

**KERN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
KERN REGIONAL BLUEPRINT VISIONING PROJECT
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
AUGUST 24, 2007
11:30 A.M.**

Mr. Ball called the meeting to order at approximately 11:55 a.m. A “sign-in” sheet was distributed.

I. ROLL CALL

Self-Introductions:

Karen Northcutt	California City
Jim Eggert	Bakersfield
Paul Hellman	Bakersfield
Derek Abbott	Tejon Ranch
Andrew Daymude	Tejon Ranch
Dennis McNamara	Wasco
Richard Chapman	Kern EDC
Paul Sippel	KC EDD
Barry Jung	KC EDD
Lorelei Oviatt	KC Planning Dept
Ted James	Kern County
Avtar Hijjer-Sidhu	CCROPP / KCDPH
Keith Woodcock	Delano
Vince Zaragoza	Bakersfield
Issac George	Arvin

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:

Mr. Ball discussed the meeting summary from the last meeting that was circulated to the committee. Action items suggested by members were to provide education on alternative growth strategies such as using the Kern Water Plan. He indicated that some members suggested the Kern Economic Development Plan. He asked the committee to bring in local example plans and maps for discussion. There were no additions or changes to these consent items.

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

Mr. Ball stated that their challenge in the educational process is to boil down the information to the public. Kern COG likes to remind the committee what the Blueprint is and is not and there is a list. Mr. Ball mentioned what the grant obligation is in the process. They are looking for a List of Principles and a Preferred Scenario or Concept Map. He presented a PowerPoint to the committee regarding the Visioning and educational process of the Blueprint. They are looking to the public to provide information to the local land use planners. These planners would be responsible for creating the map in a separate process that would happen after Phase II. SanDAG went to each of its local jurisdictions and had them draw the maps for them based on public input of where the health centers should go. Mr. Ball stated that in terms of an educational aspect, the best way to demonstrate examples was with the Otay Ranch video presentation. He stated that the same thing could be done for downtown Bakersfield. They already have mixed land and development use with housing and commercial. The information presented can be used as examples within the communities as an educational piece. He explained that this component could be used to get planners to build a final list of principles for growth scenarios. The principles often have a tie back to higher density types of development that provide increased economic activity and opportunities. The communities mentioned a lot of interest in transit-oriented centers, which are left up the local general plan jurisdiction.

V. DRAFT SUMMARY OF TOWN HALL MEETINGS/COMMUNITY ISSUES SURVEY – VISION AND VALUES – PHASE I.

Ms. Napier circulated a handout, which is still draft form. Kern Council of Governments' staff (Kern COG) wanted the committee to have a copy for review and feedback before finalization. She stated that some of the slides were a summary of the items listed in the draft report. Ms. Napier presented a brief, detailed PowerPoint presentation to the committee regarding "Visions and Values." Ms. Napier stated that Kern COG staff would review each meeting summary and make sure that everything agrees. Committee members asked questions and Ms. Napier and Mr. Hightower answered each question in detail.

Mr. Ball indicated that the slides showed how common issues were between sub-regions. If a high number was reached, then a particular agency was mentioned in most all the sub-regions and the lower numbers meant that some sub-regions were not mentioned at all in some of the discussions for future vision.

Mr. Hightower added that the charts described a curve, as opposed to a straight line. He agrees that they indicate what is common among most workshops. Items that were most common also had the highest amounts.

Mr. Jones stated that the blueprint is a visioning process and just as there are many commonalities, he stated that he was interested in finding the differences. He wondered if there were communities were more interested in certain things than others. There would be an effort to mesh everything together to and come up with one growth scenario that fits everything. Mr. Jones explained that when the process was started, the focus was to recognize the uniqueness of each community. One growth direction does not fit every situation.

Mr. Hildebrand emphasized that is critical that Kern County staff attend the committee meetings and voice their concerns. He stated he would enable the Kern Regional Blueprint Program to cover funding costs for any agency with budgetary problems so they can attend the meeting on September 27. Mr. Hildebrand stated that the information is starting to simmer at the eight county levels and it is critical that Kern County is present.

