Meeting of the Board of Directors
Thursday, October 22, 2009
1 to 5 pm
Radisson Hotel & Convention Center
Fresno, California

Approved Meeting Minutes

Present: James Aleru, Lee Andersen, Frank Bigelow, Will Brown (representing Secretary Kawamura), Mike Chrisman, Sid Craighead, Dee Dee D’Adamo, Fritz Grupe, Barry Hibbard, Brent Jamison (representing Secretary Aguiar), Anne McKinney (representing Secretary Thomas), Sunne McPeak, Luisa Medina, Mike Nelson, Leroy Ornellas, Richard Ortega, Pete Parra, Jeff Rowe, Paul Saldana, Ashley Swearengin, Cindy Tuck (representing Secretary Adams), Gene Voiland, Ray Watson, Pete Weber, Greg Woodard

Staff: Mike Dozier, David Hosley

I. Convene Meeting & Introductory Remarks

Chair Chrisman called to order at 1:24 pm the meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley (Partnership). Following his welcome of all participants, Chair Chrisman acknowledged the passing of Dr. Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, recalling her efforts in support of the San Joaquin Valley and especially in the education of the Valley through her support and leadership of the effort to create UC Merced.

Ms. D’Adamo commented that she met Carol while working on UC Merced when it was just a dream. Carol had tremendous enthusiasm for the University and despite the many, many obstacles, especially on the environmental side; things began to move once Carol came on board. In recalling the personal friendship they developed, Ms. D’Adamo recalled hearing Carol say on many occasions that UC Merced would have the ability to transform lives; a prediction that has proven true as evidenced by the recent graduation ceremonies for the first full class of graduates.

Mr. Grupe noted that nobody knew what they were getting into at the start of the UC Merced project but Carol had a vision; not only did she think its presence would transform the Valley’s people, it would transform the Valley.

Mr. Andersen observed that one of the things Carol spoke of was linkage; linkage within and across the educational institutions in the Valley. Here in the Valley there is clear linkage ranging from pre-kindergarten all the way through elementary, high school, community colleges and now the Universities.

Mr. Weber announced to the board that Governor Schwarzenegger is announcing today a grant to the Partnership of $2 million in funds from WIA discretionary funds. These funds are the result of the Partnership’s proposal requesting support from the state
discretionary WIA funding to specifically enhance the ability of the Partnership and the regional Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) to effectively and efficiently get the best ROI for the Valley’s unemployed and to stimulate the regional economy. Through shared goals, articulated strategies and synergistic actions the Partnership will serve as a convener to bring all Valley stakeholders together to target industry clusters that show the most promise for future growth, region-wide.

Chair Chrisman thanked Mr. Weber for his personal involvement in making this grant happen, noting to the audience that Robert Gore from the Governor’s office and Pete Weber marshaled this process and moved it along.

II. Self-Introductions

Members of the board introduced themselves.

III. Public and Board Comments

Mr. Dozier announced to the board that staff member Manjit Muhar-Atwal has accepted a position with the Fresno Unified School District and will be leaving the Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) in November. In recognition of Ms. Atwal’s tenure with and dedication to OCED and the Partnership, Assemblyman Villines’ office presented a resolution acknowledging her contribution.

Ms. McPeak advised the board of a new public awareness campaign from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF): Get Connected! CETF provides leadership statewide to close the “Digital Divide” by accelerating the deployment and adoption of broadband to unserved and underserved communities and populations. As reported at the June 2009 board meeting, the Partnership pioneered the concept of Advanced Communications Services and highlighted the need to be digitally connected. The next ACS priority should be to start working on the Valley public awareness campaign. Ms. McPeak asked if it is acceptable and appropriate for the Partnership to support CETF in public awareness activities. Great Valley Center has been chairing and staffing the ACS work group; David Hosley has offered that work group to be the lead of the public awareness effort. The public relations firm is about to send out the campaign announcements, Ms. McPeak extended a formal request for the Partnership to join with the CETF in asking Valley counties and cities to take steps within their jurisdiction to promote the use and adoption of digital technology.

There were several simultaneous motions to approve Ms. McPeak’s request; the motion was seconded by Ms. D’Adamo.

