INTRODUCTION

Immersion Week for the Santa Rosa Roseland Area Specific Plan and Annexation Projects took place June 10–23, 2015, and consisted of a weeklong series of events including two community workshops, two committee meetings, and a project team design meeting. This memorandum summarizes the completed Immersion Week purpose, process, activities, materials, and results.

The purpose of the community workshops was to provide all community members and stakeholders with the opportunity to learn about the projects and provide input on a shared vision and project options and priorities. The results of the workshops will guide development of a single preferred land use and circulation plan for the area.

The first two community workshops were scheduled in quick succession to bring back concepts to the community in a timely manner and build momentum in the planning process. The ideas put forth by participants at the first community workshop were further refined at the Steering Committee meeting, Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and second community workshop.

After the first community workshop, the project team held an internal project team design charrette to synthesize the results of the first workshop and develop content and materials for the second community workshop to be held 11 days later. These synthesized results and materials were presented to the two project committees: the Steering Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee. The Steering Committee represents residents and stakeholders in the development of the Specific Plan and in the Annexation process, and the Technical Advisory Committee is an ad hoc advisory body, convened for the plan development phase of the project, to provide technical advice and feedback at key points in the planning process. Each committee provided input on the design of materials and activities for the second community workshop. The second community workshop brought additional questions to the community to understand priorities for land use, transportation and annexation.
IMMERSION WEEK SUMMARY

The following additional project information is provided in the appendices:

- Appendix A: Community Workshops’ Invitation Postcard
- Appendix B: Community Workshop 1 Data and Photographs
- Appendix C: Community Workshop 2 Data and Photographs
- Appendix D: Steering Committee Meeting #2 Summary
- Appendix E: Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Summary

Each of the meeting presentations are available on the project website for the duration of the Specific Plan and Annexation projects at the following location:

http://srcity.org/departments/cityadmin/city_manager/roseland/Pages/Community_Meetings.aspx

KEY RESULTS

The prominent themes that emerged from Community Workshops 1 and 2 are summarized as follows:

- **Vision**: Participants imagine a future Roseland area as pedestrian/bike/transit friendly, clean, safe, affordable, and inviting and a place that celebrates its vibrant cultural diversity.

- **Transportation**: Although most participants want slower speeds, bike lanes, and more landscaping in the Roseland Area, there is disagreement about the type of traffic controls to use at key intersections. Many see pedestrian and bicycle safety as a priority and would like to widen sidewalks, but others prefer to keep the existing street configurations.

- **Land Use**: The primary themes that arose from the land use discussion include a desire for small corner stores and food carts, creation of a family entertainment hub, and provision of youth services near schools. Additionally, a mix of uses is desired along Hearn Avenue, and participants would like to see single-family residential uses and the rural character maintained along Burbank Avenue.

- **Annexation**: Community members have a number of concerns about annexation, though most view the potential outcomes of annexation favorably.

- **Neighborhood Centers**: The community prefers to have two neighborhood activity centers (77%) as opposed to one (23%).

- **Connections**: There is a desire for bicycle and pedestrian connections on Burbank Avenue, Dutton Avenue, and Hearn Avenue and along Roseland Creek.

Additional details on each topic are provided in the remainder of the report.
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 1

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

On June 10, 2015, the PMC team facilitated an interactive workshop focusing on project initiation and community visioning to accomplish the following:

- Inform the community about the Specific Plan and Annexation projects and processes
- Identify the community’s role in the planning processes
- Provide key findings from the existing conditions analysis and market study
- Conduct visioning activities to understand sentiment for the area
- Conduct group discussions to learn about project area assets and needs
- Identify areas where the community is interested in change and key priority opportunity sites (mapping exercise)

To achieve these goals, the project team designed a set of activities that included a vision wall, land use mapping, a transportation trade-offs activity, and a brief annexation discussion. A detailed transcription of results and photos from Community Workshop 1 is available in Appendix B.

ACTIVITY 1: VISION WALL

The vision wall activity asked participants to imagine the Roseland community in 2035, write up to three vision words or phrases on separate sticky notes, and post them on the wall. In considering the area’s future, participants were prompted to consider how the community will look, how people will get around, what they would like to change, and what they would like to stay the same.

The project team synthesized and grouped community input into the following generalized categories (note: percentages will not total 100% since people wrote multiple sheets/ideas). Photographs of the vision wall activity are included in Appendix B.

- Pedestrian/bike/transit friendly (28%)
- Clean, safe, affordable, and inviting (23%)
- Celebrate its vibrant cultural diversity (20%)
- Plenty of parks, recreational activities, and healthy food options (18%)
- Community events, services, and programs (17%)
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- Strong economy with local jobs and small businesses (16%)
- Rural character with preserved natural areas (13%)
- A unified community with lively social gathering places. (11%)
- Open government and empowered public (6%)

ACTIVITY 2: LAND USE MAPPING

After reviewing planned street improvements, a land use mapping activity allowed participants to identify their preferences for future land use and circulation. Each group was given a set of stickers to use to identify appropriate locations for various land uses. Participants were asked to consider appropriate land uses and combinations of land uses for the planning area. The results of this activity are included in Appendix B. The following themes emerged from this activity:

- Allow small corner stores and food carts
- Maintain single-family residential along Burbank and maintain rural land use character
- Provide youth services/activities hubs near schools
- Create a family entertainment hub
- Mix of uses along Hearn and around the community park and transit center

ACTIVITY 3: TRANSPORTATION TRADE-OFFS

Finally, participants were engaged in a transportation trade-offs activity that asked them to indicate their transportation preferences for key project corridors on a sliding scale from an auto-oriented focus (where the street is designed primarily to accommodate automobiles) to a multimodal focus (where the street is designed to accommodate all types of travel equally, including walking, cycling, transit and driving). Participants were asked to consider which roads should be designed to make travel more convenient for cars, pedestrians, cyclists, and buses, considering that road widths are limited and not all amenities can be provided on each street.

The results revealed the following:

- **Burbank Avenue**: There is a strong desire to have more landscaping, to accommodate local travel, and to have bike lanes. However, the results were divided regarding whether stop signs should be installed at minor intersections and whether the road should maintain a rural character or include sidewalks.
• **Corby Avenue:** Participants were divided over intersection traffic control options (stop signs versus roundabouts) and whether or not to widen the street to accommodate more lanes of traffic. However, there was a clear preference for eliminating parking and adding a sidewalk on the west side.

• **Dutton Avenue:** There was general agreement for a multimodal focus on this street.

• **West Avenue:** Participants generally agreed on a multimodal focus for this street, except that there was some disagreement about intersection traffic control options (stop signs versus roundabouts) at minor intersections.

• **Local Residential Streets:** Although most want slower speeds and more landscaping, there is disagreement about traffic control options (stops signs versus traffic circles) at minor intersections. Although many favor pedestrian and bicycle safety, including widening sidewalks, others prefer to keep the existing street configurations.

A visual representation of the results are included in Appendix B.

**ACTIVITY 4: ANNEXATION DISCUSSION**

An explanation of the annexation process was provided and participants were asked to share questions about annexation. These questions were compiled and categorized to be revisited during Community Workshop 2. The questions include:

1. Where can people go to ask questions to ease anxiety?
2. Who is LAFCO?
3. How are members of LAFCO selected and how are they appointed?
4. Can an area opt out of annexation?
5. How are non-registered voters’ voices to be heard?
6. What law established the voter requirement?
7. How will those without computers know about next meetings?
8. At what point does pre-zoning get infused into the process?
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 2

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

On June 23, 2015, the PMC team facilitated a second workshop, where the community had the opportunity to review and provide feedback regarding alternative concepts for portions of the Specific Plan developed from community feedback from Workshop 1.

The workshop covered the following:

- Summarize key issues and comments from Workshop 1
- Comment on possible outcomes of annexation
- Solicit feedback on options for land use
- Provide input on potential new connections to improve mobility

To further consider the planning options for the Roseland area, the project team designed three interactive activities focused on annexation, neighborhood center preferences, and circulation mapping. A detailed transcription of results and photos from Community Workshop 2 is available in Appendix F.

ACTIVITY 1: ANNEXATION

Four identical stations dispersed around the room presented information on the most commonly asked questions about annexation. In addition, each station had a poster for participants to indicate with a sticky dot whether the potential outcomes of annexation were positive, negative, or neutral from their perspective. Although a few participants indicated that the statements about annexation would have a negative impact, the majority saw annexation as positive, as reflected below (percentage positive response). The complete results and percentages for positive, negative and neutral responses are included in Appendix C.

- The ability to vote in city elections, run for City Council, or be appointed to a City board or commission (85%)
- Infrastructure repair and replacement becomes the City’s responsibility (80%)
- Neighborhood-oriented policing (75%)
- Police services provided by one agency (70%)
- One set of regulations and permitting requirements (63%)
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- Potential of increased property value (55%)
- Ability to connect to City sewer and water (49%)

ACTIVITY 2: NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

After reviewing the results of a market study and the preferences that were identified at the first community workshop, participants were asked to indicate their preference for one activity center (at Sebastopol Road) or two activity centers (Sebastopol Road and Hearn Avenue) in the Roseland area. Participants were prompted to consider the proximity of residents to goods and services, access via transit, and the business value of clustering shops and restaurants.

The results show that there is a strong preference for two activity centers, with 49 participants favoring two centers over 15 participants favoring only one center. Bicycle and pedestrian accessibility was a primary reason people wanted two neighborhood activity centers. However, some participants were concerned about the cost of developing two centers and the challenge of attracting business in both locations. Some suggested taking a phased approach, beginning with a focus on further developing and improving Sebastopol Road. The neighborhood center activity results are included in Appendix C.

ACTIVITY 3: MAPPING CONNECTIONS

In considering transportation connectivity, participants were prompted to reflect on potential new connections to the future downtown SMART station, access to areas north of Sebastopol Road, and ways to improve connections to schools, businesses, parks, and the bus transfer center. Participants were grouped at tables and then asked to add colored tape to large-scale maps to show where new automobile and pedestrian/bicycle connections are needed.

The results indicate that multiple groups desire improved bicycle and pedestrian connections along Burbank Avenue, Dutton Avenue, Hearn Avenue, Sebastopol Road, Roseland Creek, and across Highway 101. New auto connections were suggested across Highway 12 and to connect Northpoint Parkway to Roseland Accelerated Middle School. A couple of groups desired bicycle and pedestrian connections along Colgan Creek, Stony Point Road, Dutton Meadows, and to/from the Southside Bus Transfer Center. The mapping activity results are included in Appendix C.
NEXT STEPS

A series of topical meetings are being scheduled during the month of August to address items of community concern, including annexation. The online forum for the project is being launched to provide additional opportunities for engagement. The website for the online forum is: https://santa-rosa.granicusideas.com/surveys/santa-rosa-roseland-specific-plan-and-annexation-projects

The next Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Meeting will be held prior to the next workshop to provide input on workshop materials and activities. The upcoming community workshops, scheduled for September/October 2015 and January 2016, will focus on the draft Land Use and Circulation Plan and on components of the draft Specific Plan, respectively. Both workshops will include an update on annexation.
‘APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS INVITATION POSTCARD
¡Por favor acompañenos a dos talleres comunitarios!

Please Join us at two community workshops!

We want to hear your ideas about the future of the Roseland Area.

¡Por favor acompáñenos a dos talleres comunitarios!

Queremos escuchar sus ideas sobre el futuro de la zona de Roseland.

**Roseland**

srcity.org/roseland

The city will host two additional workshops. Future notices will be sent by email. To be added to the email list, please contact Jessica Jones: jjones@srcity.org, (707) 543-3410.

La ciudad será la sede de dos talleres adicionales. Avisos futuros serán enviados por correo electrónico. Para ser incluido en la lista de correo electrónico, por favor póngase en contacto con Jessica Jones: jjones@srcity.org, (707) 543-3410.
Community Workshop #1
Taller Comunitario #1
CREATING A SHARED VISION
CREANDO UNA VISIÓN COMPARTIDA
June 10, 2015
5:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
Roseland Accelerated Middle School (RAMS) - Gym
1777 West Avenue

Community Workshop #2
Taller Comunitario #2
CONSIDERING PLANNING OPTIONS
CONSIDERANDO LAS OPCIONES DE PLANIFICACIÓN
June 23, 2015
5:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.
Roseland Accelerated Middle School (RAMS) - Gym
1777 West Avenue

Workshops will be conducted in English and Spanish.
Food and child care (for children 3 years & up) will be provided!
Se realizarán talleres en inglés y en español.
¡Se proporcionará comida y cuidado de niños (para niños de 3 años para arriba)!
Appendix E: Community Workshop 1 Data and Photographs

ACTIVITY 1: VISION WALL
Workshop attendees each wrote down and placed on the “Vision Wall” three key words or phrases to describe what they value about Roseland, and their priorities and vision for the future.

Vision Wall phrases were summarized and categorized as shown in the table on the following page.
Workshop #1 Vision Wall Activity Results

Total participants = 141

*(note: Percentages will not add up to 100% since people put down multiple sheets/ideas)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Roseland Area of the future will be:</th>
<th>Times an idea was mentioned</th>
<th>% of participants who listed this idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A place that is safe, comfortable and efficient for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users to get around</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable/pedestrian friendly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike routes/paths</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Traffic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street improvements (sidewalks, street lights, crosswalks, ...)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Public Transit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Streets; Protection from Vehicles/Traffic Calming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A healthy community with access to plenty of parks, recreational activities, and diverse food options | 25                         | 18%                                   |
| Parks and trees (*pocket parks, dog parks, urban green*)                                              | 14                         |                                       |
| Food access/healthy foods/grocery stores/restaurants                                                  | 5                          |                                       |
| Improved Infrastructure                                                                             | 3                          |                                       |
| Skate park                                                                                          | 2                          |                                       |
| Bowling alley                                                                                       | 1                          |                                       |

| Home to a number of community centers, events, services and programs for people of all ages, including children and teens | 24                         | 17%                                   |
| Programs/Activities/Center for Kids/youth/teens                                                      | 10                         |                                       |
| Community/Recreation Center                                                                         | 7                          |                                       |
| Education/learning center; Learning opportunities                                                    | 3                          |                                       |
| Community events                                                                                    | 2                          |                                       |
| Community services                                                                                  | 1                          |                                       |
| Better Schools                                                                                      | 1                          |                                       |
| Library                                                                                             | 7                          |                                       |

| A welcoming community that is clean, safe, affordable and inviting                                    | 33                         | 23%                                   |
| Inviting/welcoming/strong community/caring                                                          | 14                         |                                       |
| Clean/bright                                                                                        | 6                          |                                       |
| Beneficial                                                                                          | 2                          |                                       |

<p>| Better Police (foot patrol, less descrimination, more education for cop)                             | 6                          |                                       |
| Reduce Crime                                                                                        | 5                          |                                       |
| Affordable housing                                                                                  | 9                          |                                       |
| Affordable                                                                                          | 6                          |                                       |
| No gentrification                                                                                   | 3                          |                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home to a strong economy with good local jobs and prosperous locally-owned small businesses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong economy/Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local small businesses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better wages/less poverty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/commerce</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart technology/sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain its rural character with residential neighborhoods and preserved natural areas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep low density/ no new housing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep country/rural feel; don't annex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve open/natural space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No city / no change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less low income housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer homeless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate its vibrant cultural diversity through cultural centers, events, and support for local artists</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Arts Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural identity/neighborhoods (AKA Chinatown)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally produced art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant/flourishing/revived</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun/exciting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place where open government is valued and people are empowered to participate in the decision-making process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowered public/more representation/ data to the people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less taxes/regulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change outdated zoning codes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase tax base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering Places/Unity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified/integrated neighborhoods/community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park/plaza/town square</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local coffee shop for gathering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND USE ACTIVITY
The below are the results of the land use mapping activity, with each image representing the outcome of one of the seven working groups. Each group was given a large-format poster showing an aerial map of the project area and areas of focus along key corridors. Using pre-printed land use stickers showing images of public improvements and land uses/building types, participants collaboratively identified appropriate locations for these along each key corridor on the map.
The colored areas shown on the map below represent land use designations as chosen by each participant group. Almost every single use category was desired along Hearn Avenue.
TRANSPORTATION TRADE-OFFS
During this activity, participants were asked to compare alternative street design options for a number of key streets in the project area. Transportation trade-offs included design options such as providing on-street parking versus providing bike lanes. After weighting the trade-offs, each participant placed a colored dot to indicate their support for each item.

