two outlying cities. Mr. Hildebrand stated that the survey was reliable statistically within plus or minus three percent, which improved from the normal five percent. The 28-question interviews were done between February 14 – 18, 2007 and lasted approximately

20 minutes each. Mr. Hildebrand stated that the survey would become a standard program for Kern COG and it will be retaken every two to three years to establish a trend. He stated that there would be approximately 18 or 19 questions that will remain the same but there are going to be six or seven questions that may change according to major issues that are taking place in the communities. He discussed more highlights of the survey in detail with the committee and he answered each question in detail.

VII. PROVIDING EDUCATION ON ALTERNATIVE GROWTH STRATEGIES – Brainstorming Session – Local Examples:

Mr. Ball stated that in providing education on alternative growth strategies, Kern COG would be looking at strategies to achieve their visions. He indicated that he also has the task to produce scenarios. The scenarios will tie back to the issue areas that were previously identified. He discussed the 8-page executive summary working draft report he circulated to the committee. They are still in the process of compiling data with changes to the metro Bakersfield information. Mr. Ball stated that they are compare and contrasting the survey results with the data. He explained that to achieve the visions and values, our communities have many success stories. He asked the committee to provide Kern COG with ideas and concepts on how the blueprint committee could present solutions to address individual issues. Mr. Ball asked the committee what types of educational material they would present to the public in order to solve water problems, economic development, and air quality issues identified in the town hall meetings. Mr. Ball asked the committee to help the design a process so that products are consistent with local general plan updates underway. **Action ITEM: Several members suggested using the Kern Water Plan, the Kern Economic Development Plan, local examples, and other favorite examples from other communities. Rancho Mirage was suggested as having a good low water and shade component.** There was a discussion among the committee and Mr. Ball answered each question in detail.

VIII. DRAFT TIMELINE: Coordinating Development of the Preferred Alternative with Local Planners and Plan Updates:

Mr. Ball discussed the legislative updates regarding the carrots being developed for the Blueprint process statewide. The new term in Sacramento is called the Carrot Stick. He circulated a handouts regarding SB 375 and discussed a summary he received from CalCOG that answers questions about SB 375 legislation. He explained that this legislation is a response to AB 32 that was passed last fall. Included in the handout was a copy of the lawsuit that was filed against the County of San Bernardino County general plan because they did not address the greenhouse gases. Mr. Ball stated that a copy of the mitigation measures on how to mitigate CO2 emissions was attached. He explained that AB 32 is requiring a goal to set back emissions to 1990 levels, which is about a 27% reduction in current CO2 levels. He also attached a copy of the letter from Attorney General Jerry Brown regarding the failure of Kern COGs Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) EIR to address CO2 and greenhouse gas emissions. Kern COG included an 18 pages of response and was asked to send notice of determination dates, which has a 180 day clock that runs out around November 2007. At this time, none of the COGs have been sued but consultation with staff at recent statewide meetings indicate the attorney general is trying to make a statement that he wants each of the COGs to consider CO2 emissions before California Air Resources Board (ARB) develops a methodology. He explained that strategies such as efficient communities to reduce CO2 also promote cleaner air for pollutants that we are non-attainment for. Mr. Ball stated that the new legislation SB 375 is talking about using COG transportation models to calculate a region's CO2 emissions. The blueprint process would be used to push the policies of the SB 375. This item was for information and discussion and Mr. Ball answered each question in detail.

IX. NEXT STEPS – Summarize Action Items for Next Meeting:

Mr. Ball encouraged the committee to bring and present sample plans and projects to the meeting. He wanted to highlight what developments like Millcreek and Windemere in Bakersfield. He said that he would like to reshoot the Otay Ranch video again regarding Cycle 2 to the committee.

X. OTHER BUSINESS / NEXT MEETINGS FRIDAY, JULY 20, 2007 AT 11:30 – WORKING LUNCH

Mr. Ball scheduled the next meeting date to be on Friday, August 10, 2007 at 11:30 a.m. in the Kern COG Boardroom to further discuss information regarding SB 375.

XI. ADJOURNMENT:

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