Mr. Hosley spoke about the ACS workgroup’s efforts to close the digital divide including a large grant pending to support multiple projects in the Valley to capitalize on the success of the Pixley project which demonstrated great success in getting young, old, and impoverished people connected. Having a public information campaign like this, with endorsement at the local level, will help level the playing field across the Valley.

Mr. Bigelow noted that he withheld vote on the motion only due to his connection to telecommunications; he would normally have endorsed the proposal.
Carrie Bowman provided the following update from the High Speed Rail Authority (Authority). [http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/)

On October the Authority submitted to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act a funding request for $4.7 million in support of the high speed rail train. The HSRA hopes to hear early in the New Year the results of this request and considers the chances good to be funded: California is further along in the planning process than other states and have Bond measure matching funds to support the project.

Ms. Bowman extended the Authority’s thanks to all who supported and worked on this extensive effort.

Continuing her report, Ms. Bowman noted there will be Altamont scoping meetings in November. The many alternatives regarding the two segments: Merced to Fresno and Fresno to Bakersfield, have been narrowed and the Authority hopes to have a draft in 2010 and final plan in 2011.

On November 4 at the Authority’s board meeting will be the topic of the heavy maintenance facility.

Chair Chrisman asked when residents could expect ground broken on HSR construction. Ms. Bowman responded 2012, with push to start sooner.

Mr. Weber extended thanks to Ms. Bowman and the staff at the Authority navigating a difficult course to get to the final ARRA application. Mr. Weber noted the focus now needs to be on Washington, DC and offered the Partnership and its individual members to be involved in any way necessary to support the interests of the Valley there.

Ms. D’Adamo interjected that Ms. Bowman and Chair Chrisman met with members of Congress and staff this week; as a result Representatives Costa and Cardoza are drafting a letter to the Federal Railroad Administration in support of California’s application and recommended the Partnership draft a similar letter of support.

### IV. Review and Approval of Minutes

Chair Chrisman solicited any corrections to minutes from the previous meeting. No corrections were offered; several members simultaneously moved and seconded the motion to approve the minutes as presented.

### V. Secretariat Report

Mr. Dozier advised that the Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) had submitted an application for a University Centers grant in the amount of $260,000. Although this application placed ninth of all requests, only eight were funded; the evaluation committee strongly urged the office to reapply for the next round of funding.

Page 132 of the board package contains a report on financial contributions from the COGS in support of Partnership. The total reported so far is $86,698 received, with commitments from all but two counties; Stanislaus cannot participate due to funding constraints and there is no response yet from Kern County. The Governor’s $2million
grant funds require a match; without these funds from the counties we would not be able to meet the matching requirement.

In response to a question from Ms. Medina, Mr. Weber explained that the $2 million grant is coming from Workforce Investment Act (WIA) sources; phased over two years, 50% is discretionary and requires a 1 for 1 match of cash or in kind. The deliverables from this grant will help create a new approach to workforce development in the Valley through a fully articulated curriculum approach from junior high school through high school, community college and ultimately to a four year institution. Mr. Weber noted that Jeff Rowe refers to the workforce investment boards as a “second chance” system, one designed to try to re-configure the current workforce. The purpose of the WIA grant is to try to fix the problem of unqualified workers by getting ahead of the curve; graduating educated, qualified workers. Pilot programs will be developed in the north, south and center of the valley.

Employers consistently report challenges in areas of English language, mathematics and digital literacy. Since the schools are doing good work on the math area, we will focus on English language academies, similar to what the Partnership funded with the initial CVELI seed grant and three digital literacy academies working with the ACS work group. The pilot programs will include establishing entrepreneurship centers in three other parts of the Valley. A challenge and opportunity is figuring out how to incorporate green jobs into the programs.

Mr. Dozier extended thanks and kudos to Mr. Weber for his tireless efforts in support of this grant.

Mr. Saldana inquired as to whether there is tracking of time spent by the work groups that aren’t being funded; perhaps those efforts could also be included as part of the match since there is still activity taking place and work being expended. If the effort could be tracked it might be helpful to sustain this effort and secure further funding Mr. Parra asked if the hard match dollars go to support of the same projects and Mr. Weber replied that the match needs to be associated with the projects identified through an in-kind match.