Burbank Avenue:
Corby Avenue:

- Stop signs and signals at intersections
- Roundabouts and mini-roundabouts at intersections
- Baker to Hean: one lane per direction where possible
- Hean to Bellevue: maintain one car per direction if possible

Dutton Avenue:

- Seabastopol to Hean: add more vehicle lanes
- Seabastopol to Hean: remove on-street parking and bike lanes
- Hean to Bellevue: extension allocates road width to prioritize auto flow
- Hean to Bellevue: extension allocates road width to balance modes
West Avenue:

Local Residential Streets:
ANNEXATION
The following questions were posted by participants during the annexation Q&A period:

1. Where can people go to ask questions to ease anxiety?
2. Who is LAFCO?
3. How are members of LAFCO selected and how are they appointed?
4. Can an area opt out of annexation?
5. How are non-registered voters’ voices to be heard?
6. What law established the voter requirement?
7. How will those without computers know about the next meetings?
8. At what point does pre-zoning get infused into the process?

SUMMARY OF COMMENT CARDS:
The comments submitted by participants on comment cards are summarized as follows:

- **Annexation** – Concerns about congestion, safety, and impact on/cost to homeowners. Desire to maintain the rural character. Desire to avoid annexation and/or to have more of a voice in the discussion. Need for traffic calming measures at Hearn/Burbank, Stony Point/Sebastopol, and on Gardner Avenue. Concern about annexation vote for those who cannot register to vote.
- **Land Use** – Distinguish between the two sides of Dutton Avenue. Clean up the existing parks and bike paths. Preserve the existing businesses and encourage new small businesses through tax incentives. Need grocery stores and better lighting. Create a culture/arts center. Concern that added high-density housing will keep Roseland low income.
- **Transportation** – Need more buses; not sure about roundabouts. Concern about how to handle added traffic with increased growth. Desire for transportation improvements on Dutton Avenue. Desire to maintain rural roads. Desire for improvements for the Bellevue overcrossing and the alignment of the crossing on Burbank with the Roseland Creek bike trail.
- **Input on Workshop**: Provide more food, do not use sticky dots, provide the PowerPoint via e-mail, make sure to follow up with everyone who attended the meeting.
APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 2 DATA AND PHOTOGRAPHS
Appendix C: Community Workshop 2 Data and Photographs

**ACTIVITY 1: POTENTIAL OUTCOMES OF ANNEXATION**

The following table demonstrates the results of the activity seeking input on participants’ perspectives on possible annexation outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Annexation Outcomes</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>TOTAL Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police services provided by one agency</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood oriented policing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to connect to City sewer and water</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure repair and replacement becomes the City’s responsibility</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential of increased property value</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to vote in city elections, run for City Council or be appointed to a City board or commission</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One set of regulations and permitting requirements</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are a list of questions and comments that were provided by participants as part of this activity. All questions will be answered on the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) handout provided on the project website and at future workshops. The project website is: http://srcity.org/departments/cityadmin/city_manager/roseland

**Annexation Questions**

- Are there any plans for Santa Rosa Police Department officers to interact and to meet residents of Roseland?
• Will there be a local Roseland Santa Rosa Police Department station?
• Do I have to get rid of my horses upon annexation?
• What are unintended or negative consequences of annexation? Doesn’t seem that is spelled out. Improved property values is great – what about increased taxes and associated increase in rents? I approve of annexation but it doesn’t seem the whole picture is presented.
• If we currently have roosters, after we are annexed, will we have to get rid of them?
• Will one effect be higher rents? They are already rising drastically, how will annexation affect that?
• What is the City’s plan for increasing police officers to take the place of County Sheriffs and California Highway Patrol?
• How is housing density established? What kind of density (per acre) is stated in the General Plan?
• What is the timeline for sewer in Hearn Avenue Area? There is some on Dutton Meadows – will sewer hookups be provided for the rest of Dutton Meadow?
• What is the existing land use designation for the proposed annexation areas? If the properties are Low Density Residential now, does the City plan to change this to a higher density? If so – when does the public get notified about this process to give input?
• How long will it take for the City to upgrade the sewer and water in Roseland? I was annexed about 20 years ago still no new upgrades.
• Will homeless people get any additional units if annexation passes and happens?

Annexation Comments

• Please make very clear how a resident with a question can get an answer. Name of person/people, phone number, not just website.
• Benefit to annexation: pizza delivery! Pizza places will not deliver to W. Hearn Avenue – a County road – insurance issues.
• It would be great to have an opportunity to “rank” benefits or improvements.
• Issues with rent increase. Landlords kicking out tenants.
• Increase rent of business space not addressed.
• Be consistent with permit requirements and zoning regulations. Duplicity.

General Comments/Questions (not specifically related to annexation)

• What about a Santa Rosa Junior College site in central Roseland?
• Minor businesses, delis only, no major commercial along Hearn Avenue.
• Business service between Hearn and Sebastopol Road.
• Sebastopol Road as commercial center only.
• Recreation (pool, parks, senior center, after school classes/center) at Hearn Avenue.
• Sebastopol Road is ALIVE.
• We should be using reclaimed water.

**ACTIVITY 2: NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS**
The following graph represents the preference for one or two neighborhood centers in the Roseland area.

The following is a summary of the key discussion points in favor of only one center at Sebastopol Road. Participants expressed that:

• Support should be focused on businesses that are already investing in the community.
• Anchor development is needed along Sebastopol, such as a grocery store, to increase commercial viability now.
• Sebastopol Road is underutilized and needs re-investment.
• Efforts along Sebastopol Road should be prioritized.
• This location connects downtown to Roseland Village.
• Sebastopol Road is the heart of Roseland.
• This center is located close to the proposed SMART station.
• More civic uses should be located along Sebastopol Road, such as a library, swimming pool and senior center.
• A second center would bring more traffic to Hearn Ave.
The following is a summary of the key discussion points in favor of two centers, at Sebastopol Road and at Hearn Ave. Participants expressed that:

- Two centers provide more services within close proximity to southern areas of Roseland
- Two centers provide alternative transportation choices for people to walk and ride from homes to stores and activities
- There would be too much traffic along Sebastopol Road if there is only one center.
- Traffic makes it difficult to access Sebastopol Road and it is a deterrent to visiting businesses located there.
- Two centers provides an opportunity for a greater concentration of recreational activities near/at Southwest Community Park such as a community pool and recreation center
- The shopping center on Dutton Meadows near Southwest Community Park should be expanded
- This second center along Hearn Ave should be a less intense center than the one along Sebastopol Road, with a focus on civic activities, such as a library and community center, and continue to focus retail uses along Sebastopol to support the business that are already there

**ACTIVITY 3: NEW STREET AND/OR PATH CONNECTIONS**
The following maps demonstrate the results of the circulation mapping activity. The orange tape represents new street connections, while the green tape represents new bicycle or pedestrian connections.
COMMENT CARDS

Below is a summary of the participant comments submitted at the end of the workshop.

- **Annexation** – Concerned about gentrification. Want to understand the benefits of annexation; concerned about increased taxes and traffic. Want more of a voice in future development after annexation. Concerned about increased water costs. Concerned about slower police response (currently the Sherriff’s Department is fast to respond).
- **Circulation** – Want separated bike paths. No sharrows. Dutton and Corby need repairs. Deal with traffic on Sebastopol Road.
- **Housing** – The area requires more housing and rent control. Need to determine appropriate density for the area.
- **Land Use** – Develop a recreation area, pool, and library on Sebastopol Road.
- **Input on Workshop** – Should have more time for Q&A, discussion and table activities. Need more time for the workshop overall. Focus more on Spanish-speaking outreach. Everyone should have been able to ask questions.
Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Steve Rasmussen Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, at 6:20 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present: Gary Balcerak, Frank Baumgardner, Marianne Causley, Duane Dewitt, Don Edgar, Gregory Fearon, Bill Haluzak, Jessica Hughes, Hilleary Izard, John Iervolino, Karen Kissler, Pat Kuta, Pablo Lopez, Jen Mendoza, Gustavo Mendoza, Christina Meyer, Donata Mikulik, Angie Perez, Magdalena Ridley, Nora Rivas, Chris Rodgers, Anne Seeley, Jacque Sprague, Deborah Wilfong,


I. Welcome, Review of Agenda, Collect Logo Ballots
   a. Introduction of the Steering Committee members, members of the public and the project team.
   b. Logo ballots were collected at the end of the meeting to allow members time to consider the options and vote (see attached Logo ballot).

II. De-Brief of June 10th Community Workshop
   a. Results of Workshop—the project team gave an overview of the results of the workshop starting with the Vision Wall Activity (see attached presentation slides). Members provided the following comments and direction:
      • Need to quantify vision wall results
      • Summary is missing several things that were listed, including: vibrant economy, library and pool
      • Post slide shows on website
b. **What was good? How can we improve?**—the project team asked members for their feedback on what was effective about the workshop and what could be improved. Members responded:

**EFFECTIVE**

- Bilingual tables
- Enormous amount of effort—made people feel respected and heard
- Childcare
- Tables were engaging—diverse people listening and collaborating
- Table facilitators did good job engaging everyone, balancing discussion (note other members felt differently as listed below under “could be improved”)
- Youth participation
- Good representation of neighborhoods

**COULD BE IMPROVED**

- Space was cavernous—tables should be closer together
- Move tables to front of room
- Acoustics—hard to hear at back tables
- Need time for tables to report back
- Too long
- Too late at night for families
- Too many topics, people self selected those they were most interested in—should limit or focus topics
- Provide more “blanks” for new ideas
- Some people stood around on edges—Steering Committee members should engage them and bring them in
- People had unlimited dots and used them to vote all for one thing—not valid survey
- Table facilitators need to make sure everyone is involved—not allow few people to dominate (note other members felt differently as listed above under “effective”)
- Tables had too many people—20 too many, may 12?
- Get steering committee members to help more with facilitation at tables
- Need to assure table space for everyone
III. Refining Alternatives in Preparation for Workshop 2

a. Circulation Alternatives—the project team presented results of Workshop 1 regarding circulation and proposed circulation alternatives (see attached slides and draft worksheets). Members then worked in small groups to review the draft worksheets. Small groups then reported back their recommendations for refining the materials and alternatives. Member comments included:

Round-abouts
- Surprised we are talking about round-abouts
- Round-abouts popular in Mexico, residents accustomed to them
- Judgment of whether round-about or stop sign better is site specific
- When did round-abouts start? Are they safer than stops? Why?
- Round-abouts slow things down. How do you get pedestrians through safely?
- Have round-about discussion later in workshop in small groups so not distracting

Worksheets and Alternatives
- Be more location specific, hard to consider options abstractly
- Dot exercises not totally clear—tradeoffs confusing
- Eliminate jargon or explain—like “bulb-out”
- Organize elements North to South
- Take out “minimum” vs. “enhanced”
- Are these “either/or”?
- Should have menu of options—but need to know which ones can not go with each other
- Need context to make decisions like bike lane or parking; are these mutually exclusive? Linked?
- Have picture of current street conditions and then show what it would look like after improvements
- Include relevant pictures of actual streets
- Having some of the same elements in both alternatives is confusing
- Need to give cost information—associate improvements with costs
- Maybe have people “spend” the available funds
- Consider asking which streets people want to focus the limited resources
- Of course everyone will pick the enhanced Alternative B with all the improvements—but need a way to prioritize
- Need information on sidewalk width—what is needed for two people, for person with stroller
• Need to know how much space needed and available—for example minimum width of lanes
• What about paths and trails through blocks
• What about other potential bike paths
• Maybe work on a circulation map—put possible bike paths on as an option

Transit Planning
• What is planned for the Roseland area?
• Hand out surveys on buses
• Could we do a workshop activity asking what additional routes people want?
• Currently routes do not connect to origins and destinations
• How do we make transit system work for neighborhood?
• Nothing goes south
• Why is the Transit Center located where it is? Nothing goes there, no interconnection?
• Need unified system that responds to neighborhood

b. Land Use Alternatives—the project team presented the results of Workshop 1 regarding landuse (see attached slides and draft worksheets). Members then worked in small groups to review the proposed land use worksheets. Small groups then reported back their recommendations for refining the materials and alternatives. Member comments included:
• Colors are confusing—multiple things are green
• Be sure base map is accurate—show existing conditions rather than the General Plan land use map
• Better not to use General Plan map at all
• Clarify meaning of zoning
• Show more road and planned roads for context—proposed roads should be dashed in (for example, Dutton)
• Need legend—for example, blue dots equal schools
• Maybe provide map of what exists and give people overlay maps of options
• Provide a planning term glossary
• Confusing that A and B for housing are almost the same—just two spots different—don’t give us two choices that look the same.
• Can we choose both scenarios?
• If we choose housing in one location does that mean we can’t place it in another? Not clear.
• Maps should highlight differences—alternatives too close together
• Area by area focus would be better than element by element
• Should not make Sebastopol Road Urban Vision Plan a given—plan is too old

IV. Follow-up on Annexation and Planning Questions and Topics
Members were asked if they had any outstanding questions on annexation or other planning topics. Members had no additional questions.

V. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
Steering Committee members and members of the public in attendance were given the opportunity to comment on any items not on the agenda. No Steering Committee members or members of the public desired to comment.

VI. Next Steps
The project team summarized the feedback received and the plans to revise the alternatives and materials following Steering Committee members’ direction. The project team encouraged all members to recruit participants for the upcoming Community Workshop #2 on June 23, 2015.

Adjournment: Steve Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, adjourned the meeting to the next Roseland Area Projects Steering Committee meeting, date and time to be determined, at 8:00 p.m.
Logo Ballot / Boleta del Logo
Logo Ballot / Boleta de Logotipo

**Option 1**

Roseland
GROWING TOGETHER
CRECIENDO JUNTOS

**Option 2**

Roseland
BLOOMS FLORECE

**Option 3**

Building the Future Together
Roseland
Juntos Construyendo el Futuro
Worksheets / Hojas de Trabajo
Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where commercial/retail should be allowed.

**Option A**
Concentrate retail on Sebastopol Road, with corner markets/food trucks throughout

**Option B**
Distribute new retail development between Sebastopol Road and Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Multi-Family Housing

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where multi-family housing should be allowed.

Option A
Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & at Bellevue/Stony Point Road

Option B
Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & on Dutton Ave, south of Hearn
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES
Civic/Social/Community Services (e.g. library, youth center)

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where civic, social, and community services should be allowed.

**A** Focus community and civic uses along Sebastopol Road

**B** Focus community and civic uses on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Recreational Facilities (e.g. indoor/outdoor sports fields, pool)

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where recreational facilities should be allowed.

A Focus recreational facilities along Dutton Ave, south of Hearn

B Focus recreational facilities around the intersection of Bellevue Ave and Stony Point Rd
Family Entertainment Uses (e.g. bowling alley, movie theater)

Please choose Option A, B, or C for the general location of where family entertainment uses should be allowed.

