

## Summary of Discussion Topics

### Introduction

The third meeting of the Santa Rosa Forward Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was held on December 13, 2021, via zoom. This meeting provided an opportunity for the CAC to hear project updates and discuss the Equity Priority Communities analysis, draft Alternatives Workbook, and upcoming Community Engagement Event Set #2. This was the third in a series of ten planned CAC meetings that will be conducted between February 2021 and March 2023. All meetings are open to the public and facilitated by the Santa Rosa Forward project team (a combination of City staff and consultants).

The project team graphically recorded comments of the CAC members and members of the public on a digital whiteboard. A photo export of the whiteboard is included at the end of this document. This summary synthesizes the key discussion topics and questions raised during the meeting; it is not intended to serve as a transcription of the meeting.

### CAC Role

The role of the Community Advisory Committee is to:

- **Serve** as liaisons to their community connections and constituent groups.
- **Encourage** community participation in the Santa Rosa Forward project.
- **Understand** broad community needs and desires and articulate those back to the Santa Rosa Forward project team.
- **Provide** ideas for consideration in preparing the General Plan Update.

## CAC Membership

The City Council identified 25 positions for the Community Advisory Committee. There are currently (December 2021) 22 members of the CAC. Four of the seven members have been appointed by the Santa Rosa City Council as district representatives. The other 18 CAC members were selected by the Planning & Economic Development Department through an open application process. The committee currently includes the following individuals (listed alphabetically):

1. Ali Soto
2. Andres Vigil
3. Annette Arnold
4. Delashay Carmona Benson
5. Erica Mikesch
6. Evette Minor
7. Jen Klose
8. Kevin Anderson
9. Lee Pierce
10. Lisa Joslen
11. Melanie Ahlers
12. Michael Cook
13. Omar Lopez
14. Patricia Thompson
15. Rituja Bhowmik
16. Ryan Tracey
17. Stephanie Manieri
18. Steven Spillman
19. Michelle Sepulveda, City Council Appointee, District 1
20. Vacant, City Council Appointee, District 2\*
21. Vacant, City Council Appointee, District 3\*
22. Joel M. Batterman, City Council Appointee, District 4
23. Ana Stevens, City Council Appointee, District 5
24. Anne Barbour, City Council Appointee, District 6
25. Vacant, City Council Appointee, District 7\*

## Discussion Summary

The meeting included an interactive discussion with each CAC member providing their initial thoughts and reactions to the Alternatives Workbook (specifically, the Equity Priority Communities, three land use and circulation alternatives, and the alternatives analysis). The following is a summary of feedback and comments raised by CAC members.

## Equity Priority Communities

The project team presented an overview of the Equity Priority Communities and asked the CAC if they have any questions or comments on the information and if there are any communities missing from the list.

### CAC Questions and Comments

- When is the City planning to hold specific events and what are the locations? *The project team mentioned that these events will be tied to the Community Event Set #2 activities planned for January through April 2022.*
- Are we tracking the homeless encampments? And if so, where are they located? *The project team mentioned that the City has not been tracking homeless encampments as part of the Santa Rosa Forward project, but that they will investigate available information.*
- Can we look at areas for affordable housing that are outside of the current alternative map boundaries? *The project team responded yes, that is part of the Alternatives discussion.*
- Is there a further breakdown or detail on who lives where? *The project team mentioned that the analysis is based on Census data related to Census tracts.*
- Is there a way to make this more effective by tracking metrics, adjusting data when new information becomes available, etc.? *The project team agreed and mentioned that this is part of the intent for the Equity Priority Communities Workplan.*
- How does income impact access to transportation for people who are transit-dependent? *The project team mentioned this was an important question for CAC members to consider as they review the alternatives.*
- CAC members also provided ideas about additional groups that could be considered as Equity Priority Populations:
  - o People with addiction
  - o People with mental health issues
  - o Teachers
  - o Essential workers (medical, police, fire)

## Alternatives Workbook

The project team presented an overview of the draft Alternatives Workbook that included a summary of how the alternatives were developed; how they will be used to gather community feedback and discussion around growth policy choices; and how each of the alternatives compare to one another related to housing, economic development, transportation, safety, resilience, and equity. The project team then opened the meeting for discussion and feedback from the CAC.