Ms. Swearengin asked Mr. Dozier to talk about the EDA grant and how consistent it is with the Partnership work groups. Mr. Dozier responded that it is about 50% Partnership driven and 30% RJI driven, with a portion to work force development in Kern County.

Mr. Weber announced there is a new opportunity now under Economic Clusters of Opportunity to apply for a grant as the Partnership; to do something similar to the original Partnership grant funding.

Mr. Dozier continued the Secretariat report by outlining other grant and funding opportunities being pursued such as an iHub grant.

In the Secretariat’s Legislative update Mr. Dozier pointed out a request from Congressman Radanovich’s office for a letter of support from the Partnership on HR855, the California Drought Alleviation Act. Kimberly Kauffman from Congressman Radanovich’s office offered to work with Katie Stevens and the Government Affairs Committee to vet the letter and provide any additional information necessary.
At the request of Chair Chrisman, Ms. Kauffman described HR855 as an effort to lift the EPA restriction of Delta pump operations, allowing water to flow. The proposal includes provisions for smelt hatchery and directs the Federal government to work with the State on those issues. This bill was introduced at the end of the last Congress and is being re-introduced in this Congress. Congressman Costa joined in asking for hearings on the Legislation; the bill has been offered twice (March and October 2009) as amendments to other legislation. Partnership endorsement will be appreciated.

Continuing with the Communications section of his update, Mr. Dozier reiterated the board’s request for a strategy for outreach around the Valley in order to communicate Partnership activities, accomplishments and lessons learned. Mr. Dozier confirmed that staff is constantly working to expand our sphere of contacts and our database. Many people receive Partnership communiqués but they’re not necessarily even read much less attended to so a primary objective of the communications plan is to generate informed involvement.

Staff research has indicated several reasons for inattention to Partnership communications:
1) Recipient inundation of information from multiple sources.
2) Budget crisis; people doing more with less and email gets last shrift.
3) Some people don’t see the Partnership as a value or an asset.

The outreach strategy and plan includes work to make communications pertinent to the partners, with subject lines that are brief and descriptive and content that is relevant. In addition, staff will conduct an outreach campaign to Valley cities, counties and agencies to explain and highlight the Partnership’s activities and value. Through speaking engagements, electronic distribution, marketing and websites staff will raise awareness of the Partnership. Staff will request assistance from board member by reaching out to county boards of supervisors, cities and COGS at least once a year. If this outreach strategy is approved, staff will be contacting board members for their support and participation in their communities, regions and business sectors.

Marketing efforts will include the Partnership Annual Summit as well as other local and regional events through EDCs and other organizations. The web site will be enhanced with a page dedicated to the interests of the local and regional electeds.

Outreach to the general public includes partnering with the Maddy Institute for television and radio dealing with Valley issues as well as seeking other media opportunities. Other outreach is being considered through social networking using media such as Twitter and Facebook.

Staff is also seeking opportunities for joint communications such as Get Connected [http://www.getconnectedmedia.com/]; working with partner organizations such as SJV CEO to participate in conferences and programs.

As part of the ongoing effort to promote the Partnership staff continues to seek opportunities for speaking engagements to civic organizations such as the League of California Cities, League of Women Voters, etc.

Mr. Saldana suggested board members partner with staff to address local public groups and to consider presentations to EDCs and WIB boards. In conjunction with Partnership board meetings consider making the dinners hosted and invite all the local electeds to
network with board members and other regional representatives. Mr. Saldana has committed to assist with the August board meeting in Tulare.

Mr. Grupe noted that the counties that aren't working as closely as they could and suggested talking with them about what problems are unique to them then have the Partnership get involved in their activities.

Ms. McPeak commented that it is important to continue outreach to local and to State and Federal delegates and cannot underscore how important it is do the dinner the night before the board meeting. Ms. McPeak also suggested having a panel during the board meeting that elicits local participation and asks them for a focused discussion so the board can hear and interact with them. Ms. McPeak noted the importance of mobilizing the “senior bench” of local and regional government leadership in the Valley and in Washington.

