

**KERN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
KERN REGIONAL BLUEPRINT VISIONING PROJECT
PLANNING DIRECTORS ROUNDTABLE FORUM #4 MINUTES**

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

**FRIDAY
OCTOBER 6, 2006
11:30 A.M.**

Mr. Ball called the meeting to order at approximately 11:40 a.m. A “sign-in” sheet was distributed.

I. ROLL CALL

Self-Introductions:	Issac George	Arvin
	Paul Hellman	Bakersfield
	John Stinson	Bakersfield
	Dan Allen	California City
	Karen Northcutt	California City
	Mike McCabe	Delano
	Emery Rendes	GET
	Ted James	Kern County
	Gerald Forde	McFarland
	Steve Perez	McFarland
	Wayne Clausen	Shafter
	Mike Lee	Taft
	Keith Woodcock	Wasco
Staff:	Becky Napier	Kern COG
	Troy Hightower	Kern COG
	Robert Ball	Kern COG
	Michael Heimer	Kern COG

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS / VISITOR INTRODUCTIONS: None

Mr. Ball stated that this was the fourth Kern Regional Blueprint Planning Directors’ Roundtable. It is one of four committees in Kern County that have begun the Blueprint process. Other committees are the Economic and Community Development, the Environmental and Equity Stakeholders Group, and the Economic and Real Estate Stakeholders Group. The state grant for this project is focused on public outreach. He explained that although this was a Planning Directors’ Roundtable meeting, it was an open for others to attend and included other land use agencies such as BLM and LAFCO. Mr. Ball indicated that Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG) encourages all communities to be involved and provide input in this process to ensure that it will be useful to your communities specific needs.

III. MEETING SUMMARY / APPROVAL OF DISCUSSION SUMMARY: Consent Approval

Mr. Ball reviewed the minutes from the September 1, 2006 meeting and asked for the conformed consent approval from the committee to accept the minutes as is. Hearing no dissensions, Mr. Ball moved on to the next item.

PAST ACTION ITEMS:

- Mr. Ball stated that the Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG) is to scale back the planning area capacity analysis from the full capacity to a growth around 2050. He stated that there was a spreadsheet attached to the agenda regarding this item.
- All participants were to provided feedback on the draft constraint maps as needed, The Military Flight Corridors Map was missing the MOA for Lamore NAS.

- He added that all participants were requested to review the growth principles carefully and recommend changes for consideration of endorsement at today's meeting.
- Mr. Ball explained that Kern COG is to explore feasibility of providing a Housing Data Supplement with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and open a dialog with HUD on it.
- Mr. Ball stated that they only received one response to the Public Facilitator RFP and it was rejected. The deadline has been extended to October 12, 2006. He encouraged the volunteers to review responses to Public Facilitator RFP when they receive the proposals next week.

IV. COORDINATED 8-COUNTY MODEL STEERING COMMITTEE (MSC) SCHEDULE AND TASKS:

Mr. Ball stated that there was a schedule sheet draft handout located on the sign-in table that was separate from the other handouts. He stated that there is a San Joaquin Valley Group made up of technical representatives from each of the 8-COGs and state representatives that are going through development of the modeling for the 8-County region. He indicated that one of the things that may be arising out of the process is a "one voice" for the valley concept. Mr. Ball explained the task sheet in detail with the committee. This item was for information and discussion.

V. CONSULTANT SELECTION TO PUBLIC FACILITATOR CONTRACT:

Mr. Ball stated that one of the major efforts in the grant program is a public facilitator contract.

Ms. Napier stated that Kern COG received only one proposal response to the RFP and that it was inadequate. RFP was re-circulated and responses are due October 12, 2006.

Mr. Ball indicated that the committee members could log onto the www.kerncog.org website to look at the RFP. This item was for information and discussion.

VI. PUBLIC OUTREACH TOOLS (MODELING, GAMING, CHARENTTES, ETC):

Mr. Ball discussed another handout from the sign-in table regarding a demonstration of UPLAN that will be facilitated by Mr. Heimer from Kern COG. Mr. Ball stated that UPLAN would not be the only tool that will be used because Kern COG also maintains a Regional Transportation model. UPLAN is limited on what it can address on some of the issues and value indicators. He explained that the UPLAN demonstrates some of the interrelations and interactions of different types of modeling tools and techniques. Mr. Ball stated that one of the key areas to promote industry clusters could be generated by a lot of input from other modeling tools. They hope to develop a customized spreadsheet based index that could rank different types of land use alternatives. Mr. Heimer demonstrated the latest modeling efforts with the UPLAN software. This item was for information and discussion.