**Option A**
Focus family entertainment on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)

**Option B**
Focus family entertainment on Dutton Ave south of Hearn

**Option C**
Focus family entertainment along Sebastopol Rd
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

Local Residential Roads

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for local residential roads? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen sidewalks to meet minimum standards</td>
<td>Wider sidewalks that exceed minimum standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaped buffers where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini roundabouts at larger intersections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

### Alternative A
- Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks

### Alternative B
- Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks
- Bike lanes
- Remove parking on one side of the street
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

Dutton Avenue (between Hearn and Bellevue)

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ENHANCED OPTION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands</td>
<td>Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking both sides</td>
<td>Add sidewalks where missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-street parking both sides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Alternative B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add sidewalks that meet minimum standards</td>
<td>Add sidewalks with landscaped buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on east side of roadway</td>
<td>Remove parking on east side of roadway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

### MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS

**Alternative A**
- Bulb-outs with high-visibility crosswalks
- Bike boulevards
- Mini-roundabouts at West /Leo and West/ South
- Raised Crosswalks near schools

### ENHANCED OPTION

**Alternative B**
- Bike lanes
- Mini-roundabouts at West /Leo and West/ South
- Bulb-outs at other crossings
- Raised Crosswalks near schools
- Pedestrian-scale lighting
- Bus pull-outs and shelters
- Remove parking on one side of the street
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road
SPECIFIC PLAN & ANNEXATION

Burbank Avenue (between Sebastopol and Roseland Creek)

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

**MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS**

**Alternative A**
- Sidewalks on both sides
- Bike lanes
- Remove parking on both sides of the street
- Requires property acquisition

**ENHANCED OPTION**

**Alternative B**
- Sidewalks on both sides
- Remove parking on both sides of the street
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on one side of the street</td>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use path/rural sidewalk on one side of</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street with landscaped buffer</td>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentations / Diapositivas
Welcome
AGENDA

• De-Brief of Workshop #1
• Workshop Results and Alternative Development to Date
• Refining Alternatives for Presentation at Workshop #2
• Follow-up on Annexation and Planning Topics
• Member and Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda
• Wrap-Up/Next Steps
Workshop Results

Vision wall, transportation tradeoffs, and landuse alternatives
VISION WALL RESULTS
VISION WALL RESULTS

- Pedestrian/bike/transit friendly
- Plenty of parks, recreational activities, and healthy food options
- Community events, services and programs
- Clean, safe, affordable and inviting
- Good local jobs and small businesses
- Rural character with preserved natural areas
- Celebrate its vibrant cultural diversity
- Open government and empowered public
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS - Burbank

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Divided

Divided
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Corby

Divided

Divided

Clear Direction
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Burbank

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Clear Direction
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS

- West

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Divided
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Local Residential Streets

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Divided

Divided
PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING THE CIRCULATION ALTERNATIVES

– Reviewed results of the transportation trade-offs exercise
– Identified where there was clear direction and where there was disagreement
– Developed specific design options for each of the key streets to address community input
– Generally Alternative A meets minimum street standards
– Generally, Alternative B exceeds minimum street standards
Mini-Roundabout

- Slows traffic
- Aesthetically pleasing
- Keeps drivers alert
- Safer than two-way stop-controlled intersections
- More capacity than all-way stop-controlled intersections
- Center island mountable by buses or trucks
Proposed Circulation Activity

Select from alternative options
The Community will be asked to select either A, or any/all options for B.
Is the activity clear?
Are we sharing the right options?
Should any options be removed?
Should any other options be included?
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES ACTIVITY
PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING THE LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

— Summarized and synthesized results of the land use mapping activity

— Checked against:
  • Market demand
  • Planned developments
  • General Plan land use map
  • Sebastopol Road Vision
  • Metropolitan Transportation Commission guidelines and targets
SYNTHESIZED COMMUNITY RESULTS
MARKET DEMAND SUMMARY

• Residential demand is for single-family homes, townhomes, and multifamily apartments
• Very little demand for office or industrial uses
• Commercial demand is for:
  — general retail
  — food and beverage stores
  — restaurants/drinking places
PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS
SEBASTOPOL ROAD VISION
General Plan Breakdown:

- Public/Institutional: 5%
- Low-density Residential: 46%
- Med-high density Residential: 25%
- Mixed-use: 6%
- Retail and Business Service: 8%
- Office: 0%
- Industrial: 8%
- Parks/Recreation: 2%
- TOTAL: 100%

Area of community consensus
AREAS OF FOCUS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TRANSPORT NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGNATION GUIDELINES</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing mix</strong></td>
<td>Low-rise, townhomes, mid-rise and small lot SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station area Total units Target</strong></td>
<td>1,500-4,000 (currently 5,000 in plan area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Project Density (for new housing)</strong></td>
<td>20-50 du/ acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Jobs Target</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MTC GUIDELINES

### TRANSIT NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Predominantly residential organized around transit station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit modes</td>
<td>Light rail, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, and/or local bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use mix</td>
<td>Predominantly residential with supporting commercial and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Housing</td>
<td>Range of choices to accommodate families, senior housing and affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Low to medium density; Increasing densities within ½ mile of a transit stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of retail</td>
<td>Primarily local-serving retail opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Locate essential social services like child care centers and health clinics near transit stops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Land Use Activity

Select from alternative options
• Workshop participants will be asked to select option A or B for each focus area.
• Is the activity is clear?
• Are the right options included?
• Should any options be removed?
• Should any other options be included?
NEXT STEPS

• Workshop #2 – June 23rd
  • Land use options selected will be communicated in the Specific Plan, either through
    – land use map, and/or
    – land use policies
  • Circulation options will be communication in the Specific Plan, either through:
    – circulation map
    – street design diagrams, and/or
    – circulation policies
Thank You!

Jessica Jones
City of Santa Rosa
(English)
jones@srcity.org
(707) 543-3410

Steve Cancian
Outreach Coordinator
(Spanish and English)
canciansteve@gmail.com
(707) 543-4689

srcity.org/roseland
MEETING OVERVIEW

The purpose of the second Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was to present and discuss the Specific Plan alternative plan concepts.

The project team first gave a presentation summarizing the results of Workshop #1 and explaining how the alternative concepts were developed. PMC and W-Trans then presented the land use and circulation alternatives and engaged the group in a discussion. Committee members were asked to provide technical expertise on each of the alternatives and input on whether each one was feasible.

A list of meeting attendees begins on page 9 of this summary.

MEETING OUTCOMES

TAC members provided input on the viability of the land use and circulation concepts. The following main discussion points were noted by the group:

- **Constraints to removing on-street parking.** Loss of on-street parking is a concern, particularly along Corby Avenue in the Auto Row area. Previous commitments have been made to retain this on-street parking.

- **Feasibility of installing roundabouts.** Roundabouts might not be a viable option, as land would most likely need to be acquired to install them.

The following sections provide additional detail about each meeting discussion, including a summary of all comments provided during the discussion and the alternatives presented.

CIRCULATION AND LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

The following diagrams are the preliminary land use and circulation alternatives presented to and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee. They are also available in higher resolution by viewing the meeting Powerpoint presentation on the project website, up during the duration of the project process.
**TAC MEETING #2 SUMMARY**

**TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES**

**Dutton Avenue (between Sebastopol and Hearn)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks</td>
<td>Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove parking on one side of the street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES**

**Dutton Avenue (between Hearn and Bellevue)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands</td>
<td>Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking both sides</td>
<td>Add sidewalks where missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-street parking both sides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

City of Santa Rosa
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

**Corby Avenue (between Hearn and Bellevue)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add sidewalks that meet minimum standards</td>
<td>Add sidewalks with landscaped buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on east side of roadway</td>
<td>Remove parking on east side of roadway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES**

**Burbank Avenue (between Sebastopol and Roseland Creek)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides</td>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires property acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

**Burbank Avenue (between Roseland Creek and Hearn)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on one side of the street</td>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use path/walkway sidewalk on one side of street with landscaped buffer</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

**Civic/Social/Community Services (e.g. library, youth center)**

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where civic, social, and community services should be allowed.

**A**

Focus community and civic uses along Sebastopol Road

**B**

Focus community and civic uses on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Family Entertainment Uses (e.g., bowling alley, movie theater)

Please choose Option A, B, or C for the general location of where family entertainment uses should be allowed.

A Focus family entertainment on Heam Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)

B Focus family entertainment on Dutton Ave south of Heam

C Focus family entertainment along Sebastopol Rd

LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Multi-Family Housing

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where multi-family housing should be allowed.

A Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Heam Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & at Bellevue/Stony Point Road

B Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Heam Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & on Dutton Ave, south of Heam
TAC MEETING #2 SUMMARY

LAND USE ALTERNATIVES  

**Commercial/Retail**

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where commercial retail should be allowed.

A. Concentrate retail on Sebastopol Road, with corner markets/food trucks throughout.

B. Distribute new retail development between Sebastopol Road and Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center).

---

LAND USE ALTERNATIVES  

**Recreational Facilities (e.g. indoor/outdoor sports fields, pool)**

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where recreational facilities should be allowed.

A. Focus recreational facilities along Dutton Ave, south of Hearn.

B. Focus recreational facilities around the intersection of Bellevue Ave and Stony Point Rd.
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND KEY ISSUES

A discussion with the committee followed the presentation of the alternative circulation and land use plan concepts to identify their concerns, issues, and questions. Individual comments are listed below.

CIRCULATION

Local Streets
- Transit needs at least 11-foot travel lanes to accommodate buses.
- Use phasing/enhance streets over time.
- People use a lot of on-street parking in the area.

Dutton Avenue (Sebastopol to Hearn)
- Need to talk to people who live/own property before removing on-street parking.
- Need to look at bike lanes globally and prioritize where they should go.
- The SMART path provides a Class I bikeway facility, so may not need bike lanes on Dutton.
- Need to maintain intersection capacity.
- Need to increase single path of travel – streetlights, accessibility per ADA requirements (significant cost).

Corby Avenue (Hearn to Bellevue/Auto Row)
- Dealerships do not want to remove street parking, since employees park on the street.
- Transportation and Public Works is working with dealerships/property owners – need to reflect what is already under way.

West Avenue
- Target West Avenue as a priority for future improvements – it is heavily used by families.
- Need to consider school pick up/drop-off. Need passenger drop-off points.
- Alternative B will cost a lot from an accessibility perspective. ADA accessibility should be considered. This also affects right-of-way and needs to be discussed with other committees.
- Slow down traffic.
- Need higher visibility signage.
- Mini-roundabouts were not successful on Humboldt. Roundabouts were difficult for pedestrians/children to understand.
• Keep existing crossings, particularly near Bayer Park. Consider new crosswalks to connect schools and parks.
• Bike boulevard concept might not work on a street with bus transit. Does this work?

**Burbank Avenue**
• Constrained width. Bike lanes would require property acquisition.
• Scenic road classification?
• Might be a good road for a bike boulevard.
• Desire for crosswalk between school and park.

**LAND USE**
• Commercial to the east might be more viable since it is closer to jobs.
• There is already a lot of multi-family housing in this area, which has led to comments/issues of overconcentration.
• How will multi-family housing option A work with realignment of Ludwig and Bellevue?
• Places along the SMART corridor are a better location for multi-family housing.
• Need to link multi-family to transit. There is currently a project going on called Reimagining CityBus. Rachel Ede, from the Transit Division, noted that the Southwest Bus Transfer Center might not always be in that location. Roseland residents say they often go downtown to transfer and then come back. There are future transfer opportunities in other areas. They are seeking feedback from riders now to determine how the center is currently working for riders, and how it can be improved.
• Share info about CityBus and the proposed Roseland Creek Community Park at Workshop #2. Unify these efforts as much as possible.
• Like the idea of civic uses around the park, and in both locations (Sebastopol and Hearn). People want a pool at Southwest Community Park, but there may not be enough space.
• Crossroad development – how does this work with the Leo Drive extension?

**ATTENDANCE**

**CITY OF SANTA ROSA DEPARTMENTS**
• Economic Development and Housing
• Rafael Rivero (Community Outreach Specialist)

• Community Development
  o Jessica Jones (Senior Planner)
  o Lisa Kranz (Supervising Planner)
  o Chuck Regalia (CD Director/Assistant City Manager)
  o Mark Setterland (Building Official)

• Transportation and Public Works
  o Rachel Ede (Transit Planner)
  o Carol Clark (Associate Civil Engineer)
  o Nancy Adams (Transportation Planner)

• Utilities
  o Danielle Dugre (Associate Civil Engineer)

• Recreation and Parks
  o Jen Santos (Deputy Director of Parks)

• Fire
  o Toby Rey (Fire Inspector)

• City Attorney’s Office
  o Molly Dillon (Assistant City Attorney)

• City Manager’s Office – Violence Prevention Program
  o Khaalid Muttaqi (Program Manager)

COUNTY OF SONOMA DEPARTMENTS

• Transportation and Public Works
  o Mitch Simson

• Health Services
  o Beth Dadko
TAC MEETING #2 SUMMARY

- Kelly Elder
  - Sheriff’s Office
    - Alan Vernon (Lieutenant)

OTHER AGENCIES

- California Highway Patrol
  - Jeff Rhea (Lieutenant)

- Metropolitan Transportation Commission
  - Stefanie Hom

- Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit
  - Linda Meckel (Senior Planner)

- Sonoma County Water Agency
  - Michael Thompson (Assistant General Manager)

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- Greg McMahon
- Duane De Witt
INTRODUCTION

The third community workshop for the Santa Rosa Roseland Area Specific Plan and Annexation Projects took place the evening of Wednesday, October 21, 2015. The event was an open house with six stations to provide information and seek input from participants. The station topics were Land Use, Circulation, Implementation, Annexation, Transit, and Parks. Approximately 70 people attended the event. This memorandum summarizes the workshop activities, materials, and results.

THE SIX STATIONS

At the first two stations, the Land Use Station and the Circulation Station, meeting participants were given the opportunity to review, discuss, and provide input on the draft land use plan and circulation plan, and respond to a series of questions posed by the Steering Committee about these plans. A number of maps and diagrams illustrating the draft land use plan and circulation plan were displayed. Facilitators at each station provided a brief overview of the exhibits shown. Participants were invited to comment on the exhibits by writing their comments on Post-it notes and placing them directly onto the exhibits. Participants were also asked to identify whether they agreed or disagreed with a number of questions raised by members of the Steering Committee at its last meeting, such as “Should on-street parking be provided along Burbank Avenue?”

The Implementation Station invited participants to prioritize approximately 20 potential public improvements that would be needed to implement the Specific Plan. The Annexation Station provided information on the potential annexation of Roseland and four other county islands, and staff members from the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) were available to answer questions. The Transit Station displayed the bus routes and solicited input on transit service needs for Roseland. The Parks Station presented a map to demonstrate that the current and proposed parks serve the entire project area showing 1/2 mile and 1 mile radius service areas, and solicited input on proposed parks in the project area.
The results of the workshop will guide development of the land use and circulation plans for the area and the phasing of public improvements for inclusion in the draft Specific Plan. A transcription of the meeting comments provided by meeting participants are in Appendix A: Community Workshop 3 - Data and Photographs.

**KEY RESULTS**

The prominent themes that emerged from Community Workshop 3 are summarized as follows:

- **Land uses along Hearn Avenue**: Participants were concerned about an increase in residential density and the addition of retail uses along Hearn Avenue, as they relate to an increase in traffic on a road that is already heavily congested. This direction was at odds with the clear direction received at the second workshop in support of an intensified neighborhood mix of goods, services, and residential along Hearn Avenue.

- **Retail along Burbank Avenue**: Most participants did not support the neighborhood shopping center/ mixed-use designation along Burbank Avenue, south of Roseland Creek Park.

- **Recreation and Parks**: The community supports additional parks along the creeks and in the area east of the railroad tracks and south of Barham Avenue. Participants had questions about maintenance and plans for Southwest Community Park and were positive about progress on Roseland Creek Park and Bayer Farm and Gardens.

- **New Streets**: Participants were not in support of any of the additional street extensions at West Ave and Campbell Drive proposed by the Steering Committee.

- **Burbank Avenue**: Participants were supportive of the roadway design, which provides bike lanes, no on-street parking, and landscaped bioswales along the portion of the road south of the creek.

- **Bikeways**: The community was supportive of additional bike paths along the creeks and Wiljan Court, and a bike route along Roseland Avenue.

- **Annexation**: Participants had questions about what annexation meant to them and their property and what costs might be.

- **Transit**: Participants were interested in greater frequency and service in Roseland, along with longer, evening, and weekend transit service hours.

A complete transcription of the notes and workshop activities is provided in Appendix A.

**NEXT STEPS**
A series of smaller meetings is being held with members of the community who live in the county islands that are being considered for annexation. A meeting is also being held to discuss concerns regarding housing affordability and potential displacement. The next Steering Committee meeting will be held prior to the final workshop to provide input on workshop materials and activities. The final community workshop, scheduled for February 2016, will focus on a review and discussion of the key components of the draft Specific Plan, including policy topics, and will provide information about annexation and an opportunity to raise questions about the annexation process.
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 3 - Data and Photographs

STATION 1: LAND USE
The following table demonstrates the results of the activity seeking input on participants’ perspectives on the proposed land use plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Is the shopping center/mixed-use designation on Burbank Avenue as currently planned in the Santa Rosa General Plan appropriate?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Should the existing mixed-use land use designation be extended northward along Burbank Avenue, as shown on the map?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: Do you want retail land use at the location of the northeast corner of Stony Point Road/Hearn Avenue?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: Do you want retail land use at the location of the northeast and northwest corners of Burbank Avenue/Hearn Avenue?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Is another new park needed to serve the residential area east of the railroad tracks, south of Barham Avenue, around Corby Avenue?</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6: Should parks be added along Roseland Creek?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7: Is medium-high density residential along Hearn Avenue appropriate?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are comments provided by participants as part of this activity.