Mr. Craighead, citing as an example of Partnership participation in a regional county event, noted Mr. Dozier’s attendance as a Partnership ambassador at the King’s County Council of Governments (COG) dinner on October 29.

Ms. McPeak moved to accept the communications strategy as proposed; the motion was seconded by Mr. Hibbard.

Finalizing his update on the Secretariat, Mr. Dozier highlighted the six staff people working hard to put on the Annual Summit. We had hoped the Governor would be in attendance so the Partnership can recognize his support of and contribution to the Valley.

The day-long event will begin with a Continental breakfast, several dynamic speakers and panels, lunch and informative breakout sessions due to three outstanding sponsors: the City of Fresno; ValleyCAN and Kaiser-Permanente. Featured presentations include several of the gubernatorial candidates, a panel on the History of the Partnership, a water panel moderated by Mr. Grupe and six breakout sessions over three hours. Thanks to sponsorships by other local businesses the day will end with a wine and food event courtesy of the San Joaquin Valley Winegrowers’ Association, Wawona Frozen Foods and Bouquet of Fruits among others.

VI. Sustainable Communities

Mr. Rollie Smith, Field Office Director for the Fresno office of Housing and Urban Development introduced himself and noted he is here to request the Partnership be the lead agency for the Sustainable Communities Initiative for the San Joaquin Valley. The initial work asked would be to partner with Mr. Smith to develop the plan for the initiative in the Valley, for the Valley.

Mr. Smith explained that Sustainable Communities is an initiative of the Obama Administration, a partnership of HUD, DOT, EPA and DOE with augmentation by local agencies and state counterparts. Mr. Smith averred a hope that the Federal Task Force authorities will have money to bring to the table.

Definitions will need to be written on a community-by-community basis; Mr. Smith suggested focusing on major cities in the Valley, especially those who will have
opportunities for High Speed Rail (HSR) and stations which will serve as great economic engines for those areas. Federal agencies will focus on big pictures issues such as climate change and sustainable/renewable energy whereas local agencies will be able to work with the San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy Organization (SJVCEO) and San Joaquin Valley Housing Collaborative (formerly Trust) to develop “place based strategies”.

The vision of the initiative is taking communities and making them sustainable through housing and building retrofits that include play-spaced neighborhoods and whole cities as models. City planning will be a really big part of the initiative and can build on the Blueprint; is even a good way to actually implement the Blueprint if done right.

Ms. Swearengin pointed out some practical examples of what such a plan would look like in Fresno with a focus on rebuilding the urban core of Fresno. With the first neighborhood as the critical domino, Ms. Swearengin cited the Lowell neighborhood in tremendous disrepair. At present much revitalization is being done through the lens of energy efficiency; as other agencies look through the lens of sustainability they will come up with other areas of focus. If we can demonstrate that a neighborhood of concentrated poverty can be made energy efficient, it becomes a model for others and starts the domino effect.

Ms. McPeak commended Mr. Smith for identifying this opportunity and bringing it to the Partnership; it is definitely one we should wade into. Ms. McPeak opined it is the wealthy communities who are the worst transgressors and are causing the most non-attainment of a zero carbon footprint and the inability to meet AB32 goals. There is no way to meet goals adopted in AB32 without changing transportation and land use patterns which are contributing to the carbon footprint. The key metric in the carbon footprint is the jobs/housing balance and the impact of reducing the average trip generation for a single family residence. Current planning anticipates 10 trips per single family residence; this could be reduced to six by changing the urban form through mixed use, walkable, bikeable communities of mixed interests and income. There are metrics to advance the sustainability profile and this is certainly one of the ways to get the SJV noticed by making progress in this area.

Ms. Medina encouraged the board to jump in fully based on the input from Ms. McPeak and Mayor Swearengin. This is another layer that allows the Partnership to reach out to groups of folks we haven’t been engaged with. By opening new ways of thinking and looking at how we do things support of this initiative could give added value to the Partnership.