Mr. Chapman asked how economic growth and growth management was defined while being presented at each city presentation. Mr. Hildebrand replied that growth management was not defined but instead each city came up with its own concepts. He stated that the 2007 survey that shows the comparison and contrasts at random. The current meetings obtain a nice size turnout from the business minded and civically active. They do not always hear from the unrepresented groups such as the elderly, minorities, and the disabled.

VI. PHASE II. PROVIDING EDUCATION ON ALTERNATIVE GROWTH STRATEGIES

Ms. Napier discussed a survey summary table with the committee from the handout. She said it did not include Metropolitan Bakersfield because the committee did not play the card game. The survey shows the categories that came up and how different communities ranked and how they felt their issues should be handled. She stated that Phase I of the Blueprint meetings have been completed except for the last one to be held at Stallion Springs. Phase II will start in October 2007 and Kern COG staff plans to finish by the end of January 2008. She explained that they will host the Kern Blueprint Regional Vision and the city and county is updating its general plans. Ms. Napier stated that Kern COG is on schedule to conduct Blueprint revisions in October 2008. There were questions asked by the committee and Ms. Napier answered each question in detail.

Mr. Hildebrand stated that Kern COG's process and meeting content are much better than what is being done in the eight-valley counties except for San Joaquin and Stanislaus who are following the same guidelines as Kern COG. They are now catching up because the quality of work presented is much better. He stated that Ms. Oviatt was able to get some of the county junior staff involved to work with the Blueprint committee to conduct small group facilitations.

VII. PHASE II. LAND USE SCENARIO ACTIVITY AND SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT FOR GENERAL PLAN UPDATES

Mr. Ball stated that at the last Blueprint meeting the committee did some positive brainstorming. Two things that were discussed was looking at the existing economic plan that Kern EDC and the Water agency has.

Mr. Chapman, Kern EDC Director, spoke with the committee about what is Kern's Economic Development Plan. He stated that they have a stewardship group that is working in six sectors that provides business development support. Three staff members oversee two sectors each. The Board of Trade handles tourism, entertainment, and recreation. He explained that the group is in the process of tracking where the inches of growth for the economy and where it is going. He discussed a diagram with the committee, which he explained that the size of the bubble is the number employed in a particular industry. Mr. Chapman stated that business services trends and logistics are the fastest growing services. He stated that Bakersfield has the lowest commercial and industrial rates in the country. Builders have to be convinced to come to our city to build or there will be many missed opportunities. Mr. Chapman explained how the growth rate in 2005 was over 10% and there has been a lot of discussion about intermodal facilities and how they can enhance the transportation infrastructure. Mobility includes air and rail transportation, in addition to roads. The inner cargo discussion is to put a customs official in the airports where air cargo would be key for growing the industry as well. He stated that energy is strong and considered the second largest employer growing at a healthy 6% rate, which include the blue collar and white-collar office jobs. Transportation is growing as a distribution hub, Bakersfield has about 20 million square feet available in industrial space, and in the last three months, more parts that are industrial have opened. He explained that because we are so close to Los Angeles, Bakersfield does not offer specialty services for health care. A lot of money is being spent in other economies and the facilities need to be built locally. Mr. Chapman discussed more information from his presentation with the committee regarding the quality of life in Bakersfield where a 5-year

growth is treading upward in a positive direction. He went into detail on his report regarding current projects Kern EDC is involved in. There was a discussion among the committee and Mr. Chapman answered each question in detail.

VIII. DRAFT TIMELINE: COORDINATING DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE WITH LOCAL PLANNERS AND PLAN UPDATES

Mr. Ball tied Kern EDC's presentation to the Blueprint by reiterating how during Phase I they review the visions and values, in addition to economic development. He stated that the next step was to make the connection to a set of broad principles but there would not be many details. In making the connection, they would need to refer back to the economic development aspect.

Mr. Hightower stated that in response to the last workshop, Mr. Iger from the Kern County Water Agency designed a nice PowerPoint that is also available on the Kern COG website. Mr. Ball stated that they would probably present the PowerPoint at the next committee meeting.

IX. CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE BLUEPRINT. SB375

Mr. Ball stated that the SB375 has infill opportunity areas. A parking lot is taken and something is done to create a higher level of activity within that center, which support the goals for economic development or water savings. The Blueprint committee is looking to tie each one of the examples back to the individual visions that came out of the process. People in the community have suggested doing high-growth concentrated smart growth centers because greenhouse gas emissions would be reduce. Mr. Ball stated that the first set of meetings is in rural areas.