**Land Use Map Comments:**

- No big box retail in “star” area south of Hearn and West of Victoria Dr
- No retail on Hearn (x4)
- No retail zoning change on Hearn @ Dutton. Keep med-low density.
- No new retail on Hearn at Dutton (x2)
- Yes retail on Hearn
- Why can’t we have the Sheriff Sub Station on Burbank Ave since we have the BRFD there already
- Would like to see Sheriff Sub Station on Burbank Ave and not hidden on Sebastopol Road near the park
- Some retail that increases walkability (grocery, coffee, books, etc.) would be good!
- This is where we work. Good industrial against freeway [on map: Hampton Way @ Sepastopol Rd]
- Bad residential better business + commercial [on map: Joe Rodota Trail @ Roseland Ave]
- This area is good jobs only trucking hub around [on map: Joe Rodota Trail @ Roseland Ave]
- Support local businesses in Sebastopol Rd corridor!
- Higher density housing along busy streets/intersections is smart and good for the environment. I vote yes.
- Keep area medium density – Hearn to Stony Pt. Not medium high as proposed.
- Mixed use housing and store at corner! [on map: Hearn @Butler]
- Bus stop should remain at the south park [on map: NE corner of Southwest Community Park]
- Yes – community center library near bus center [on map: East of Southwest Community Park]
- More open space
- Small scale retail with w/in walking distance is always good
- No more hard liquor permits, please!
- Plant more trees in southwest community park

**Flip Chart Comments:**

- Roseland Creek Park should be designated “Open Space” not “Park”
- No retail on Hearn – Will exacerbate existing traffic problem. [mentioned twice]
• Make Southside Transit Center a real transit center like at Downtown and W. College
• No roosters!
• Street trees along streets
• Low impact design/resiliency
• Growth without proportional infrastructure improvements is awful
• What is definition of shopping center? Are all the same type and size?
• Congestion due to poor [land] use planning + lack of coordination between the City and County contributes to bad air quality and childhood asthma. Diesel bus storage across from Roseland El School is problematic.
• Roseland Creek Park should be preserved - not a dog park
• Preserve City staff institutional memory by keeping a binder
STATION 2: CIRCULATION

The following table demonstrates the results of the activity seeking input on participants’ perspectives on the proposed streets and bikeways plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Should West Avenue be extended through the Roseland Village Shopping Center as currently planned in the Santa Rosa General Plan?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Should West Avenue be extended south of Hearn Avenue? (may require easements and acquisition of private land)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: Should on-street parking be provided along Burbank Avenue?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: Should Campbell Drive be extended farther east to connect with Rose Meadow Court?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Should the Southside Bus Transfer Center be moved east to the proposed shopping center on Hearn Avenue?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6: Should a bike route be added along Roseland Avenue to lead pedestrians/bicyclists from Sebastopol Road to the Joe Rodota Trail?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7: Should Burbank Avenue be designated a bike boulevard, where bikes and cars equally share the road, instead of having designated bike lanes?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8: Should a bike path be added easterly along Roseland Creek and at Colgan Creek?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9: Is Wiljan Court appropriate for bike lanes?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are comments provided by participants as part of this activity.

**Streets Map Comments**

- Cruce peatonal con luz para los niños al cruzar (A crosswalk with flashing lights for the kids to cross) [on map: Hughes @ Burbank]
- Se necesita un semáforo porque hay mucho tráfico y no puede uno salir rapido (A signal light is needed because the heavy traffic makes it hard to turn out onto Dutton). [on map: Dutton Ave @ South Ave]

**Bikeways Map Comments**

- Bike lanes and roads before housing
- Necesitan banquetas lado izquierdo (Sidewalks are needed on the left (west) side) [on map: Roseland Creek @ Burbank Ave]
- We need Roseland Creek bike/greenway
- Pave Roseland Ave
- No medians on Sebastopol Road [on map: Sebastopol Rd @ West Ave]
- We need the proposed bike path class 1! [on map: Sebastopol Rd @ dashed green line]

**Flip Chart Comments:**

- Finish Roseland Creek Greenway
- More frequent buses (x3)
- Route on Burbank to school
- Bus on Stony Point below Sebastopol
- Need better signage as you approach intersections – can’t see street names
- Bike route only on Burbank
- Please do not clog up Hearn Ave with retail directly on Hearn Ave near Dutton
- Bike lanes on Dutton won’t be possible, not enough room, why show it on the plan?
- Keep bus stop at the community park – it’s fine
- Question 1 is inappropriate/misleading
- Se necesita un semáforo urjentemente Burbank y Hearn (We need a signal light by Burbank and Hearn Ave)
- These questions are ambiguous and lack context to help people understand
STATION 3: POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

The following table demonstrates the results of the activity seeking input on participants’ priorities for implementing public improvements in the Specific Plan area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Implementation Action</th>
<th>Number of participants that identified this as a top priority</th>
<th>% of participants that identified this as a top priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing roads</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete gaps in existing sidewalks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new parks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek improvements, trails, and restoration</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/sewer/stormwater infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install bike lanes and paths</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install street lighting</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to existing parks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/cultural/youth center</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signals/enhanced crosswalks for pedestrian safety (including safe routes to schools)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community health clinic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit service</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central plaza/ town square</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct new roads</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop furniture (bench, lighting, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install new curb/gutter/sidewalks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional signage to major destinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Civic amenities (highlighted in blue)
- Parks, creeks, and green space (highlighted in green)
- Streets/infrastructure (highlighted in orange)

COMMENT CARDS
- No retail on Hearn Ave
- No more alcohol sales – enough across the freeway
- I am in favor of limited housing and whatever retail to be in areas that are already retail, i.e., Sebastopol Road, Santa Rosa Ave. Our neighborhood now cannot get to and from our
neighborhood because of too much traffic. Piling additional high/med density will make Hearn Ave a nightmare for those of us who live off Hearn.

- We neighbors on Hearn Ave do not want the zoning changed to allow retail on Hearn Ave near Dutton Ave. We want our neighborhood to stay residential only.
- Please leave the bus hub at the park where it is now.
- Please do not increase housing density above medium – anywhere.
- No retail directly on Hearn Ave.
- Keep bus stop at the park. It’s all set up and more convenient for school and park.
- No rezoning to increase housing density. It will be too crowded on the roads, even with widening. We don’t want to live in a Ridley Scott – Blade Runner movie.
INTRODUCTION

The fourth and final community workshop for the Santa Rosa Roseland Area Specific Plan and Annexation Projects took place the evening of Thursday, February 18, 2016. The event was an open house with three stations to provide information to and solicit input from participating community members. The stations were 1) Land Use Plan, Circulation Plan, & Implementation Actions, 2) Policy Recommendations, and 3) Annexation. Approximately 90 people attended the event. This memorandum summarizes the workshop activities, materials, and outcomes.

THE THREE STATIONS

The Land Use Plan, Circulation Plan, & Implementation Actions Station gave participants the opportunity to review and provide input on updates to information presented at Workshop 3. This included detailed land use, street, and bikeways maps. A list of recommended implementation actions was also provided and participants were encouraged to leave comments to indicate their level of support for the actions.

The Policy Recommendations Station introduced participants to new policies developed after Workshop 3. A number of different policy topics were covered: Pedestrian, Bicycle, Trails, & Transit; Roads; Commercial Activity and Healthy Food Access; Residential Areas & Affordable Housing; and Parks, Utilities, Public Facilities and Services. Participants used red and green dots to indicate policies that they did or did not support. Additionally, attendees left comments and suggestions specific to each suggested policy and policy topic.

The Annexation Station provided information on the potential annexation of Roseland and four other county islands, with City of Santa Rosa staff members available to answer questions. In this workshop, Annexation Station participants were specifically engaged about the role of off-street mobile food vending.
The results of Workshop 4 will guide development of the public draft Specific Plan. A transcription of the meeting comments from meeting participants is provided in Appendix A: Community Workshop 4 - Data and Photographs.

KEY RESULTS

The prominent themes that emerged from Community Workshop 4 are summarized as follows:

- **Traffic Congestion, Safety and Land Use Intensification along Hearn Avenue.** Participants expressed concerns with current traffic congestion and an unsafe environment for pedestrians walking along and crossing Hearn Ave. Policies supporting development along Hearn Avenue were met with concerns about worsening vehicular congestion, density, and diminished safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Participants were concerned about an increase in residential density and the addition of retail uses along Hearn Avenue, as they relate to an increase in traffic on an already heavily congested road. Nearly 20 participants indicated that they did not support a policy to attract a shopping center south of Hearn Avenue at Dutton Avenue due to the resulting increase in traffic along Hearn Ave. This direction was at odds with the clear direction received at the second workshop in support of an intensified neighborhood mix of goods, services, and residential uses along Hearn Avenue.

- **New Roadways.** Concern over new roadways focused on the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. Specifically, participants noted potential for conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians, and cars on the new road that would cross the Joe Rodota Trail.

- **Rural Character.** Over 50 participants indicated a desire to maintain rural character along Burbank Avenue by requiring greater setbacks and disallowing on-street parking. Comments indicated support for preserving Burbank Avenue as a scenic road with open space and potential for more parks.

- **Community Park on Burbank Avenue.** Participants supported the development of the Roseland Creek Community Park across from Roseland Creek Elementary School, but indicated they thought it should be maintained as a nature park that preserves rural and wild areas. Eight comments were direct requests to not develop the natural area.

- **Low-Income Development.** Residents were largely supportive of residential development that represented a range of housing types and income levels, but many participants indicated that not all of the new development should be set aside for low income. Participants expressed a desire for below market-rate housing to be spread across Santa Rosa (not concentrated in Roseland) and that a mix of market rate- and low-income homes be developed.

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure.** All of the policies pertaining to improvements to enhance pedestrian and bicycle comfort and safety received a great deal of support. These included policies to improve sidewalks, crossings, bike lanes, and street lighting.
• **Access to Healthy Food.** There was overwhelming support for policies that would increase access to healthy foods, goods, and services.

• **Economic Development and Local Flavor.** Participants widely supported policies that would preserve and encourage new local jobs and businesses that reflect the cultural uniqueness of the area.

A complete transcription of the notes and workshop activities is provided in Appendix A.

### NEXT STEPS

Over the coming months, several smaller meetings will be held to discuss annexation with sectors of the business community. One session will bring together Sebastopol Road restaurants, mobile vendors, and retail establishments to discuss issues including how best to regulate vending after annexation. Another planned meeting will bring together the auto service, logistics, and light industrial businesses located between Sebastopol Road and Highway 12 to discuss their particular concerns. The next opportunity to provide comments on the Specific Plan will be when the public draft is released at the end of April and during the public hearings anticipated to take place in June and July.
# Community Workshop 4 - Data and Photographs

## STATION 1: LAND USE PLAN, CIRCULATION PLAN, & IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

The following table illustrates the results of the activity seeking input on participants' perspectives on changes to the Land Use Plan, Circulation Plan, and Implementation Actions since Workshop 3.

This table shows results of input on recommended implementation actions (to be phased through 2035).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation

- **Repair roadways**
  - 11 Y
  - 0 N
  - Dutton Avenue is an emergency.
  - Yesterday, agree!
  - Please!
  - Takes too many years to fix; need lean and green contracts.

- **Repair sidewalk ramps and make accessible**
  - 4 Y
  - 1 N
  - Yes, make walking the preferred choice. Walk everything before building.

- **Repair sidewalks**
  - 5 Y
  - 1 N

- **Improve Sebastopol Road and intersections (including bike lanes)**
  - 8 Y
  - 1 N
  - You’re doing it!

- **Improve existing Dutton Avenue and intersections (including bike lanes)**
  - 6 Y
  - 0 N
  - It’s impossible to move through in the morning and evening commutes.

- **Lengthen right-turn lane on westbound State Route 12 off-ramp at Dutton Avenue to increase vehicle queueing capacity**
  - 2 Y
  - 0 N
  - How? Unclear? But needs to be addressed for sure!!!
  - Is this possible? Highway 101 westbound to Sebastopol merges with Dutton off-ramp.
  - This would be very helpful. Backed up traffic on the freeway would be dangerous.

- **Improve Corby and Baker Avenues and intersections including US 101 southbound ramps**
  - 4 Y
  - 1 N
  - What does this mean? Very vague.
  - Does this mean widening?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improve safety where the Joe Rodota Trail crosses streets - Stony Point Road and State Route 12 eastbound ramps | 3 Y, 2 N | • How?  
• No! Too clogged already!!!  
• Too clogged already.  
• More street lights at Dutton. People walk against the light and it’s hard to see them. |
| Widen Stony Point Road from Hearn Avenue to Sebastopol Road (including bike lanes) | 3 Y, 0 N | • You’re already doing this…  
• Bike lanes yes, widening no.  
• You already began.  
• Finish this project! |
| Widen Stony Point Road from Bellevue Avenue to Hearn Avenue (including bike lanes) | 2 Y, 0 N | • No. Bikes yes.  
• In process!  
• Yes, and pave.  
• Yes, we need it. |
| Improve Hearn Avenue and intersections (including bike lanes) | 6 Y, 0 N | • What does this mean? |
| Improve Dutton Meadow and intersections (including bike lanes) | 2 Y, 0 N |  |
| Improve Burbank Avenue and intersections (including bike lanes) | 2 Y, 0 N | • Now!  
• We need crosswalks!  
• Desperately need a Bellevue overpass to facilitate traffic flow to Santa Rosa Avenue.  
• We want a 101 overpass to Santa Rosa Avenue.  
• Light at Yuba Drive. In the morning and evenings when people are taking their kids to the high school, it is very difficult to get out onto Stony Point. When the new 4 lanes on Stony Point necks down to 2 lanes just before Yuba, it will be 2 times worse. Someone will be killed. |
| Improve existing Bellevue Avenue and intersections (including bike lanes) | 2 Y, 0 N |  |
| Install bike lanes along West Avenue | 3 Y, 0 N |  |
| Improve Barham Avenue (including bike lanes) | 2 Y, 0 N | • Fix potholes!  
• Repair potholes and repave. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalize intersections at Sebastopol Road/Olive Street, Dutton Avenue/Barham Avenue, Bellevue Avenue/Dutton Avenue, and Bellevue Avenue/Corby Avenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install street lighting where deficiencies exist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct new roads and street extensions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete gaps in existing sidewalks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Highway 101 overpass at Bellevue Avenue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Hearn Avenue Highway 101 overpass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish new bike routes (signed on-street)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct off-street bicycle and pedestrian paths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate an incentive grant program to spur exterior building improvements in both commercial and residential areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish priority business recruitment targets. Special consideration should be given to locally owned cafes, restaurants, indoor/outdoor recreation, and retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Please recommend additional actions…                                   |                                   | - Homeless services/shelters.  
- Maintain current jobs?  
- Hire locals for work!  
- Move road next to Rodota Trail - need eyes on thoroughfare.  
- West must continue through to trail  
- Need smaller blocks: walkable retail corners, parcels small businesses can afford, more eyes on street for safety.  
- Work should keep in mind social determinants of health. |

| PUBLIC SERVICES, FACILITIES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE                        |                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Construct central plaza/town square                                    | 5                                 | 0  
- Loose structure >> not "bloks" and such, but yes  
- Good idea!  
- Roseland Village. |
| Build library                                                          | 7                                 | 0  
- Roseland Village.  
- Very important to enlarge this!  
- Very important. |
| Build cultural/youth center                                            | 8                                 | 0  
- Roseland Village.  
- Teen clinic.  
- With extended hours.  
- Very important. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build community health clinic</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>• Roseland Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Great healthy bodies = healthy minds!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenemos clinicas cercas; estoy de acuerdo con este comentario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation: <strong>WE HAVE CLINICS NEARBY; I AGREE WITH THIS COMMENT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Si! Tenemos! SR Community Health Clinics Centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Si! Tenemos! SR Community Health Clinics Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- YES! WE HAVE Santa Rosa COMMUNITY HEALTH CLINIC CENTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build pool</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>• Too much money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for parks</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>• No; would take too much land, and already have plenty!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and build new parks</td>
<td>Y 0  N 0</td>
<td>• We need more wild places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pocket parks throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With wild untamed nature preserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build? Acquire land. Then let land (mostly) be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Los terrenos utilisen los para casas. Translation: Utilize land for homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• De verian contruir casas para toda las personas. Translation: You should build homes for all persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• De verian aponer atension en lo que es importante para las personas que no cren lo que asen. Translation: You should pay attention to what is important for the people who do not believe what you do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade existing parks</td>
<td>Y 8  N 0</td>
<td>• Very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and restore creek and creek trails</td>
<td>Y 8  N 0</td>
<td>• Leave the neighbor wood wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes; the recent improvements are so awesome!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve aging water supply system</td>
<td>Y 5  N 0</td>
<td>• Drought &gt;&gt; put it off&gt;&gt; prioritize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve aging sewer supply system</td>
<td>Y 7  N 0</td>
<td>• Think ahead! Will need new sewer system!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes, as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Drought &gt;&gt; put it off&gt;&gt; prioritize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Legalize composting toilets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Legalize and utilize composting toilets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve aging storm drain system</td>
<td>Y 1  N 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS ACTION? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade the water supply system to accommodate future population</td>
<td>5 Y</td>
<td>• If you can eliminate drought, this may work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Water is a limited resource...How will a new system help accomplish this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade wastewater for 2035 population</td>
<td>3 Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade storm drainage system for 2035 population</td>
<td>0 Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve public transit service per the results of the Re-Imagining City Bus Project</td>
<td>8 Y</td>
<td>• Yes, with better coordination with County buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create a South Transit Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes, more often and with more cross connections, like a grid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install bus stop furniture (bench, lighting, etc.)</td>
<td>5 Y</td>
<td>• Yes! Yes!! Yes!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shelter; lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install directional signage to major destinations</td>
<td>5 Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate the Roseland Fire Station to one of the two new sites preferred by the fire department</td>
<td>0 Y</td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Low priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add another one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please recommend additional actions...</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserve actual nature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SERVICES, FACILITIES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate reasonable funding options to install streetscape improvements along Sebastopol Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>• Priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Make sure they are &quot;improvements&quot;! (Define, please.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate private/public partnerships for private neighborhood revitalization projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for grants/secure funding to implement projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>• Good concept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are comments provided by participants at this station.