After discussion amongst board members Mr. Weber encouraged the board to support Partnership participation in the Sustainable Communities endeavor. There are Federal energy bloc grants available; Fresno is already using some of this funding. The small cities and counties around the Valley have a serious deficit because money is available but the Federal government is concerned about effective use of those funds so are putting reporting requirements on the money that exceed the ability of the communities to even apply. The SVCEO, with help from PG&E grant funds, has offered to work with the 51 eligible cities, 31 of which have already signed up.

Mr. Parra, commenting about the numerous poor communities around the Valley, noted that the final outcome of an energy audit on a poor home is often that the home is
irreparable. In many cases farm work cannot be done because the work itself would be
worth more than the value of the home. There is a challenge in determining how to
address those rural communities’ needs.

Mr. Smith asked support to form a steering committee under the Partnership to
determine what the deliverables will look like.

Ms. Medina moved to approve the request and was seconded by Ms. McPeak.
Luisa moved; second Sunne.

VII. California Forward

Mr. Weber pointed out this topical transition from fixing air conditioning and heat ducts to
fixing state governance. There is plenty of reason for us to feel California should be the
golden state with its huge natural resources, innovative people and richest agriculture in
the world with ports that access the fastest growing economies in the world.
But we can no longer claim Golden statehood. California’s educational system is rated
46th in the nation; our budget is 47th in the nation. From pension reform to prison reform,
much legislation seems aimed at micromanaging elements of our lives. Most people
cannot remember a time of greater frustration in the state with a Legislative approval
rate of only 13%. The Pugh Center ranks California’s state budget process lower than all
but Louisiana and there is a plethora of governance reform initiatives.

For California to meet the challenges of the coming decades – in the areas of
healthcare, education, the environment and economic growth, among others – the state
will need to dramatically change how public decisions are made and how public dollars
are spent.

In recognition of these challenges several major California foundations (The California
Foundation, The James Irvine Foundation, and The David and Lucile Packard
Foundation) came together to ask four civic organizations to recommend a plan to
achieve this change.

California Forward is the result. This new organization was created by California
Common Cause, Center for Governmental Studies, New California Network and The
Commonwealth Club of California’s Voices of Reform Project. The goal of California
Forward is to contribute to improving the quality of life for all Californians by creating
more responsive, representative and cost-effective government.

Mr. Weber concluded his introduction of California Forward by noting this bipartisan
organization includes Partnership and governmental leaders ranging from Gene Voiland,
and Sunne McPeak, to Chuck Poochigian, Leon Panetta and Robert Herzberg.
http://www.caforward.org/default/index.cfm/about/

Mr. Weber introduced Jim Mayer, Executive Director of California Forward. Mr. Mayer
described his goals as truly seeking a bipartisan solution to the problems of California.
The challenge of governance reform is to translate the vision into an appropriate action;
to engage as broadly as possible across California to make as big a change as we can
as fast as we reasonably can and do so in ways that enable even bigger and better
changes.
The current recession has turned a chronic budget problem into an acute budget problem, with no capacity in the Legislature for systematic reform. California Forward proposes to bring sanity to the state budget process with a combination of constitutional language and statutory language (see California Forward “It's About Trust” document http://www.caforward.org/index.cfm/projects1/ite28099s-about-trust1/.

This chronic situation of spending more than taking in; one party describes it as a spending problem, the other party describes it as a revenue problem. The fact is, California has to deal with a volatile income cycle; which extends well beyond rainy day funds and must also address “debt” through the use of boom funds. California Forward’s proposal includes performance metrics, includes an oversight cycle and includes provisions for boom/bust cycles. This has now become a threshold issue; how to fashion a solution on the 2/3 vote threshold and at present doesn’t make sense to try.

California Forward is seeking endorsement by and participation from the Partnership in fostering governance reform.

Mr. Weber directed members to page 165 of the board package, asking support of the budget reform proposal and that which protects local revenue and gives local jurisdictions the ability and incentive to collaborate. In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. Weber confirmed that this proposal addresses a majority only vote for budget reform; increasing taxes requires 2/3 majority.