VII. REVISED PLANNING AREA CAPACITY ANALYSIS (FULL BUILDOUT) AND STEPPED BACK FORECAST TO 2050:

Mr. Ball discussed an attachment to the agenda with the committee regarding the revised planning area capacity analysis. He used a generalized map of all the combined general plans in the Cities and County to assist with this presentation. He stated that general plans have been collected and inputted. UPLAN has a limited set of general plan land use. The general plan also includes the pending general plan amendments. Mr. Ball stated that in addition, they created a planning area capacity land use. When the growth was allocated, the East Wasco area and Southwest Bakersfield area were not filled to capacity. He discussed the map in further detail regarding the UPLAN model in regards

to the 2050 forecast. Mr. Ball stated that next spring they would be testing scenarios using the UPLAN tool. There was a discussion between the committee and Mr. Ball answered each question in detail. For the next meeting Mr. Ball will have provide a better base case scenario run using the UPLAN model. This item was for information and discussion.

VIII. ENDORSEMENT OF GROWTH PRINCIPLES ADOPTED BY VALLEY COUNTIES AND CITIES: (No Action Taken)

Mr. Ball stated that at the last Blueprint Meeting the committee was given a handout and asked to review the growth principles for sustainable growth. He stated that in the past couple of years the Great Valley Center has been working with a group called the Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley to promote regional growth strategies and ideas. Mr. Ball indicated that since the San Joaquin Valley Regional Association of California Counties and the central California Mayors Conference have already adopted the strategies, it was suggested to consider them for use in the blueprint process. He stated that the action for this item was to recommend an endorsement of these “off-the-shelf” strategies by local agencies and Kern COG’s Board.

After considerable discussion, two issues with the strategies were identified by the group. 1) In the second whereas Mr. James pointed out that of the Valley Mayors’ version excluded growth in unincorporated communities. The word “cities” should be changed to “communities.” Mr. Stinson suggested that growth go into communities with urban infrastructure. Mr. Perez shared concern that it could limit growth and economic opportunities in smaller communities. 2) The 4th whereas recommend avoiding premature or un-necessary conversion of prime ag land. It is vague on who determines what is premature conversion.

Concerns were raised that the Great Valley Center, the State and/or legislators outside the region have an agenda to circumvent local land use authority with these principles. Mr. James pointed out that these strategies need to re-affirm that urban growth and monitoring of land use is best done at the local government level. Mr. Ball suggested that this blueprint process is the 4th attempt at regionalism in the past 25 years and that this is the first time they have provided for a bottom-up approach by allowing the COGs to enlist the participation of all local governments and their constituents in an extensive public outreach process. Mr. James pointed out that new sources of funding being proposed are being used as a leverage for local agencies to participate. No blueprint, no bond money. Mr. Ball indicated that the bond Measure 1C was leading in the polls and included funding for infrastructure and smart growth types of projects.

Mr. Ball also pointed out that this was the 4th time these strategies had been on the agenda of the Planning Director’s Roundtable. Since they were originally placed on the agenda we found out that none of the other valley COGs are taking action on them. Therefore it is not necessary that we carry through with the recommended action. This item was tabled and no action was taken.

IX. PARTNERSHIP FOR THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY – STATUS REPORT:

Mr. Ball circulated report to the committee, which contained the recommendations of the Land Use, Housing and Agricultural work group for the Governor’s Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley. He explained to the committee that they could download more information from the California Business Transportation and Housing website <http://www.greatvalley.org/sjpartnership/index.aspx>. A comment form is available at <http://www.greatvalley.org/sjpartnership>. Mr. Ball stated that on October 26, 2006 is a public hearing, and when the report should be adopted by the Partnership. Comments should be submitted as early as possible prior to the meeting. This item was for information and discussion and no action was taken.

X. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA)

Mr. Ball stated that at the last meeting Kern COG would explore the potential of creating a housing data book as a part of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment forecast every 5 to 7 years, which are put into housing elements. He stated that if Measure 1C passes then funding could be available for this activity. The funds would be helpful to have a housing element data book that would have the numbers needed to crunch each housing element for each community. The state data should relieve the burden of each agency having to hire consultants to update housing elements. There was a discussion between the committee and Mr. Ball answered each question in detail. This item was for information and discussion and no action was taken.

XI. SUMMARIZE ACTION ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING:

- Kern COG to provide a sub-area land use model run.
- Kern COG will distribute copies of the proposals received to the volunteer reviewers.
- Member agencies are encouraged to provide feedback to the partnership for the San Joaquin Valley. On the website <http://www.greatvalley.org/sjpartnership/index.aspx> you will find land use for agricultural, education, etc. He indicated that the proposal was available for public review and written comments may be submitted in advance. A comment form is available at <http://www.greatvalley.org/sjpartnership>

XII. OTHER BUSINESS / NEXT MEETING:

Mr. Ball indicated that the potential for a conservation plan for the entire 8-county region would allow development to occur within Kern for less than a 1-county mitigation fee. The habitat fee will be increasing because the cheaper habitat land has already been purchased. Competition and greater availability valley-wide could help to drive down mitigation costs. The blueprint project is receiving a lot of federal and state attention and because of that they could leverage additional funding for creating this type of plan.

The next Kern Regional Blueprint Roundtable Forum would (be determined) convene on Friday, November 10, 2006

XIII. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at approximately 1:35 p.m.