**LAND USE MAP COMMENTS**

- “Leave the Neighbor Wood Wild” (Note in margins of map).
- Object to retail/MD designation along Hearn Avenue – unmanageable traffic.
- Need parks along Burbank Avenue.
- 2013 = 18k residents - 6ac/1,000. Need 113 acres of park.
- How to balance new development with scenic road designation? Southbound not enough (Burbank Avenue).
- Where will water come from for Medium High Density land use on Hearn?
- Dutton Meadow at Dutton is not medium density in area of change.
- More density is scary.
- People are shopping in Rohnert Park.
- Lived on Hearn and had to move out – too much high density.

**CIRCULATION MAP COMMENTS**

- Set aside some parking spots within the huge parking lots on Sebastopol Road between Dutton and Stony Point Road for mobile eateries to park by day.
- Leave Roseland Creek Wild.
- Big concerns about cars crossing Joe Rodota Trail.
- Need metering on freeway.
- Traffic counts not accurate.
- Streetlights are out.
- Hearn near West and Westwood – light made traffic noise.
- Hard to get in and out of driveway.
- Traffic backs up to 101.
- Is the West Avenue extension going to be a road to nowhere? When will the connection by the Joe Rodota Trail be built?
- Between Hearn and Bellevue traffic, going up, pedestrian died.
- No services will be available to serve residents in areas of increased density (Hearn). Need to walk.
- No room for transportation (transit) and Highway 12/Sebastopol and school buses.
- Concern about extension of Leo Drive.
- Dutton Avenue bike lane – parking to remain or be removed?
- Don’t feel safe walking at night – fix the lights, make the streets safer.
- Make improvements to Stony Point now! Need to finish it.
- School traffic at Bellevue Ranch makes it impossible to turn onto Yuba.
- What about a light at Yuba and at Stony Point?
- Fix what you have first.
- Need working lights on Hearn.
## STATION 2: POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following tables illustrate the results of the activity seeking input on participants’ perspectives on new policy recommendations. Each table represents the five different policy topics covered: Pedestrian, Bicycle, Trails, & Transit; Roads; Commercial Activity & Healthy Food Access; Residential Areas & Affordable Housing; and Parks, Utilities, Public Facilities, & Services.

### PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, TRAILS, & TRANSIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure convenient opportunities to walk, bike, and take transit to daily destinations.</td>
<td>16 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design as “complete streets” to safely serve and accommodate all travel modes.</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td>• No cul-de-sacs – walkability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement streetscape improvements resulting in attractive, functional streets with overall enhanced access, lighting, and safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists.</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) to ensure safe railway crossings for all users.</td>
<td>16 0</td>
<td>• Street level crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build the trail! Not just pieces of it!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and install wayfinding signage to the downtown SMART station, SMART pathway, Sebastopol Road commercial district, and other key destinations. Wayfinding should be designed to help create a sense of place and strengthen project area identity.</td>
<td>13 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/TRAILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider adding a new bike and pedestrian crossing of the SMART rail corridor between Barham and Hearn Avenues.</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian and bicycle amenities to serve the recreation and</td>
<td>Y 13  N 0</td>
<td>• Making roads bike-friendly – meaning having the streetlight turn green while on your bike so we don’t have to wait for a car to come or go to sidewalk to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel needs of residents and visitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify gaps and build sidewalks to complete the pedestrian network in neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Y 15  N 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require dedication of right-of-way for improvements and/or expansion of pedestrian and bicycle facilities where insufficient right-of-way currently exists.</td>
<td>Y 11  N 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements identified on the circulation maps.</td>
<td>Y 10  N 0</td>
<td>• If people can SAFELY walk or bike, there will be fewer cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install high-visibility crosswalk markings and signage in areas with high pedestrian activity.</td>
<td>Y 11  N 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance safety at the Joe Rodota Trail crossing of Stony Point Road by eliminating the free-flow right-turn island at the SR 12 eastbound ramps intersection, using curb extensions to reduce crossing distances where possible, and implementing pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly signal timing strategies.</td>
<td>Y 12  N 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure any proposed fencing along the SMART railroad corridor is attractive and does not obstruct visibility to the corridor.</td>
<td>Y 11  N 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage SMART to provide lighting along the railway corridor multiuse path.</td>
<td>Y 13  N 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support bike education events and classes.</td>
<td>Y 6  N 0</td>
<td>• No bike or foot paths can safely terminate on Victoria Drive - keep at RR tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure safe routes to school, including</td>
<td>14 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe pedestrian crossings and clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marked routes near schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide crosswalk enhancements near</td>
<td>14 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools, parks, and high-volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedestrian areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize pedestrian crossing signal</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td>• Coordinate with the County bus systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timing enhancements at signals around</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A transit center in the Roseland Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools to promote safety for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct high-visibility sidewalks,</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td>• Make sure Roseland residents are notified when these changes occur so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike paths, and crosswalks, particularly</td>
<td></td>
<td>more people can utilize the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the use, efficiency, reliability,</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordability, and convenience of public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transit in the project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide well-lit shelters with benches</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and bicycle parking at bus stops near</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools and shopping areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support increased connectivity and</td>
<td>8 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency of transit routes serving the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Transfer Center, in keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with City Bus’ long-range plan for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southwest Santa Rosa service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that public transit service</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connects major destinations in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland Area, including educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions, community facilities,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks, and major commercial corridors,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as well as to the downtown and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destinations outside of the plan area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ROADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improve connections in the project area by creating new streets or extensions of existing streets, as identified in the Circulation Plan. | 1 11 | • Nah, just maintain them (or let us maintain them).  
• North Point Parkway to Hearn only (x2)  
• Big concerns with two streets crossing Joe Rodota Trail north of Sebastopol Road. |
| Provide the right-of-way and related street improvements or new streets as identified in the Circulation Plan when properties develop. | 4 2 | |
| Enhance existing intersections along major arterials to improve traffic flow through use of coordinated or adaptive signal timing and/or dedicated turn pockets. | 6 1 | |
| Implement coordinated or adaptive signal timing along arterials to improve traffic flow, using intelligent transportation systems (ITS) strategies rather than roadway widening to maximize roadway efficiency, minimize congestion, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. | 7 2 | • Coordinated train. |
| SEBASTOPOL ROAD |                                  |          |
| Create a lush and colorful landscaped ambiance along Sebastopol Road through the use of broader sidewalks, landscaped medians, historic style street lamps, shade trees, flowers and bike lanes. | 24 1 | • No median!!  
• Slow the cars!  
• Agree with no median; would be hard to get into all the little driveways; it would maybe cause more traffic.  
• Do it without making sidewalks broader. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a new east/west roadway on the north side of the Joe Rodota Trail. This road will span from Hampton Way to West Avenue extended north to provide better access to this area.</td>
<td>9  5</td>
<td>• Traffic study on West! Lots of kids! Safety at night!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No! Not until the unsavory population on the Joe Rodota Trail is removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design of the raised roadway median should balance the need for access to businesses while enhancing pedestrian safety and the streetscape environment.</td>
<td>3  3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Sebastopol Road as a focal gathering point and pedestrian-oriented main street.</td>
<td>19  0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support efforts by CityBus to increase transit service along Sebastopol Road to minimum 15-minute headways.</td>
<td>13  0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please recommend additional policies here:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• More benches and crosswalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is impossible to drive east on Sebastopol Road from Stony Point during the 3PM hour due to parents picking up kids from school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HEARN AVENUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximize traffic capacity of Hearn Avenue while balancing the livability and character of the street.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>• Need traffic study of side streets off Hearn, Westwood, Burbank - these are heavy [traffic] areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hearn Avenue and overpass need to be widened before more residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize curb cuts along Hearn Avenue to improve traffic flow.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>• Scary to cross street - too much traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Double negative. Need sidewalks, schools, park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize and secure funding for the planned widening of the Hearn Avenue overcrossing and associated interchange improvements to relieve existing congestion and improve multimodal connectivity.</td>
<td>Y 10  N 6</td>
<td>Yes - this overchange area needs widening. But then what to do with the traffic going westward? Only 2 lanes - huge traffic issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Hearn Avenue as a primary bus corridor.</td>
<td>Y 4  N 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections to/from the bus transit center with new linked bike lanes and paths, as shown on the Circulation Plan.</td>
<td>Y 10  N 0</td>
<td>Visibility!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a new east/west connection for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by extending Northpoint Parkway down to Hearn Avenue at Burbank Avenue.</td>
<td>Y 5  N 12</td>
<td>Burbank Avenue is a scenic road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please recommend additional policies here:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t terminate any paths at Victoria Drive; not safe, no sidewalks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No retail on Hearn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If capacity is increased for overpass traffic and not on Hearn Avenue, what’s going to happen? Another bottleneck?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearn Avenue is residential. Keep it that way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New overpass.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regarding prezoning in Roseland, a &quot;grandfather clause&quot; would enable existing property zoned for rural-agriculture use to be safe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER ROADS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the planned construction of a Highway 101 overpass at Bellevue Avenue to improve east/west multimodal connectivity to/from the Roseland Area.</td>
<td>15 Y 1 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the new street design in order to balance new improvements with the existing rural character along Burbank Avenue.</td>
<td>5 Y 1 N</td>
<td>• What does this mean? Keep rural character of Burbank Avenue. &lt;br&gt;• Keep rural character - more parks on Burbank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance the desire to maintain rural character with pedestrian and bicycle safety along Burbank Avenue.</td>
<td>7 Y 0 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design the Campbell Drive extension as a low-speed residential collector street.</td>
<td>0 Y 3 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSAL DESIGN &amp; ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all paths, streets, and crossings are designed to be safely accessed by all users, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).</td>
<td>6 Y 0 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible parking spaces must be provided per ADA requirements.</td>
<td>2 Y 1 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider providing accessible on-street parking spaces along major commercial corridors such as Sebastopol Road.</td>
<td>2 Y 3 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit riders typically start and end trips as pedestrians; therefore, ensure proper connectivity and accessible pathways to/from transit stops and amenities.</td>
<td>8 Y 0 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SEBASTOPOL ROAD VISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Promote a mix of land uses and increased development densities to ensure Sebastopol Road as Roseland's commercial core and encourage pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes of travel for local trips. | 13 4                             | • Not just low-income.  
• "Increase development densities" can be an ugly thing indeed. Like anything done 'wrong'! Care and caution… |
| Encourage outdoor dining along Sebastopol Road.                        | 14 0                             | • Food trucks and picnic tables.  
• Certain given areas, yes. Wholesale, nuh-uh. |
| New development shall: Celebrate the multicultural ethnicity of the area and create a unique sense of place as an international village and market place. | 13 0                             | • Permanent library!  
• Reach out to the youth to get opinion on what activities.  
• Use existing infrastructure, revitalize! Don’t rubble-ize! |
| New development shall: Provide a place for a community center and a library, social services, a cultural center, extended education facility, and youth activities center. | 16 1                             | • 1/3 of market-rate rents - mixed incomes.  
• Do this all over Sonoma County, not just concentrated in southwest Santa Rosa.  
• Spread affordable housing throughout Santa Rosa.  
• We need market-rate housing too! |
| New development shall: Ensure more choices in affordable housing types, for both renters and homeowners. | 14 0                             | • For sure.  
• Dutton extension: make green strip park along residential east side (along Victoria Drive side). |
| New development shall: Provide more green spaces throughout the area in the form of parks, landscaping, active parks, open space, and a green streetscape, including the enhancement of the Joe Rodota Trail. | 13 0                             |                                                                 |
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New development shall: Allow for a variety of businesses while remaining small- and local-business oriented.</td>
<td>16 Y 0</td>
<td>• NCD: Neighborhood Commercial Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrict: Chain, formula stores (no formula businesses!).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development shall: Maintain affordability for existing small businesses and avoid displacement of existing businesses.</td>
<td>15 Y 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development shall: Avoid “strip mall” type development.</td>
<td>19 Y 0</td>
<td>• There already is! Repurpose, people!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development shall: Ensure adequate parking for the businesses.</td>
<td>11 Y 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development shall: Respect the small scale of local businesses, and have elements of early California historic character.</td>
<td>13 Y 0</td>
<td>• Honor Roseland's agricultural heritage; allow rural use as it presently exists (2x support, agree).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No dog park on the park site between McMinn and Burbank Avenues; it was originally proposed to be a natural environment (agree).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please recommend additional policies here:

- Honor Roseland's agricultural heritage; allow rural use as it presently exists (2x support, agree).
- No dog park on the park site between McMinn and Burbank Avenues; it was originally proposed to be a natural environment (agree).

### RETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand local-serving retail and personal services uses to accommodate the daily needs of Roseland Area residents, visitors, and employees.</td>
<td>6 Y 2</td>
<td>• Not in residential area! I agree!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Follow same rules as rest of city - allow mobile food vendors throughout Santa Rosa, not just Roseland!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• As long as there are no subwoofers!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow mobile food vendors at off-street locations.</td>
<td>13 Y 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Attract a shopping center south of Hearn Avenue at Dutton Avenue. | 3 19 | • Traffic study!  
• Traffic!  
• No - terrible traffic issue - FAIL NOW.  
• No shopping center on Hearn Avenue - it’s residential (agree).  
• Retail on Hearn will create another traffic nightmare in addition to the SMART train rail crossing.  
• Don’t put shopping on Hearn and Dutton. Traffic nightmare. |
| Encourage small neighborhood stores, such as corner food markets, in residential areas to provide services within walking and bicycling distance. | 16 1 | • Where specifically? |
| Provide social gathering places in commercial areas. | 4 1 | • Social gathering encouraged in public space "parks."  
• Encourage these gatherings to happen in the park. |
| Encourage small-scale, local-serving, and active retail uses that enhance walkability, such as coffee shops and bookshops. | 12 1 | • Where? Board is confusing. Sebastopol Road, yet Hearn Avenue? |
| Preserve the rich cultural uniqueness and sense of place as new development occurs. | 10 0 | • Amen! Especially in older farm communities and neighborhoods. Preserve the agrarian feel. |
| Preserve the local character and maintain existing businesses in the project area. | 14 0 | |
| Encourage activity-generating uses such as outdoor dining development along the Roseland and Colgan Creeks. | 6 5 | • Creeks are natural areas. Outdoor dining here will increase litter! Keep it natural. |
| Please recommend additional policies here: | | • Keep Hearn low density.  
• I’d like to see the agricultural uses have more usability. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS TO HEALTHY FOOD, GOODS, AND SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the County Health Department to develop incentives and</td>
<td>3 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs to attract and expand businesses that support healthy living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the County Health Department to host, sponsor, and/or</td>
<td>11 0</td>
<td>• More community garden plots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize public health events such as health fairs, senior fairs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth fitness programs, farmers markets, and workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to attract a range of healthy food sources such as full-</td>
<td>11 0</td>
<td>• How can government dictate what businesses sell?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service grocery stores, ethnic food markets, farm stands, community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardens, edible schoolyards, and farmers markets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a program to encourage convenience stores,</td>
<td>7 0</td>
<td>• People can travel to services - keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supermarkets, liquor stores, and neighborhood and ethnic markets to</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential neighborhoods &quot;residential.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carry fresh produce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support development of small-scale neighborhood nodes that provide a</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range of neighborhood-serving retail, public amenities, and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to residents within walking distance of their homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance public safety by ensuring development projects are designed</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with adequate lighting, limited access, and windows facing public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESIDENTIAL AREAS & AFFORDABLE HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL AREAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Include a variety of housing types near workplaces, schools, parks, stores, and amenities. | 10 2                              | • Spread around Santa Rosa! Not just low income.  
• Mix in income levels of housing all over Santa Rosa, not just southwest.          |
| Utilize the Santa Rosa Design Guidelines to ensure that new higher-density development along Hearn Avenue, near the Southside Bus Transfer Center, is attractive and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. | 9 4                              | • Where are all the cars going to go? It is stopped now!  
• No high-density along Hearn - traffic already a FAIL. Also, where is the water coming from for all these "proposed" high-density areas?  
• Address traffic issues first.                                           |
| Maintain rural character along Burbank Avenue by requiring greater setbacks and disallowing on-street parking. | 53 7                              | • Where will cars go?  
• Burbank is a scenic road!  
• Burbank has open space for more parks!  
• Burbank Avenue is prettiest street in Roseland - preserve it!               |
| Encourage community pride by promoting beautiful and safe neighborhoods and quality of life for all residents. | 19 0                              | • But of course!                                                                                                                       |
| Please recommend additional policies here:                            |                                   |                                                                                                                                        |
| **AFFORDABLE HOUSING**                                                |                                   |                                                                                                                                        |
| Continue to engage the community in developing new and refining existing affordable housing and anti-displacement. | 11 4                              | • Spread around Santa Rosa! Not just in southwest.  
• Citywide!                                                                |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Promote inclusion of second dwelling units in new and existing single family neighborhoods to provide a smaller, more affordable housing option. | 10 6                             | • Citywide!  
• Important.                                                                                     |
| Preserve existing affordable housing in the plan area. Identify funds to preserve units at-risk of converting to market rate. | 10 6                             | • No slumlords.  
• Low-income affordable housing needs to be spread all around Santa Rosa!                          |
| Utilize economic development strategies, such as local hiring practices, job training, and promoting cultural identity, to strengthen the local community. | 12 1                             |                                                                                               |
| Continue to provide homebuyer assistance programs including first time homebuyer down payment assistance programs, CalHFA loan program, and Mortgage Credit Certificate Program. | 11 1                             | • Not all low-income, please.  
• Is there a plan to increase police coverage? Already break-ins, vandalizing fence.              |
| Provide outreach and education to existing homeowners and offer resources and information to allow continued residence in their homes. | 11 2                             | • Low!  
• Not all low-income. We need variety as well as diversity.                                        |
| Encourage development of quality, well built, attractive housing units, that contribute to neighborhood character and quality of life. | 19 3                             | • Not just low-income apartment. Our area has more than our fair share.  
• Affordable - hopefully not ALL high density dumped in Roseland.                                   |
<p>| Encourage development of a range of housing types that meet the needs of population groups including seniors, large and small families, low and middle-income households, and people of all abilities. | 14 4                             |                                                                                               |
| Encourage new residential development include a range of housing types including single-family residences, townhomes, condominiums, and rental units. | 11 3                             |                                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the integration of market-rate housing with affordable units at the project level as well as the neighborhood level.</td>
<td>Y: 9, N: 2</td>
<td>• More market rate. We have more than our fair share of low-income housing in Roseland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Don’t concentrate low-income homes in Roseland; spread this around Santa Rosa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARKS AND OPEN SPACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the development of a diverse range of park types, functions, and recreational opportunities to meet the physical and social needs of the community.</td>
<td>Y: 17, N: 0</td>
<td>• Burbank Avenue has more open space for parks; buy now before too late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We are very under-parked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need many more parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With a population of 18,918 residences as of 2013, we need at least 113 acres of parks (6 acres: 1,000 residents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Colgan Creek Park – a 4.5-acre neighborhood park at Bellevue Avenue and Dutton Meadow.</td>
<td>Y: 12, N: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop Roseland Creek Community Park – a 18.75-acre community park across from Roseland Creek Elementary School on Burbank Avenue. | Y 19 N 7                         | • Maintain the wooded wild land as an open space with little development.  
• The project "concept" plan should be supporting a nature park and not a developed park. This is consistent with community input and protection. It affords for wildlife and climate change. It is a new day, not the old way.  
• Do not develop the Neighbor Wood please! We need wild spaces.  
• Was this not recommended as a natural setting?  
• This is a nature park!  
• Please keep this as a rural park.  
• This is supposed to be a nature preserve.  
• Our organization, representing many within our environmental community, supports a natural park with its myriad interests and protections. |
| Encourage joint use of park, recreational, and school sites to expand opportunities for physical activity (healthy – physical activity). | Y 16 N 0                          | • Leave "dirt" and places for kids to make their own play space.                                                                                                                                          |
| Ensure parks, playgrounds, and neighborhood play spaces are safe, clean, and well lit.          | Y 17 N 0                          | • With down-facing lights, minimal light pollution in neighborhoods!                                                                                                                                     |
| Design parks to be beautiful public amenities accessible to all residents. Ensure design also discourages vandalism, deters crime, and creates a safe and comfortable environment. | Y 13 N 1                          | • With a balance of natural wildlands and highly impacted designs.                                                                                                                                      |
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage new housing developments to provide recreational and community activity spaces.</td>
<td>18  2</td>
<td>• All around Santa Rosa - not just southwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the use of transparent fencing along creeks and adjacent to parks to provide “eyes” on these public amenities.</td>
<td>11  2</td>
<td>• On public property and biz only, not residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade street lighting to meet city standards.</td>
<td>19  0</td>
<td>• Using low light pollution lights, shining down and not up!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Please replace lights that are out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Already done!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide appropriately scaled and designed lighting for all modes of travel.</td>
<td>12  0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide utility upgrades to ensure water and wastewater services support increased density and intensity in the area.</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional recommended policies may be identified after the Infrastructure Analysis is completed.</td>
<td>4  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage new uses, such as a teen center or community center, to locate along Hearn Avenue to create a new and centrally located community focus of civic uses.</td>
<td>11  4</td>
<td>• Where? Not enough law enforced now!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How about a senior center?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Place next to existing Southwest Community Park only - best location with bus access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DO YOU SUPPORT THIS POLICY? (Y/N)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrate community-serving uses along with new residential development along Hearn Avenue at Dutton Meadow. | 7 3                               | - No more biz on Hearn Avenue; it's residential.  
- Access issue - traffic study needed.  
- What is this? Senior center or youth center? These are needed. |
| Encourage location of pool at the Southwest Community Park.           | 13 4                              | - Too expensive to build and maintain!                                                                                                     |
| Prioritize public investment and improvements for public facilities and amenities that provide significant health and equity benefits. | 5 0                               |                                                                                                                                           |
| Invest in improvements to public facilities that provide social, economic, and community benefits in underserved neighborhoods, such as educational facilities, parks, playgrounds, libraries and community centers; streetscape improvements; and programs for community gardens. | 12 0                              | - Where?  
- More community gardens everywhere. |
| Additional policy recommendations may be identified after the Public Services Analysis is completed. | 1 4                               |                                                                                                                                           |

Below are comments provided by participants at this station.

**POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS COMMENTS**

- Would like to see policies relating to jobs and economic development. Maintain working class jobs.
- Concerned about the area north of Sebastopol Road changed to residential. Preserve trucking jobs and facilities in proximity to freeway. Residential should not be near freeway.
- Please give out current draft plan to residents (participants).
- Write article in *Press Democrat* to update community on this planning process.
- Very concerned about traffic on Hearn. Traffic on Hearn is already very bad. What is going to happen once all the new housing is built? How will they integrate into already heavy traffic? Traffic on Hearn is particularly bad at the end of the school day.
- Please send out copies of wall hangings to all participants who came tonight.
• Steering committee should be at the table for next decision making,
• Invite/let steering committee come to any future project team discussions.

STATION 3: ANNEXATION STATION

The following questions illustrate the results of the activity seeking input on participants’ perceptions of mobile food vending in the planning area.

1. Should mobile food trucks/carts be allowed on Sebastopol Road (off street)?
   YES = 51  NO = 3

2. Should outdoor dining be allowed at mobile food truck/cart locations (tables, chairs, shade tents)?
   YES = 46  NO = 1

3. Should there be a minimum separation (distance) between mobile food trucks/carts (to avoid over-concentration)? Example: 200 feet
   YES = 33  NO = 16

4. Should there be a minimum distance between mobile food trucks/carts and non-mobile restaurants? Example: 500 feet
   YES = 9  NO = 33

COMMENTS
• City should acquire sections of parking lots to provide parking for food vendors and customers. For safety!
• Just allow Mexican food.
• Fine the way it is.
• It’s where people come to eat. Should be left how it is.
• Annexation needs to “grandfather in” current animals as goats and number of animals currently here.
• Love food trucks! Feels that some parameters on how many are allowed within a street should be considered. Also, diversity of cuisine.
• We need a food truck lot such as in Portland, OR. I agree! X2!
• I want a pizza food truck, please.
• A distance should be implemented between taco trucks [to] give each vendor the opportunity
to have each other’s clients and not be so close to each other and be so jammed and crowded.
A law should be [made regarding] distance.
• More food trucks.
• Food truck-designated lot is a terrific idea! Safe/accessible and possible truck responsibility
for area too! Yes, keep, thanks.
• Where we are meeting here tonight in this very parking lot, there is sufficient room for some
mobile food eateries to park safely by day. Places could be rented with the money reinvested
in Roseland.
• My only concern that bothers me is the distance between taco trucks and carts; there should
definitely be a 500-foot distance between all mobile trucks to give them all the opportunity to
succeed in all possible ways.
• Don’t take away our food trucks!
• Allow food trucks to operate in Roseland area, but only allowed subject to having all required
permits and licensing and any other City and County agency requirements that have to be
met. A method needs to considered in regards to controlling any nonpermitted mobile food
vendors that show up to operate after 5 p.m. or on the weekends when no agencies can
enforce permits.
• Haya distancia entre las loncheras en las esquinas.
Translation: A distance between food trucks at the corners is a must.
• Si se incerpora muchos cembios los duenos se pueden afecten y entorce pruede fracer inpreto
 neciativo el area y delincieciq.
Translation: If too many changes are incorporated, this could affect owners; therefore, this
could bring a negative impact to the area and then crime could increase.
• Estoy deacuerdo que permitar las loncheras, pero deverian poner una dutancis de 500 pies
entre una y otra para que sea buen negocio para todos.
Translation: I am in agreement with the operation of food trucks but they should have distance
of 500 feet from one another to keep it competitive.
COMMENT CARDS

The following sentiments were expressed in comments cards left for the City after the workshop.

COMMENT CARD CONTENT:

- “The selection process is great!”
- “Concerned for impacts on Hearn Avenue – traffic – density – streetlights – safe conditions for walking. How will the plan address this? Would like to share this information with neighbors.”
- A letter was submitted: “The City has devalued/ruined assets paid for with public money, the houses at both 1400 Burbank and 1027 McMinn.

The City has done nothing to patrol and protect the park.

The City has had no contact with the local residents who were instrumental in getting the park established and pledged services that are part of the matching grant from the district.

The dog park was discussed early on and rejected by the community as incompatible with the passive nature park envisioned for the Burbank Woods. It was brought forward by Jen Santos at the community meeting and was again flatly rejected by the community, but somehow is part of the RFP.

The community was told by Jen Santos that the Master Plan had never been adopted by the City Council; therefore, it was required to be revisited. However, Recreation and Parks staff has been utterly dismissive of residents who have attempted to point out the history and events that led up to the vision and the Master Plan (before being altered by Parks). At the two “public meetings,” the questions allowed to be asked by the public were extremely limited and citizens were informed that they could submit questions in writing. It begs the question: If there is not going to be an open and honest question-and-answer period, what function does the “public meeting” have? When was the Master Plan adopted by the Council? How can the City plan for property they do not own? Is it legal or responsible to begin construction of a Master Plan when all the properties are not owned?”
WORKSHOP 4 PHOTOGRAPHS
Wednesday, April 22, 2015
Sheppard Elementary School, 1777 West Avenue, Santa Rosa

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Steve Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, at 6:10 p.m.


I. Welcome, Review of Agenda, Guidelines for Meeting
   a. Steering Committee members were asked if Spanish translation would be needed during the meeting. No one stated a need for translation, and the decision was made to conduct the entire meeting in English.

   b. Introduction of the Steering Committee members, members of the public and the project team.

II. Steering Committee Orientation
   a. Roles and Responsibilities:

      After reading the Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities sheet (attached), members had the following comments and questions:

      - Would like training for the SC members to be effective in their role
      - Would like to get City and County department heads to attend SC meetings to answer questions directly
      - Does the committee have authority to make decisions? To develop options for the community to consider? To develop alternatives?
• Would like a trolley/bus tour/bike ride for SC members to see and learn about the project area and identify issues, opportunity sites, take photos, etc.
• Agenda topics should be provided early so that Committee members can tell others
• Notify the Committee of events where Roseland Area Projects will be discussed

b. Annexation and Specific Plan Processes and Project Timeline:

City staff gave a detailed presentation on the Annexation and Specific Plan processes and the project timeline, and committee members had the following comments and questions:
• Has an alternative already been drafted?
• Timeline graphic – there is a typo – Phase 3 for Annexation is really Phase 2. Graphic needs to show that the workshops are for both SP and Annexation.
• Present cost/benefit analysis of Annexation
• Research MTC Priority Conservation Areas
• There should be a comprehensive planning effort between the City and the County.
• What is the difference between the Specific Plan and the Roseland Village Shopping Center project?
• When are the next meetings?
• What will happen to the data that doesn’t get incorporated into the Plan?
• There are joint meetings of the City and County regarding the annexation.
• Provide an explanation of all acronyms.
• Add workshops to the annexation process.
• Clarify the boundaries of the annexation.
• A sentiment survey is needed to determine support for the annexation.

III. Your Vision for the Project – What should our slogan and logo be?

Due to meeting time constraints, this item was moved to the end of the agenda.

IV. Planning and Leading the Community Participation Process

a. Participation Plan:

The project team reviewed the proposed Participation Plan (see attached graphic). Steering Committee members raised the following comments and questions:

• When will future meetings be?
• Conducting the workshops in English and Spanish will be difficult and may discourage attendance
A second Steering Committee meeting is needed prior to the first community workshop
Do two workshops in one night, rather than one – one in English and one in Spanish

Following the discussion of the Participation Plan, the project team emphasized the importance of each member recruiting two additional people to attend the community workshops. The project team explained they would follow up to provide each member with flyers and other tools to recruit participants. Members had the following comments and questions:

- “Strive” rather than “require” Committee members to bring at least two people to each workshop
- The Steering Committee members should only bring Roseland residents to the workshops

b. Identifying Opportunity Sites and Corridors for Consideration at Community Workshop 1:

The project team presented a large map of the study area and explained that a goal of the first community workshop would be to identify key opportunity sites in the neighborhood.

The project team asked members to identify which sites and corridors had the greatest need or offered the greatest opportunity for improvement and thus should be the focus of the Workshop. Members identified the sites shown on the map below. Members also identified a range of desired uses and amenities, which are listed after the map.
DESIRED USES AND AMENITIES
- Activities for youth – bowling alley
- Activity centers
- Library
- Community Center w/ library, computer lab
- Affordable housing (inclusionary housing ordinance)
- Work center for day labor
- More parks
- More trees
- Priority conservation areas (MTC designated)
• Entertainment/night clubs/bars
• Continuous Bike Lanes
• Continuous Sidewalks
• Complete Streets
• More night-life in Roseland. There used to be a lot of bars. Let’s make it fun again.

VALUES
• Southwest culture
• Open spaces

TRANSPORTATION OPPORTUNITY SITES
• Rose Avenue and Sunset Avenue – wider sidewalks
• Sebastopol Road needs improved
• Sebastopol Road and McMinn Avenue – wider sidewalks
• Sebastopol Road and Olive Street, and throughout area – fix potholes
• West Avenue and Sunset Avenue – bike routes to school
• Burbank Avenue and Hearn Avenue – traffic control
• Sidewalks near Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)
• Corby Avenue and Hearn Avenue – lighting and bike lanes
• Olive Street – north/south bike connection
• Highway 101 crossing?

LAND USE OPPORTUNITY SITES
• Roseland Village Center Site on Sebastopol Road – vacant
• Roseland Village Center Site – library?
• Around the new high school site
• South of southwest community park (more parks)
• Rose Avenue and Burbank Avenue
• Lot across from Roseland Creek Elementary
• Sebastopol Road – Arts & Cultural Center, nightclubs
• Bayer Farm – complete plan
• Roseland Creek – priority conservation areas
• Cement Plant
• Along Joe Rodota Trail – mixed use and housing near SMART station
• Corby north of Hearn – parks?
• Barham Avenue at Hearn Avenue and Dutton Avenue – stores, grocer, places people can walk to
V. What should be our slogan and logo?

a. Themes for a Project Logo and Slogan:

The project team explained how a memorable, meaningful project logo and slogan could help raise the project’s visibility and the community’s level of participation. The team gave each member several post-its and asked them to write down words, phrases or pictures that expressed what they think the logo and slogan should communicate. The results are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Objective/Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: BikePathfinders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathfinders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s bike Roseland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Fun 2 Play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More fun for Roseland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play and stay in Roseland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, recreation, &amp; culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Immigration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland IN not OUT</td>
<td>IN - can stand for Immersion Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified/joined together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building community together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete city</td>
<td>“make my city whole”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dive In</td>
<td>Logo could be water—DIVE IN is an Acronym for Diverse, Include, Vibrant, Engage, Immersion, Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving forward together</td>
<td>lots of people/faces in logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add, Incorporate, Collaborate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISHA Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and unity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-ethnic zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8: Follow the Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow the money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most bang for the buck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: Past and Future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Roseland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure the future, preserve the past</td>
<td>Logo could be background outline of Roseland village with rose and quail in foreground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland: A bitter future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7: Beloved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique/ Beloved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love your hood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9: Roses and Blooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roses Together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland blooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling out the roses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet of Roses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Roses for Roseland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Members of the public in attendance were given the opportunity to comment on any items not on the agenda. No members of the public desired to comment.