Ms. Swearengen asked what CF envisions going to the voters in 2010. Mr. Weber responded with a focus on the state budget process through Pay-Go initiatives and Ms. D’Adamo commented that Pay-Go does seem to rein in spending at the Federal level but is not as familiar with Pay-Go in a 2-year cycle. Mr. Mayer confirmed borrowing the concept from the State of Washington. It is really not a 2 year budget; each year the governor proposes 2 years of spending and revenue and the legislature votes on and enacts the first year’s expenditures. The goal internally is to get the legislators to look at the long term result.

Mr. Grupe asked, in the event of a freefall in revenue, what would have happened if this was in place. Mr. Mayer responded that under Proposition 58, the role of the governor could be expanded to allow him to blue pencil the problem if the Legislature cannot reach a solution.

Mr. Parra asked for a definition of Pay-as-you-go spending. Mr. Mayer answered, any budget item of $25 million or more must either generate income, reduce expenditures, or divert funds from somewhere else and would not affect cost of living adjustments if already in the law.

Ms. McPeak affirmed that the package before the board is the result of much public input, great consultation with experts and discussion and negotiations with legislators and stakeholder groups. Ms. McPeak confirmed herself as one of the last on the leadership council to sign off on the provision of going to less than 2/3 on the budget and would not have done so in the absence of a package of this nature. As a strategy for trying to right the ship of state of California, Ms. McPeak declared herself in favor of getting something in front of the voters. Ms. McPeak also provided the following personal comments:
“I personally view 2 year budgets and pay-go and rainy day funds as basic elements of what we should do in good fiscal management; what this does is it gives the taxpayers a much better view of what they’re getting for what they’re paying. So much waste is a result of inefficiency; once the results-based criteria are being met the performance will improve. There will continue to be a time that we have to do more with less to establish credibility. If we think Governance improvement is only about how the government works, we’re wrong. It extends to the community and individual level, pointing toward empowerment of the individual, the community. This is pretty good; it’s that better deal for the tax payer the accountability and the results based government that will make all the difference to the taxpayer.”

Mr. Andersen interjected the need to have education stakeholders involved in the process and how they’ll identify the impacts identified in that process. Hopefully the plan will include unraveling some of the fund shifts that have involved the education, city and county systems. Mr. Mayer responded that input was gathered from local constituents; local and elected school boards, PTA meetings, school principals, teachers and superintendents. Also in Sacramento they have been working the the education coalition, CSBA, ACCESS and CTA.

Mr. Voiland commented that this group represents a very full spectrum of people ranging in affiliation from liberal to conservative and the discussions and deliberations over 18 months have really found the common ground; it isn’t a perfect plan but it gets you started.

Mr. Bigelow interjected a concern, noting his approval of the work that has been done but asking if there is enough safeguard that the Legislature cannot nullify or negate it. “How can we prevent them running this right back to what we have now?” Mr. Weber responded that safeguards would exist through constitutional and statutory provisions. Chair Chrisman pointed out the resolution on page 165 of the board packet. Chair Chrisman, Ms. Tuck and Ms. D’Adamo abstained from voting.

Mr. Saldana moved to approve the resolution and was seconded by Mr. Ortega.

**VIII. Partnership Funding**

See Report from the Secretariat.

**IX. Comprehensive Water Plan Alternative**

Mr. Watson, commenting on the current water crisis, commended the Governor and Partnership’s great foresight in setting up Integrated Regional Water Management Plan effort (IRWMP). The water work group has begun to develop the framework of an IRWMP, asking all counties, cities, rural communities, water agencies and utility districts to project population and economic growth and their anticipated water needs and sources in future.

Sarge Green and Jim Tischer from Calif Water Institute, working with the Water Work Group, developed a framework which is built around an accountability of the sources and uses of water.
This IRWMP framework was reviewed at the Partnership March 2009 board meeting; San Joaquin County had concerns that it might supersede or interfere with plans they already had completed so the water work group deferred any Partnership endorsement in hopes of gaining a subsequent unanimous vote of support.

At the Partnership June 2009 board meeting, San Joaquin County brought forth an interregional water management plan but did not present it for endorsement because it did not meet the spirit or the letter of the Governor’s intent.