### Initial Reactions to the Alternatives

- The project team conducted a quick poll that asked each CAC member to identify which alternative best met their vision for the future of Santa Rosa. This was not a formal poll or voting, but just a way to get some quick reactions. CAC members were generally split evenly between Alternatives 1, 2 and 3.
- Feedback on Alternative 1:
  - o Heavily focused on Downtown and a few corridors.
  - o Does it allow flexible housing growth in other parts of the city (e.g., State housing law changes allowing accessory dwelling units)?
- Feedback on Alternative 2:
  - o This alternative creates more accessible resources, services, transportation, and housing at various key neighborhoods.
  - o This alternative seems to be more inclusive by developing transportation hubs throughout the city, since not everyone can get to downtown.
- Feedback on Alternative 3:
  - o Having housing throughout the city would help alleviate the current housing crisis.

### Questions and Comments for the Alternatives

- Several CAC members mentioned that it is difficult to choose between the different alternatives due to the different needs and drawbacks.
  - o Should there be a suite of Alternatives or a prioritization of alternative concepts?
  - o The Alternatives Workbook should describe the drawbacks and opportunities for each realm or neighborhood of the city.
  - o How are the alternatives impacting the different groups (ages, Equity Priority Communities)?

- Several CAC members asked if the main prompting questions in the Alternatives Workbook can be refined for clarity:
  - o Should we be asking more about “where” changes should be made?
  - o In general, questions should be more specific and nuanced.

## Questions and Comments Related to Major Topics in the Alternatives Workbook

### *Housing and Economic Development:*

- Create housing throughout the city:
  - o Distribute housing while also discouraging single-occupancy vehicles (e.g., new housing near transit).
  - o Add housing in areas recently annexed to the city and along the outskirts of the city limits.
  - o Consider incorporating more land.
  - o Increase the City’s housing goals and do not limit the alternatives to 36,000 new homes.
  - o How do you determine the transit hubs? Can more be created?
  - o What would be the timing be for development?
  - o How do we encourage housing everywhere in the best way possible?
- Locating housing near commercial uses:
  - o The proximity to housing should depend on the type of commercial use to avoid conflicts (safety, noise, smells, traffic).
  - o Focus commercial and residential growth near downtown and along the central corridors.
  - o Example: All residential areas or spaces should have easy access to food and focus on the downtown.
  - o Downtown has potential for growth (especially due to the fires and desire to be away from wildland areas).
  - o Where are the hubs for services in certain parts of the city?

### *Transportation:*

- Increase connectivity and mobility goals:
  - o Increase (more than 10%) the amount of future walking, biking, and transit trips.
  - o Target street enhancements along corridors where there is new housing.
  - o Close sidewalk gaps and expands bikeways.
  - o Keep youth mobility in mind when thinking about future street design.
  - o Adapt the pattern to create more access to services.
  - o Adapt to the most housing options.

- Provide more public transportation to access more services
  - o Capitalize on freeway and transit access.

*Safety Considerations:*

- Improve public safety throughout the city.
- Have fewer power shutoffs/a more stable electrical grid.
- Locate new development farther from the Rodgers Creek Fault and wildland-urban interface.
- Add more trees to the urban canopy.

*Equity:*

- Provide services throughout the city:
  - o Childcare, police, fire
  - o Social Justice is supremely important
  - o Needs to be more impactful
- Provide the data and metrics:
  - o For example, how were the hazards ranked? Believe Downtown should have a higher hazard severity rank.
  - o Ensure we meet environmental justice goals/needs.
- Give people a chance to make decisions on the biggest equity issues, provide data on educational outcomes, health outcomes, etc.

**CAC Member Community Engagement Roles**

The CAC discussed several considerations to help people understand the alternatives better during Community Event Set #2:

- Conduct a tactile activity for people to understand the planning concepts.
- Provide additional mapping information/materials to identify the different neighborhoods.
- Provide full data for the transportation components.
- Provide additional details and conditions of the alternatives.
- Consider the difficulty of choosing an alternative.

## Public Comments

Every CAC meeting is open to the public. Four members of the public provided comments during the meeting. The following is a combined summary of their comments.

- Public Engagement Considerations:
  - o Concerns regarding the pandemic and need to conduct virtual engagement.
  - o Follow-up with robust community outreach: emails, flyers, etc.
  - o Provide captioning during meetings and workshops.
  - o Collaborate and cohost events with local schools.
  - o More intentional engagement with the Asian communities.
  