Ms. Oviatt stated that the committee has a good representation of the communities along with Metropolitan Bakersfield. She feels the committee is trying to map an urban solution onto a diverse county. The county of Kern is in opposition of SB375.

Mr. Zaragoza indicated that there is land that is owned by a master property owner and there are other parts that were developed by a city or development agency that designed a master plan or RFP. When it comes to urban infill, a city, county, or redevelopment agency that is spending the money to acquire the land to make it available.

Mr. Ball explained that the maps described rural development and the centers would be rural centers such as the new transit station in the City of Delano. Kern COG is looking to take the concept to the general public for feedback that would be taken back to the planners. The planner would then draw a map for where the centers should be placed. There was a discussion among the committee and Mr. Ball answered each question in detail. He proposed general plan update solutions that addresses the issues that are raised from the general public.

Mr. Hildebrand stated that according the teleconference between the eight-valley COGs, the Blueprint process needs to move faster. He stated that any concerns that the agencies have need to be brought out and the lack in involvement with the planners in other counties is not a good thing. He stated that they needed to comply with their contractual obligations and produce something that has credibility with the committee and is usable. Mr. Hildebrand stated that the committee would need to give Mr. Ball some suggestions and solutions to help address agency concerns.

Mr. Woodcock suggested that instead of choosing a preferred alternative and four different scenarios was determined having 1) all the growth go to the cities, 2) all the growth go to the smaller communities, 3) equally share the growth, or 4) create a new town. He stated that it would be better if they choose between suggested alternatives instead of trying to determine on preferred alternative.

Mr. Ball stated that each community and sub-region would have a different path on what they want to see happen. The discussion is an extension and he is looking to help each agency with its general plan process. The general nature of the map is for the communities to determine where the centers would be located. He stated that he is willing to create a preferred scenario if the committee agrees. Mr. Ball indicated that if SB375 passes then the wording has to state that the Blueprint has to identify infill opportunity areas. The infill opportunity area preferred scenario is a product that they would be looking for or the agencies would not be eligible for the money.

Mr. George stated that there is lack of regional planning and lack of revenue sharing. If a community does not have these resources in place than it would be difficult to pre-designate centers. If there is no revenue sharing plan to attract growth into the centers, the plan is bound to fail. If SB376 comes and states, Kern County has to share tax revenues based on population. He added that based on certain strategies and tools that they have accepted; they have been able to use carbon monoxide from the air. They want to go beyond traditional transit planning.

Mr. James stated that he realizes that the County of Kern's current general plan does not accommodate growth. On previous maps, they displayed areas that were in process for amendments that they thought were very likely. They might consider looking at paring back the areas for higher density based on economics.

Mr. ____ stated that the using the centers is a possible approach but letting the outlying areas look at the plan would be beneficial. He indicated that urban infill from the Governor's office would only pay 40 percent of the need by the year 2050. There has to be a traditional urban development and new communities. He believed that some successful blend of all the four alternatives would probably be successful.

Ms. Napier stated that Kern COG would like the Blueprint for Kern County to stand on its own so that it is updated on a regular basis.

Mr. Ball stated that the second round of activities are broad principles based on economic growth, growth management, and air quality. All of the principles that are in the existing Kern County/Bakersfield General Plan already speak about the centers concept. It has a rural village concept that is appropriate for each community. He stated that these areas are innovative growth strategies that not every agency is taking advantage of. He indicated that he could provide a more information. He asked would like rail be taken into consideration when making long-range commitments for funding for transportation. To be able to make the commitments for transportation funding they need a land use committee from the local communities and agencies. There was more discussion among the committee regarding land use planning.

X. EIGHT-COUNTY BLUEPRINT PLANNERS WORK GROUP – SEPT. 10 - 3PM, FRESNO COG, 2305 TULARE ST., STE. 201

XI. NEXT STEPS – SUMMARIZE ACTION ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

XII. OTHER BUSINESS / NEXT MEETING FRI, SEPT 21, 2007 AT 11:30 A.M. – WORKING LUNCH PILOT PHASE II. ACTIVITY

XIII. 1:30 ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at approximately 1:40 p.m.