Today, October 22, 2009, all parties met again and drafted a resolution for an integrated interregional water management plan framework which includes clarifying language and came from all members of the water work group. Mr. Watson extended his thanks to Dr. Mel Lytle for helping get language that everyone in the water world can understand and agree on.

Attainment of a unanimous vote sends a powerful message to the Governor and Legislature; passage of this simply agrees to adopt the framework; the next step is to resolve the problems.

Mr. Watson extended special thanks to Mr. Ornellas for his efforts in support of this effort as they are the only county supervisors on the water work group. Mr. Ornellas has worked hard to assuage the concerns of the San Joaquin County people who rely on the Delta and water and has generated great trust and appreciation around the Valley. Mr. Watson also extended his thanks to Fritz and Phyllis Grupe for making their home available and for their hospitality to the water work group. Continuing his thanks, Mr. Watson thanked Gene Voiland and Sunne McPeak for spending a tremendous amount of time on meetings and conference calls on the subject of water. Jim Tischer has “used up a couple of forests” keeping up the momentum and communications and Sarge Green has been all over the counties and communities explaining the value and benefits of an integrated plan.

Mr. Watson concluded his remarks by noting, “This is an historic things; it’s been two years in the making and is a great step in sending a message to the Legislature.”

Mr. Tischer presented the framework, noting this is a deliverable from the Partnership’s Strategic Action Plan (SAP) from 2007. Mr. Tischer expressed his own appreciation for the leadership of Mr. Voiland and Mr. Watson as well as the support of Ms. McPeak, Ms. D’Adamo and Mr. Ornellas. Mr. Tischer commented, “This is hard, hard work and it would have been easy to give up on water because it is so hard. What we’ve done for the last 30 years hasn’t worked; we have to work on different solutions”.

Mr. Ornellas thanked the leadership and persistence of Supervisor Ray Watson who kept everyone going through this process. “At times we in San Joaquin County have been seen as obstructionists. We live in the Delta and know it; we have a deep understanding of it and really appreciate the others in the Valley who have come to this point. We have all learned from this”.

Dr. Mel Lytle thanked the Water Work Group and the Partnership for the opportunity to participate in the development of the resolution being presented to the board today. This truly is a milestone event that we could come to an agreement among the eight Valley
San Joaquin County is fully committed to continuing on; next is the hard part of determining how DO we develop mutual interests?

Ms. Tuck, reviewing the resolution, noted in the resolved clause b) there is emphasis on desalination which usually speaks to coastal salt water desalination. Dr. Lytle responded that the work group views that as inland water supplies; treating groundwater for irrigation or drinking water, a device to add that to the tool box.

Mr. Weber moved to accept the report as submitted and to approve the framework as presented. Ms. D'Adamo seconded the motion.

X. Two-Year Recap of Work Group Progress with Strategic Action Plan

Mr. Dozier presented the Work Group progress updates and responded to questions as they arose.

ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

Ms. D'Adamo asked about the success rate of Digital adoption.

Ms. McPeak responded that deployment and adoption is happening outside ACS; penetration was about 65% 3 years ago; currently deployment at 95% but that also includes opportunities for broadband and faster speeds. The Valley is ten percentage points behind the rest of the state; narrowing that gap is a key to economic development in the future.

Mr. Hosley interjected the need to get to those really tough groups, especially young people or those with barriers. We need to level the playing field through direct community involvement, helping people live better lives though this effort and need to increase the throughput by many, many fold.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Grupe gave an update on Food stamps and outreach to disadvantaged communities.

Ms. Fultz-Stout announced the SJVCEO is partnering with the Air Quality Board (AQB) to secure energy block grants. Of the $400 million in energy block grants, $60-65 million is coming to Valley small communities due to this partnership.

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

The UC Merced Medical School outreach program is winding down; last night was the meeting in Mariposa followed by a meeting on November 4 in Bakersfield which will formally end the Valley-wide listening tour.

XI. Adjournment

The next regularly scheduled board meeting of the Partnership is planned for February 19, 2010 in Bakersfield, California [editor’s note: meeting date changed to February 26, 2010]. Chair Chrisman provided closing remarks and at 5:15pm adjourned the board meeting of the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley.