**MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE SHAFTER GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GPAC)**
**POLICE DEPARTMENT CONFERENCE ROOM, 201 CENTRAL VALLEY HWY**
**MEETING HELD IN-PERSON**
**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2025**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 6:00 PM, CHAIR LYNNDA MARTIN

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** 6:01 PM, VICE-CHAIR GARY NELSON

**ROLL CALL:**
PRESENT(In-Person): Chair Lynnda Martin, Vice-Chair Gary Nelson, Commissioner John Sanchez, Member Marco Avendano, Member Allen DeWitt, Member Jonathan Hudson, Member Jed Hwang, Member Phillip Jimenez, Member Nelson Salinas, Member Brett Sills, Member Jessica Smith. Also Present: Planning Director Esselman, Community Engagement Manager Zermeno, PlaceWorks Consultant Halley Grundy, PlaceWorks Consultant Colin Drukker, PlaceWorks Consultant Steve Gunnels, PlaceWorks Consultant Scott Ashlock, PlaceWorks Consultant Jordan Kessler, Fehr & Peers Consultant John Muggridge, Fehr & Peers Consultant Fatemeh Ranaiefar.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Chair Martin opened the approval of the agenda

*MOVED (JIMENEZ) AND SECONDED (HUDSON). MOTION CARRIED WITH NO OPPOSITION.*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: APRIL 22, 2025**

Chair Martin opened the approval of the minutes from April 22, 2025

*MOVED (HUDSON) AND SECONDED (JIMENEZ). MOTION CARRIED WITH NO OPPOSITION.*

**1. PRESENTATION (6:05 PM)**
City and consultant shared a timeline with the path forward for the city to adopt the General Plan by April 2027 to meet State Requirements. They presented on the input received from GPAC meetings #1 and 2, pop-up at the April First Fridays, and Shape Our City workshop series. Afterwards, they discussed various existing conditions at the City (land use, housing, demographics, retail demand, pipeline development projects, mobility etc.), community considerations for change, and state and federal mandates that the City needs to comply with.

## 2. SMALL GROUP DESIGN EXERCISE (6:55 PM)

The GPAC conducted a small group design exercise to explore potential sites for the city's lower income Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and evaluate future land use options under different transportation infrastructure configurations.

The GPAC divided into two working groups of 5-6 members each. Both groups were tasked with identifying suitable sites to accommodate the city's lower income RHNA allocation while considering the implications of different roadway alignment options on future land use planning.

- **Group 1:** Developed a future land use plan based on the Cherry to Merced expressway alignment scenario (Alternative 1)
- **Group 2:** Explored an alternative approach connecting to State Route 99 at Lerdo Highway or south of Lerdo Highway (Alternative 2)

Each group focused on identifying potential development sites that could accommodate lower income housing requirements while considering how different roadway infrastructure scenarios would influence broader land use patterns and development opportunities within the city.

## 3. LARGE GROUP DISCUSSION - PROJECT TEAM REPORT ON SMALL GROUP EXERCISE OUTCOMES (7:50 PM)

Consultant staff presented a comprehensive summary of the input and outcomes from the small group design exercise to the full GPAC.

**Alternative 1 Summary (Scott Ashlock):** Scott Ashlock reported on the feedback received regarding Alternative 1, noting that group members engaged in discussion across several key areas:

- Identification of potential housing sites to accommodate RHNA requirements
- Consideration of potential new interchange locations along the proposed alignment
- Analysis of the new expressway's role within the broader Shafter transportation network
- Discussion of appropriate buffer zones between transportation infrastructure and residential development
- Examination of the relationship between planned truck routes and planned sensitive receptors, particularly housing developments

**Alternative 2 Summary (Halley Grundy):** Halley Grundy reported that the group examining Alternative 2 did not achieve consensus on an alternative to the Cherry to Merced alignment. The group indicated conditional preference for the Cherry to Merced alignment, contingent upon two specific modifications:

1. Cherry Avenue could be depressed below grade through Shafter (specifically between Los Angeles and Fresno Streets)

2. Buffer distances between the expressway and sensitive land uses (such as homes) could be reduced to less than the California Air Resources Board (CARB) recommendation of 500 feet

The group evaluated several alternative alignment options, including routes along Lerdo, Riverside, and Burbank corridors. Key concerns identified included:

- Lerdo alignment could impede local traffic circulation, and it could impact existing businesses and property owners along Lerdo Hwy
- Riverside or Burbank alignments might encourage truck traffic to continue west to Interstate 5 via local roads not designed for heavy-duty vehicles

The group was unable to reach consensus on a preferred alternative route. Additionally, the group identified several potential housing sites and emphasized that larger properties should accommodate diverse development beyond solely higher-density housing.

Due to the nature of the discussion, staff noted that the next GPAC meeting would be scheduled within a month to continue focusing on land use and circulation options.

Public Comments

*NO COMMENTS RECEIVED.*

**ADJOURNMENT**
*MOVED (HUDSON) AND SECONDED (NELSON) ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 8:08 PM. MOTION CARRIED WITH NO OPPOSITION.*

_____
Lynnda Martin, Chair

**ATTEST:**

_____
Yazmina Pallares, City Clerk