VII. Next Steps

The project team explained that the first two community workshops are scheduled in June 2015, as is the second meeting of the Steering Committee. The dates, times and locations are being worked out now and will be announced as soon as possible.

Adjournment: Steve Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, adjourned the meeting to the next Roseland Area Projects Steering Committee meeting, date and time to be determined, at 8:00 p.m.
Roseland Area Projects

Steering Committee Role and Responsibilities

Role

- Guide the community participation in the Annexation and Specific Planning processes
- Mobilize community members to participate in the workshops and other forums
- Decide which topics and questions should be brought to the broader community in the limited workshop time available
- Provide input and direction on the issues that do not fit into the workshop agendas
- Help refine the specific options, alternatives and plans developed from the broad workshop input
- Represent the community’s perspective in the planning process between workshops and after the last workshop
- Represent the community’s perspective in public forums, including the Planning Commission, the City Council and the local media

Responsibilities

Attendance

- Attend 5 Steering Committee Meetings (no more than 1 planned absence)
- Attend 4 Community Workshops (no more than 1 planned absence)
- Attend All City Planning Commission and City Council Hearings on Plan and Annexation

Participation

- Actively participate in all meetings, workshops and forums
- Model the productive, respectful, succinct participation we want from everyone
- Nurture participation by other people from the communities you represent

Representation

- Think and speak from the perspective of the communities you represent, not your personal interest or opinions
- Take every opportunity to share information about the process and invite participation
- When speaking, be clear about when you are sharing your personal perspective and when you are describing the position of the Steering Committee or any other body.

Mobilization and Feedback Collection

- Bring, at least, 2 people to each workshop
- Confirm their attendance 2 weeks prior and the day before
- After each workshop and before the next Steering Committee Meeting, check in with the people you mobilized to get their feedback
Papeles y Responsabilidades del Comité Coordinador

Papel

- Guiar la participación comunitaria en los procesos de Anexión y Plan Especifico
- Moviliza miembros de la comunidad a participar en los talleres y otros foros
- Decide que tópicos y preguntas se deben llevar a la comunidad en general en el tiempo limitado de los talleres
- Aporta y contribuye con dirección en las cuestiones que no caen dentro de las agendas de los talleres
- Ayuda a refinar las opciones específicas, alternativas y planes desarrollados de las aportaciones en el taller general
- Representa la perspectiva de la comunidad en el proceso de planificación entre talleres y después del taller final
- Representa la perspectiva de la comunidad en foros públicos, incluyendo la Comisión de Planeación, el Consejo de la Ciudad y los medios.

Responsabilidades

Presencia

- Participar en 5 Juntas del Comité Coordinador *(no mas de una ausencia planeada)*
- Participar en 4 talleres comunitarios *(no mas de una ausencia planeada)*
- Participar en todas las juntas de la Comisión de Planeación y las Audiencias del Consejo de la Ciudad sobre el Plan y la Anexión

Participación

- Participar activamente en todas las juntas, talleres y foros
- Representar y modelar la calidad de participación productiva, respetuosa y breve que esperamos de todos
- Promover participación de otra gente de la comunidad que uno represente

Representación

- Pensar y hablar desde la perspectiva de las comunidades que represente, no sus intereses personales u opiniones
- Tomar oportunidad para compartir información sobre el proceso e invita a la participación
- Ser claro sobre cuando uno comparte su perspectiva personal y cuando describe la posición del Comité Coordinador u otra institución

Movilización y Colección de Feedback (reacciones e información)

- Traer, mínimo, 2 personas a cada taller
- Confirmar su asistencia 2 semanas antes y un día antes de la reunión
- Después de cada taller y antes de la próxima reunión del Comité Coordinador comunicarse con la gente que movilice para participar en la reunión para obtener feedback y reacciones
Roseland Area Projects Participation Plan

Individual Outreach and Followup with Potential Steering Committee Members
Participation Begins From the Bottom Up
Plan de Participación en Proyectos del Área de Roseland
Wednesday, June 17, 2015  
Sheppard Elementary School, 1777 West Avenue, Santa Rosa

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Steve Rasmussen Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, at 6:20 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present: Gary Balcerak, Frank Baumgardner, Marianne Causley, Duane Dewitt, Don Edgar, Gregory Fearon, Bill Haluzak, Jessica Hughes, Hilleary Izard, John Iervolino, Karen Kissler, Pat Kuta, Pablo Lopez, Jen Mendoza, Gustavo Mendoza, Christina Meyer, Donata Mikulik, Angie Perez, Magdalena Ridley, Nora Rivas, Chris Rodgers, Anne Seeley, Jacquie Sprague, Deborah Wilfong,


I. Welcome, Review of Agenda, Collect Logo Ballots  
   a. Introduction of the Steering Committee members, members of the public and the project team.  
   b. Logo ballots were collected at the end of the meeting to allow members time to consider the options and vote (see attached Logo ballot).

II. De-Brief of June 10th Community Workshop  
   a. Results of Workshop—the project team gave an overview of the results of the workshop starting with the Vision Wall Activity (see attached presentation slides). Members provided the following comments and direction:  
      • Need to quantify vision wall results  
      • Summary is missing several things that were listed, including: vibrant economy, library and pool  
      • Post slide shows on website
b. What was good? How can we improve?—the project team asked members for their feedback on what was effective about the workshop and what could be improved. Members responded:

**EFFECTIVE**

- Bilingual tables
- Enormous amount of effort—made people feel respected and heard
- Childcare
- Tables were engaging—diverse people listening and collaborating
- Table facilitators did good job engaging everyone, balancing discussion (note other members felt differently as listed below under “could be improved”)
- Youth participation
- Good representation of neighborhoods

**COULD BE IMPROVED**

- Space was cavernous—tables should be closer together
- Move tables to front of room
- Acoustics—hard to hear at back tables
- Need time for tables to report back
- Too long
- Too late at night for families
- Too many topics, people self selected those they were most interested in—should limit or focus topics
- Provide more “blanks” for new ideas
- Some people stood around on edges—Steering Committee members should engage them and bring them in
- People had unlimited dots and used them to vote all for one thing—not valid survey
- Table facilitators need to make sure everyone is involved—not allow few people to dominate (note other members felt differently as listed above under “effective”)
- Tables had too many people—20 too many, may 12?
- Get steering committee members to help more with facilitation at tables
- Need to assure table space for everyone
III. Refining Alternatives in Preparation for Workshop 2

a. Circulation Alternatives—the project team presented results of Workshop 1 regarding circulation and proposed circulation alternatives (see attached slides and draft worksheets). Members then worked in small groups to review the draft worksheets. Small groups then reported back their recommendations for refining the materials and alternatives. Member comments included:

**Round-abouts**
- Surprised we are talking about round-abouts
- Round-abouts popular in Mexico, residents accustomed to them
- Judgment of whether round-about or stop sign better is site specific
- When did round-abouts start? Are they safer than stops? Why?
- Round-abouts slow things down. How do you get pedestrians through safely?
- Have round-about discussion later in workshop in small groups so not distracting

**Worksheets and Alternatives**
- Be more location specific, hard to consider options abstractly
- Dot exercises not totally clear—tradeoffs confusing
- Eliminate jargon or explain—like “bulbout”
- Organize elements North to South
- Take out “minimum” vs. “enhanced”
- Are these “either/or”?
- Should have menu of options—but need to know which ones can not go with each other
- Need context to make decisions like bike lane or parking; are these mutually exclusive? Linked?
- Have picture of current street conditions and then show what it would look like after improvements
- Include relevant pictures of actual streets
- Having some of the same elements in both alternatives is confusing
- Need to give cost information—associate improvements with costs
- Maybe have people “spend” the available funds
- Consider asking which streets people want to focus the limited resources
- Of course everyone will pick the enhanced Alternative B with all the improvements—but need a way to prioritize
- Need information on sidewalk width—what is needed for two people, for person with stroller
• Need to know how much space needed and available—for example minimum width of lanes
• What about paths and trails through blocks
• What about other potential bike paths
• Maybe work on a circulation map—put possible bike paths on as an option

**Transit Planning**
• What is planned for the Roseland area?
• Hand out surveys on buses
• Could we do a workshop activity asking what additional routes people want?
• Currently routes do not connect to origins and destinations
• How do we make transit system work for neighborhood?
• Nothing goes south
• Why is the Transit Center located where it is? Nothing goes there, no interconnection?
• Need unified system that responds to neighborhood

**b. Land Use Alternatives**—the project team presented the results of Workshop 1 regarding landuse (see attached slides and draft worksheets). Members then worked in small groups to review the proposed land use worksheets. Small groups then reported back their recommendations for refining the materials and alternatives. Member comments included:
• Colors are confusing—multiple things are green
• Be sure base map is accurate—show existing conditions rather than the General Plan land use map
• Better not to use General Plan map at all
• Clarify meaning of zoning
• Show more road and planned roads for context—proposed roads should be dashed in (for example, Dutton)
• Need legend—for example, blue dots equal schools
• Maybe provide map of what exists and give people overlay maps of options
• Provide a planning term glossary
• Confusing that A and B for housing are almost the same—just two spots different—don’t give us two choices that look the same.
• Can we choose both scenarios?
• If we choose housing in one location does that mean we can’t place it in another? Not clear.
• Maps should highlight differences—alternatives too close together
• Area by area focus would be better than element by element
• Should not make Sebastopol Road Urban Vision Plan a given—plan is too old

IV. Follow-up on Annexation and Planning Questions and Topics  
Members were asked if they had any outstanding questions on annexation or other planning topics. Members had no additional questions.

V. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda  
Steering Committee members and members of the public in attendance were given the opportunity to comment on any items not on the agenda. No Steering Committee members or members of the public desired to comment.

VI. Next Steps  
The project team summarized the feedback received and the plans to revise the alternatives and materials following Steering Committee members’ direction. The project team encouraged all members to recruit participants for the upcoming Community Workshop #2 on June 23, 2015.

Adjournment: Steve Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, adjourned the meeting to the next Roseland Area Projects Steering Committee meeting, date and time to be determined, at 8:00 p.m.
Logo Ballot / Boleta del Logo
Logo Ballot / Boleta de Logotipo

*Option 1*

**Roseland**
GROWING TOGETHER
CRECIENDO JUNTOS

*Option 2*

**Roseland**
FLORECE
BLOOMS

*Option 3*

**Building the Future Together**
Roseland
Juntos Construyendo el Futuro
Worksheets / Hojas de Trabajo
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan & Annexation

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where commercial/retail should be allowed.

A Concentrate retail on Sebastopol Road, with corner markets/food trucks throughout

B Distribute new retail development between Sebastopol Road and Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

**Multi-Family Housing**

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where multi-family housing should be allowed.

**A** Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & at Bellevue/Stony Point Road

**B** Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & on Dutton Ave, south of Hearn
Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where civic, social, and community services should be allowed.

**A**  Focus community and civic uses along Sebastopol Road

**B**  Focus community and civic uses on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)
Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where recreational facilities should be allowed.

**Focus recreational facilities along Dutton Ave, south of Hearn**

**Focus recreational facilities around the intersection of Bellevue Ave and Stony Point Rd**
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Family Entertainment Uses (e.g. bowling alley, movie theater)

Please choose Option A B, or C for the general location of where family entertainment uses should be allowed.

**A** Focus family entertainment on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)

**B** Focus family entertainment on Dutton Ave south of Hearn

**C** Focus family entertainment along Sebastopol Rd
Presentations / Diapositivas
SC Meeting #2
Roseland Area Alternatives
June 17, 2015
Welcome
AGENDA

• De-Brief of Workshop #1
• Workshop Results and Alternative Development to Date
• Refining Alternatives for Presentation at Workshop #2
• Follow-up on Annexation and Planning Topics
• Member and Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda
• Wrap-Up/Next Steps
Workshop Results

Vision wall, transportation tradeoffs, and land use alternatives
VISION WALL RESULTS
VISION WALL RESULTS

• Pedestrian/bike/transit friendly
• Plenty of parks, recreational activities, and healthy food options
• Community events, services and programs
• Clean, safe, affordable and inviting
• Good local jobs and small businesses
• Rural character with preserved natural areas
• Celebrate its vibrant cultural diversity
• Open government and empowered public
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Burbank

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Divided

Divided

Santa Rosa Roseland Area Projects
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Corby
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Burbank
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- West

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Divided

Santa Rosa Roseland Area Projects
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Local Residential Streets

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Divided

Divided

City of Santa Rosa
PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING THE CIRCULATION ALTERNATIVES

– Reviewed results of the transportation trade-offs exercise
– Identified where there was clear direction and where there was disagreement
– Developed specific design options for each of the key streets to address community input
– Generally Alternative A meets minimum street standards
– Generally, Alternative B exceeds minimum street standards
Mini-Roundabout

- Slows traffic
- Aesthetically pleasing
- Keeps drivers alert
- Safer than two-way stop-controlled intersections
- More capacity than all-way stop-controlled intersections
- Center island mountable by buses or trucks
Proposed Circulation Activity

Select from alternative options
ACTIVITY INSTRUCTIONS

- The Community will be asked to select either A, or any/all options for B
- Is the activity clear?
- Are we sharing the right options?
- Should any options be removed?
- Should any other options be included?

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

Local Residential Roads

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for local residential roads? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen sidewalks to meet minimum standards</td>
<td>Wider sidewalks that exceed minimum standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaped buffers where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini roundabouts at larger intersections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES ACTIVITY
PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING THE LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

— Summarized and synthesized results of the land use mapping activity
— Checked against:
  • Market demand
  • Planned developments
  • General Plan land use map
  • Sebastopol Road Vision
  • Metropolitan Transportation Commission guidelines and targets
SYNTHESIZED COMMUNITY RESULTS
MARKET DEMAND SUMMARY

• Residential demand is for single-family homes, townhomes, and multifamily apartments

• Very little demand for office or industrial uses

• Commercial demand is for:
  – general retail
  – food and beverage stores
  – restaurants/drinking places
PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS
SEBASTOPOL ROAD VISION
General Plan Breakdown:

- Public/Institutional: 5%
- Low-density Residential: 46%
- Med-high density Residential: 25%
- Mixed-use: 6%
- Retail and Business Service: 8%
- Office: 0%
- Industrial: 8%
- Parks/Recreation: 2%
- TOTAL: 100%

Area of community consensus

City of Santa Rosa
### MTC GUIDELINES

#### TRANSIT NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGNATION GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing mix</th>
<th>Low-rise, townhomes, mid-rise and small lot SFR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station area Total units Target</td>
<td>1,500-4,000 (currently 5,000 in plan area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Project Density (for new housing)</td>
<td>20-50 du/ acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs Target</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORT NEIGHBORHOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Predominantly residential organized around transit station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit modes</td>
<td>Light rail, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, and/or local bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use mix</td>
<td>Predominantly residential with supporting commercial and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Housing</td>
<td>Range of choices to accommodate families, senior housing and affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Low to medium density; Increasing densities within ½ mile of a transit stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of retail</td>
<td>Primarily local-serving retail opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Locate essential social services like child care centers and health clinics near transit stops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Land Use Activity

Select from alternative options
ACTIVITY INSTRUCTIONS

• Workshop participants will be asked to select option A or B for each focus area
• Is the activity clear?
• Are the right options included?
• Should any options be removed?
• Should any other options be included?
NEXT STEPS

• Workshop #2 – June 23rd
• Land use options selected will be communicated in the Specific Plan, either through
  – land use map, and/or
  – land use policies
• Circulation options will be communication in the Specific Plan, either through:
  – circulation map
  – street design diagrams, and/or
  – circulation policies
Thank You!

