

## Needs Assessment Meeting Notes

**Date: February 24, 2015**

**Time: 1:30 – 3:30 pm**

**Place: Fresno COG Sequoia Room  
2035 Tulare Street, Suite 201  
Fresno, CA 93721**

### Attending (see attached)

#### I. Welcome and introductions (*Lynne Ashbeck*)

Ms. Ashbeck (Clovis) opened the meeting and everyone introduced themselves.

#### II. Approval of meeting notes

Ms. Ashbeck reviewed the notes from the November 4, 2014 meeting. The meeting notes were approved by consensus.

#### III. Overview of SB 375/Sustainable Communities Strategy and the purpose of this Needs Assessment work (*Kristine Cai*)

Kristine reviewed the context of this work as it relates to the COG SB 375 work. From the COG Policy Board, three sub-committees have been established to further advance the priorities from SB 375:

- Needs assessment
- Sustainable planning and grant program
- Ag mitigation program

From the COG Policy Board Executive Minutes (May 29, 2014):

“...to direct staff to conduct a county-wide transportation needs assessment and evaluate such needs in Fresno County’s disadvantaged communities. COG will work with partnering agencies who may already have existing data.”

#### IV. Fresno County Health Improvement Partnership/ other needs assessment initiatives in the County (*Lynne*)

Sara Bosse, Fresno County Department of Public Health, provided an overview of the current work occurring to launch a Fresno County Health Improvement Partnership (FC-HIP). Its relevance to this work is that the FC-HIP will include a focus on both conducting a community health needs assessment AND aligning other organizations who are doing similar work. There will be data from that work that will complement the COG’s work here.

V. **“Zip Codes Matter: An Overview of Health Challenges in Fresno County”**  
*Jared Rutledge, Ph.D., Fresno County Epidemiologist - CANCELLED*

VI. **Agreeing on a shared definition of a ‘disadvantaged community’ (Kristine/All)**

- Reviewed a compilation of definitions (thanks, Veronica), including the Water Code, Public Resources Code, ATP Funds Cycle 1 92014), and CalEnviroScreen 2.0.
- Goal is to use a definition that will align with other work, grant opportunities, future legislation, etc.
- After much discussion, there was consensus that, for our purposes, we will use a definition of ‘disadvantaged communities’ that is the ‘sum’ of:  
***Water code + SB 244 language on unincorporated areas + CalEnviroScreen 25% threshold PLUS the opportunity for ‘other criteria’ to be applied, as appropriate (e.g. % of kids on free lunch; % of residents on Medi-Cal or uninsured; quality/availability of housing stock; lack of local governance structures to effectively advocate for an unincorporated area)***

Staff will work on draft definition.

VII. **Defining the scope of work (Kristine)**

*After lots of discussion...with points ranging from the more narrow direction of the COG Policy Board to the broader indicators that a community health needs assessment might include, we agreed:*

- Staff to inventory what data we already know/have access to ...and data we don’t know [gaps]
- Focus should be not just on what we don’t know...but rather what don’t we know that is important to advancing our County and, particularly, our disadvantaged communities.
- Consider using ‘connectivity’ as an important element of deciding where our scope of work will end up. For example, is it more important to understand where there are/are not trails...or where trails may/may not connect with one another to allow useful travel?
  - ◆ Saying it another way, it is important to be clear on the distinction between transportation data gaps...and transportation data gaps that limit an individual’s access to jobs, transit, healthcare, schools.
  - ◆ Another important element of the idea of connectivity is a focus on *regional connections*...where trails between Clovis and Sanger might not connect to promote regional travel, as an example...more that where trails within an individual jurisdiction may or may not connect. Cities already have this information about their own communities.
- Intent of this work is to inform individual jurisdiction’s decisions about transportation, NOT to take away any of their autonomy.
- **Staff to convene smaller group of stakeholders to refine scope and bring back to our next meeting.**
- In hiring future consultant, consider adding to their tasks to understand existing health data and how it might integrate with this work AND to identify future funding opportunities.

### **VIII. Next steps to advance this work (*Kristine*)**

- We will confirm future meeting dates next month.
- Agenda will include:
  - ◆ Reschedule presentation by Fresno County DPH/epidemiologist.
  - ◆ Finalize definition of 'disadvantaged communities' for this work.
    - Veronica to create maps that 'overlay' the three definitions on a County map.
  - ◆ Confirm scope of work.
  - ◆ Discuss RFP plans, timelines.

### **IX. Other items for discussion**

**Attending:**

Lynne Ashbeck, City of Fresno  
Nicholas Don Paladino, Fresno Cycling  
Steven Son, Fresno County  
Jeff Roberts, Granville Homes  
Darrell Unruh, Public  
Gilbert Garza, FCRTA  
Moses Stites, FCRTA  
Sean Brewer, City of Coalinga  
Pedro Ramirez, Caltrans  
Veronica Garibay, Leadership Counsel  
Roseann Galvan, City of Selma  
Nyla Zuder, League of Women Voters  
Stephenie Frederick, League of Women Voters  
Sara Pomare, City of Fresno  
Andrew Benelli, City of Fresno  
Luis Patlan, City of Kerman  
Sara Bosse, Fresno CDPH  
Mohammad Khorsand, Fresno County  
Kristine Barker

**COG Staff:**

Kristine Cai  
Mike Bitner  
Melissa Garza  
Brenda Veenendaal  
Lindsey Chargin  
Kai Han  
Seth Scott  
Angela Yang