- Transportation Challenges:
  - o There is heavy congestion on Highway 12.
  - o We need more drive-through restaurants for convenience and due to COVID concerns.
  - o Consider creating an expressway to Oakmont.
  - o Consider the student population projections for traffic (Bellevue District).

**Agenda**

- I. Welcome and Agenda Review
- II. Project Updates
- III. Equity Priority Communities
- IV. Alternatives Workbook
- V. Community Engagement Event Set #2
- VI. Next Steps and Close

**EQUITY PRIORITY COMMUNITIES**

1. Low-income individuals and families,
2. Racial or ethnic groups experiencing disparate health outcomes,
3. Seniors, children, youth and young adults,
4. Individuals with disabilities,
5. Immigrants and refugees,
6. Outdoor workers and farmworkers,
7. Individuals who are limited-English proficient (LEP),
8. Unhoused people,
9. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQQ) communities,
10. Individuals who are incarcerated and those who have been incarcerated.

**Group Discussion:**

Do you have any comments on the Equity Priority Population information?

When? in planning for specific events and locations	How to make it more effective?	Track metrics	Comprehensive	Is there a further break down of who lives where?	Send the link to indepth analysis
Are we tracking the homeless encampments - where?	Looking at the areas with affordable housing outside of the current map	Adjustments to updated data?	Like the list	Exactly what we need to reach	Ability to make adjustments? Yes

Are there any communities that are missing from this list?

People with addiction, Mental issues	Teachers	Services: Police/ Fire	How income impacts life - Access to transportation	Transit dependent
--------------------------------------	----------	------------------------	--	-------------------

**ALTERNATIVES**

**Group Discussion:**

Why is it a choice - there are different needs - it should be a suite of options - seems counterproductive	Show how tier chances for each realm of the city	"Where" is the threshold question - and is it not the correct one	Little confused - though it should have been a prioritization	Change according to the neighborhood
Downtown has potential	Rephrasing the question	Separating housing/ commercial - depends on the type of commercial - ie should have access to food	Questions need to be specific / nuance	

What would you change about that scenario to better express your vision?

Which alternative comes closest to expressing your vision for Santa Rosa's Future?

Age demographics - how are the alt's impacts the different groups of people	Should have housing through the city and focus on the downtown	Connectivity - transportation bus stop sidewalk improvements - Connectivity is very different	Difficult to choose - developed a implicit criteria	Had thought of vehicles - distribute housing that would discourage single occupancy vehicles	Housing patterns that discourage single occupancy vehicles
Annex - Incorporating more land to the city - adding housing out there	Difficult to choose one over the other	need to increase connectivity to keep Youth safe - break the cycle - of the current pattern	Shift the models with new rules	How do you determine the hubs?	Where are the hubs for services in certain parts of the city?
With the fires - more people are trying to get closer to downtown	Make it possible and encourage the demand for additional housing and services	What would be the timing be? development and market takes time?	Child care, police, fire, social justice, environmental justice	Housing throughout	Services need to be throughout the city bc not everyone can go DT
Improved public transportation - but also increased access to services	The approach is problematic - separated buckets - can't make a choices	Framing the question is very important	Provide the data on the different metric levels - need the data	The hazards chart - DT - huge flood hazard	Doesn't feel impactful
Courious about the idea at all the option and linked to the same 36000 home	Want more in sites on the data motivation and challenge to have more housing	Transportation needs to adapt to the housing options	Social Justice is supremely important	Can increase the numbers for housing	Like ALT 2 - bc services would be close to housing

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EVENT SET #2**

**Group Discussion:**

What are your thoughts on Event #2 Set?

Map to identify the different neighborhood	Tactile materials - being refined	Full data - transportation componets	Hard to make a choice about the alternatives - more detail
--	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

Would you like to see some other types of events?

Another CAC Meeting



**Public Comment**

May 12 - not a space but an "event" - there is a lot of competition - make an agreement to "bust out" of the space - follow up

Encourage more drive-through services - bc of the pandemic - to find ways to get out of the car, follow up

Consider the Asian American community

Looking at the positions of the school - because district - to know what the projections will be

Access to education - working with the school - willing to host out-reach efforts

Access - closed captioning would be help.



**Next Steps and Follow-up Items**

Another CAC before the next community event set

Jan 12 - there is conflicting community meeting

Standard monthly basis - otherwise it wouldn't feel impactful