Jessica Jones
City of Santa Rosa
(English)
jjones@srgcity.org
(707) 543-3410

Steve Cancian
Outreach Coordinator
(Spanish and English)
canciansteve@gmail.com
(707) 543-4689

srcity.org/roseland
CONNECTIVITY QUESTIONS

• Connection to downtown SMART Station
• New East/West connections
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

Local Residential Roads

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for local residential roads? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS

Alternative A
Widen sidewalks to meet minimum standards

ENHANCED OPTION

Alternative B
Wider sidewalks that exceed minimum standards
Landscaped buffers where possible
Mini roundabouts at larger intersections
Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

**Alternative A**
- Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks

**Alternative B**
- Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks
- Bike lanes
- Remove parking on one side of the street
Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

**MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS**

**Alternative A**
- Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands
- On-street parking both sides

**Enhanced Option**

**Alternative B**
- Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands
- Add sidewalks where missing
- On-street parking both sides
Corby Avenue (between Hearn and Bellevue)

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

**MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS**

**Alternative A**
- Add sidewalks that meet minimum standards
- Remove parking on east side of roadway

**ENHANCED OPTION**

**Alternative B**
- Add sidewalks with landscaped buffer
- Remove parking on east side of roadway
**TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES**

**West Avenue (between Sebastopol and Hearn)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb-outs with high-visibility crosswalks</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike boulevards</td>
<td>Pedestrian-scale lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-roundabouts at West /Leo and West/ South</td>
<td>Bus pull-outs and shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-roundabouts at West /Leo and West/ South</td>
<td>Bulb-outs at other crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove parking on one side of the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raised Crosswalks near schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

### Alternative A
- Sidewalks on both sides
- Bike lanes
- Remove parking on both sides of the street
- Requires property acquisition

### Alternative B
- Sidewalks on both sides
- Remove parking on both sides of the street

---

**TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES**

**Burbank Avenue (between Sebastopol and Roseland Creek)**

---

**MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS**

**ENHANCED OPTION**

---

**Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road SPECIFIC PLAN & ANNEXATION**

---
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

**Burbank Avenue (between Roseland Creek and Hearn)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on one side of the street</td>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use path/rural sidewalk on one side of street with landscaped buffer</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Steve Rasmussen Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, at 6:15 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present: Gary Balcerak, Caroline Banuelos, Davin Cardenas, Art Cena, Arthur Deicke, Duane Dewitt, Don Edgar, Bill Haluzak, Gary Helfrich, Jessica Hughes, Hilleary Izard, John Iervolino, Laurie Kreger, Karen Kissler, Dan McDermott, Ramon Meraz, Christina Meyer, Donata Mikulik, Tanya Norath, Laima O’Brien, Magdalena Ridley, Chris Rodgers, Anne Seeley.


I. Welcome, Review of Agenda
   a. Introduction of the Steering Committee members, members of the public and the project team.

II. Review of Draft Land Use and Circulation Plans and Implementation Actions
   a. Review of Draft Land Use Plan—the project team presented the Draft Land Use Plan (see attached presentation). The presentation started with a review of the steps in the process to create the plan, including all the sources of input and data. Then each area of proposed changes in land use was reviewed (see attached presentation slides). Members where than asked, “Is the plan clear and understandable? Does it capture community input to date?” Members’ comments and questions were recorded to be incorporated into the plan or to be shared with public for consideration at the next workshop on October 21st. Members’ comments and questions were:

   - Should we expand the existing mixed use land use designation on Burbank Avenue?
   - Are there areas with Medium High Density Residential land use designation in other areas of Santa Rosa, or would it be concentrated in the southwest/Roseland area?
   - Can changes in land use occur on Sebastopol Road even though the Sebastopol Road Urban Vision Plan was adopted by the City and County in 2007?
Retail land use designation should be added at the northeast corner of Stony Point Road/Hearn Avenue and at the northeast and northwest corners of Burbank Avenue/Hearn Avenue.

A park is needed to serve the residential area east of the railroad tracks, south of Barham Avenue, around Corby Avenue.

We need more parks in the area – at least 40 acres

Clearly explain the difference in the colors on the map (if the pending developments are shown – make sure they are differentiated from the land use map colors).

Parks should be added along Roseland Creek.

The shopping center/mixed use designation on Burbank Avenue is inappropriate due to its close proximity to the proposed Roseland Creek Community Park and Roseland Creek Elementary School.

Identify the County islands on the maps.

b. **Review of Circulation Plans**—the project team presented the Draft Circulation Plans (see attached presentation). As with the Draft Land Use Plan, the presentation started with a review of the steps in the process to create the plans, including all the sources of input and data. Then each proposed area of change in circulation was reviewed (see attached presentation slides). Members where then again asked, “Are the drafts clear and understandable? Do drafts capture community input to date?” Members’ comments and questions were recorded to be incorporated into the drafts or to be shared with public for consideration at the next workshop on October 21st. Members’ comments and questions were:

- Identify the Hearn Avenue Overcrossing and Stony Point Widening projects.
- Improve bike facilities – safer with lighting.
- There is an existing crosswalk at Roseland Avenue that leads peds/bikes to the Joe Rodota Trail. That should be considered when looking at adding new bike paths.
- The Colgan Creek Trail goes south of Bellevue Avenue as a bike path.
- A SMART station/stop should be added near Bellevue Avenue.
- Dutton/Colgan – how does it connect?
- Consider adding a bike boulevard along Burbank Avenue.
- How can West Avenue be extended through the Roseland Village Shopping Center when there is a project under consideration?
• Reconsider street crossings of the Joe Rodota Trail.
• Clearly identify what is proposed for change between the General Plan and Specific Plan.
• Clearly identify proposed vs. existing streets (currently proposed on the GP).
• Make the Joe Rodota Trail distinct from streets (currently looks like a street on the plans).
• Campbell Drive at Stony Point Road – clarify the dots – why not extended east of Burbank Avenue?
• Where is Dutton Avenue a four lane road?
• Clearly identify which roads will be two lane and which will be four lane.
• Extension of roads (to Burbank Avenue and others) affect property owners.
• People who own land where roads may be planned need to be informed.
• Hearn Avenue will be untenable with realignment of intersection and a land use amendment to Medium High Density Residential.
• Extend West Avenue south of Hearn Avenue.
• Can a bike path be added easterly along Roseland Creek and at Colgan Creek?
• Wiljan Court is too dangerous for bike lanes; employees park along this street.
• The Southside Bus Transfer Center on Hearn Avenue could move. Only about 1% to 2% of people use the bus in this area. Research existing and expected riders. Possibly move east to proposed shopping center.
• How many places is right-of-way available for the street section proposed for Burbank Avenue (north end)? Identify where there is not enough right-of-way and additional land would need to be acquired.
• Provide a plan view of the proposed street section improvements for Burbank Avenue to clearly illustrate the additional right-of-way that would be needed.
• Burbank was described as a scenic road.
• Clarify that the Burbank Avenue Scenic Road Design Guidelines were not adopted by the City.
• Identify the County islands on the maps.
• Clearly distinguish between existing and proposed roads and bike facilities.
• Clarify bike facility “classes”.

C. **Review of Proposed Implementation Actions**—the project team presented the Proposed Implementation Actions. As with the draft plans, the presentation started
with a review of all the sources of input from which the proposed actions were drawn. Then the list of proposed actions was reviewed (see attached presentation slides and handout). Members where then asked, “Does the list capture community input to date? Are there any actions missing or actions mistakenly placed on the list?” Members’ comments and questions were collected to help refine the list before presenting the actions to the public for a prioritization vote at the October 21st workshop. Members’ comments and questions were:

- Business retention doesn’t cost anything, so it should not be on this list.
- Affordable housing is a citywide issue and shouldn’t be on the list.
- Add community health programs/facilities.
- Add neighborhood engagement office.
- Gang prevention should be ongoing – how do you categorize/prioritize this?
- Aren’t the funding sources for these listed items different? Would that impact prioritization?
- Isn’t the City already addressing some of these issues?
- We should look at luxuries, not things that must occur. Conversely – People define luxury differently.
- Segregate/organize the improvements into like categories (roads/safety/community/etc.).
- Wayfinding signs is confusing; needs to be defined.
- Police/fire should be removed. This is a basic service that will be provided and shouldn’t have to be prioritized.
- Add Junior College branch in Roseland.
- Of categories (like safety) – which is most important?
- Building safety code is a citywide issue and should be removed.
- Affordable housing/displacement is citywide issue and should be removed

III. Planning for Workshop #3
Most of the meeting time was allocated to the discussions above, so the remaining items were covered succinctly.

a. Planned Format and Materials—the project team reviewed the planned “open house” format and process for the October 21, 2015 session (see attached slides). Members were then asked, “Is the planned format clear and understandable? Are there ways
we could make the open house more effective?” Members comments and suggestions were:

- Add space for an annexation station with handouts and staff there to answer questions.
- There should be someone at the welcome table to explain the workshop format.
- There should be multiple people at each station, including technical experts and a translator.
- Clearly explain what power people have to influence the plan.
- There should be a troubleshooting station combined with the welcome table.
- Show the before and after for each of the maps – so people can clearly see/understand the proposed changes.
- Identify other Medium High Density Residential areas in Santa Rosa on a map.
- Provide a primer regarding how the design process works.
- Explain what is the community's power/role in the process?
- Reference other plans on the main map.
- Explain the proposed roads.
- Clearly explain the change in jurisdiction (from County to City) and how this might impact the existing food trucks in the area.

b. **Maximizing Attendance**—the project team emphasized the importance of maximizing then number of past participants who return for the October 21st workshop to review the results of their work.

### IV. Reports from Recent Community Meetings

a. **Annexation Gatherings and Charlas**—project team members reported on recent smaller community meetings regarding Annexation held in a number of the County islands, in several local apartment complexes and at a gathering of local businesses. The meetings have been successful at creating comfortable, accessible forums for residents and stakeholders to get answers to all their annexation questions.

b. **Suggestions for Next Steps in Annexation Discussion**—the project team asked members if they had any suggestions for additional annexation outreach or particular annexation questions that needed to be addressed. At this time, the members did not have any suggestions.
V. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
   The project team asked for public comment on items not on the agenda. No comments on items not on the agenda were presented.

VI. Close
   The project team encouraged all members to recruit participants for the upcoming Community Workshop #3 on October 21, 2015.

Adjournment: Steve Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, adjourned the meeting to the next Roseland Area Projects Steering Committee meeting, date and time to be determined, at 8:00 p.m.
Steering Committee Meeting #3

Roseland Area Alternatives

September 29, 2015
• Review of Draft Land Use and Circulation Plans and Implementation Actions
• Plan for Workshop #3
• Hear Reports from Recent Community Meetings
• Review Next Steps after Workshop #3
• Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
Inputs on Land Use

Workshops, Steering Committee, Online Forum Results, Market Study
Synthesized Land Use Mapping Results
Second Center Along Hearn?
PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS
Land Use Input

- Technical Advisory Board preference to locate multi-family housing near transit service; locate civic uses around Southwest Community Park
- Community preference to keep low-density residential along Burbank Avenue with rural character
- 77% of workshop #2 participants favor another neighborhood center along Hearn Avenue
  - Second center improves access to goods and services for those south of Hearn
  - Concerns about competition between Hearn Avenue and Sebastopol Road
- Approved and pending development
- Minimal market demand for commercial
- General Plan 2035
Proposed Land Use Plan
Santa Rosa Roseland Area Projects

Public/Institutional

Medium Residential/Retail

Parks/Recreation
Santa Rosa Roseland Area Projects

- Medium-High Residential
- Medium-High Residential and Public/Institutional
- Medium Residential/Retail
- Parks/Recreation
Inputs on Circulation

Workshops, Steering Committee, Online Forum Results, Proposed Development
Circulation Input

• Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee
  – Concerns about the use and feasibility of roundabouts in the project area

• Workshops/Online Forum
  – East–west connections for pedestrian, bike, and auto
  – Bike lanes along major streets
  – Pedestrian and bike paths along Roseland Creek, Colgan Creek, and SMART corridor
  – Rural character along Burbank Avenue

• Proposed Development Circulation Site Plans
• General Plan 2035
Proposed Circulation Plan: New Roads
Discussion

Circulation Plan – New Roads
Circulation Plan: Bike and Pedestrian Connections
Streets and Bikeways

- □□□□□ Proposed Street
- Green Bike Path
- Purple Bike Lane
- Orange Bike Route

Existing Transit Facility
Future Transit Facility
Proposed Bike Route to SMART path
Discussion

Circulation Plan – Pedestrian and Bike Paths
Burbank Ave
Burbank Avenue
(north of Roseland Creek)
44–50-foot right-of-way
Burbank Avenue
(south of Roseland Creek)

62-foot right-of-way
(42–46-foot right-of-way available)
Discussion

Burbank Ave
Implementation Action Input

- Stakeholder Interviews
- Workshop #1 Visioning Activity
- Annexation Fiscal Needs Assessment
- Transportation Consultant Recommendations
List of Implementation Actions

- Water/sewer/stormwater infrastructure improvements
- Community center/youth center
- Central plaza/town square
- Pool
- Library
- Parkland/open space acquisition, and development of new parks and open space
List of Implementation Actions

• Improvements to and maintenance of existing parks
• Creek improvements, trails, and restoration
• Public transit service
• Improvements to and maintenance of existing roads
• Construction of new roads
• Installation of curb/gutter/sidewalks
List of Implementation Actions

• Completion of gaps in existing sidewalks
• Installation of bike lanes and paths
• Installation of street lighting
• Signalization/enhanced crosswalks for pedestrian safety
• Enhancement of safe routes to school
• Affordable housing and anti-displacement strategies
List of Implementation Actions

- Organization of community events
- Recreational programs
- Enforcement of building safety standards
- Police/fire services
- Gang intervention/crime reduction strategies
- Business retention/recruitment strategies
- Wayfinding signage
Planning for Workshop 3
Open House Format

- Land Use Station
- Circulation Station
- Transit Options Station
- Implementation Action Prioritization Station
  (prioritize by placing your poker chips in the buckets)
- Welcome Table
  (collect 8 poker chips, post-it notes and pen)
- Food and Refreshments
Implementation Action Activity
Community Outreach Meetings
Community Outreach Meetings
Next Steps in Annexation Discussion

• What questions are most on community’s mind?

• Are there any parts of the community who are particularly concerned? Or who haven’t received information yet?
Next Steps After Workshop #3

Fall and Winter 2015-2016
• Finalize plans based on Workshop #3 input and further analysis
• Prepare components for Draft Specific Plan document
• Prepare Environmental Impact Report

Winter 2016
• Steering Committee Meeting Consider Draft Specific Plan
• Workshop to Consider Draft Specific Plan

Spring 2016
• Council Meetings to Consider Proceeding with Annexation
• Planning Commission to Con
Thank You!

Jessica Jones  
City of Santa Rosa  
(English)  
jjones@ssrcity.org  
(707) 543-3410

Steve Cancian  
Outreach Coordinator  
(Spanish and English)  
canciansteve@gmail.com  
(707) 543-4689

srcity.org/roseland
Implementation Actions

- Water/sewer/stormwater infrastructure improvements
- Community center / youth center
- Central plaza/ town square
- Pool
- Library
- Parkland/open space acquisition/development of new parks and open space
- Improvements to and maintenance of existing parks
- Creek improvements, trails, and restoration
- Public transit service
- Improve and maintain existing roads
- Construct new roads
- Install curb/gutter/sidewalks
- Complete gaps in existing sidewalks
- Install bike lanes and paths
- Install street lighting
- Signalization/ enhanced crosswalks for pedestrian safety
- Enhance/ensure safe routes to school
- Affordable housing and anti-displacement strategies
- Organize community events
- Recreational programs
- Enforce building safety standards
- Police/fire services
- Gang intervention/crime reduction strategies
- Business retention/recruitment strategies
- Wayfinding signage
Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Steve Rasmussen Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, at 6:15 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present: Caroline Banuelos, Frank Baumgardner, Davin Cardenas, David Chung, Arthur Deicke, Gregory Fearon, Bill Haluzak, Jessica Hughes, Hilleary Izard, John Iervolino, Karen Kissler, Pat Kuta, Della Littwin, Ramon Meraz, Christina Meyer, Donata Mikulik, Ray Morgan, Tanya Norath, Angie Perez, Magdalena Ridley, Anne Seeley, Deborah Wilfong.


I. Welcome, Review of Agenda

A. Introduction of the Steering Committee members, members of the public and the project team.
B. Members requested that at this new location the available parking be more clearly marked.

II. Preparing For Workshop #4

A. Where We are in the Process/What are the Next Steps?—the project team reviewed the project calendar highlighting what steps had been completed, where the process now stood and when there would be future opportunities for Steering Committee members and the public to participate (see attached presentation). Members had a wide range of questions and comments:

• What is a “program” EIR
• Explain joint City/County process
• Can public approach County? RE: delay in response to City’s term sheet for annexation
• Put City’s term sheet on website
• How do we stay involved after the last meeting?
• When is the protest period?
• We should put together a shared message to the County Supervisor candidates
• Should we officially end the SC so people can convene and meet without Brown Act restrictions?
• What is the relationship between our projects and the Village Project?

B. **Review and Improve Format for Workshop #4**—the project team reviewed the proposed format for the upcoming workshop opening house, including a map of the proposed room layout and draft input matrixes designed to solicit input on each proposed Specific Plan Policy (see attached presentation). Members had a wide range of comments and questions:

• Can we address just cause, evictions, and rent control in policies?
• We should follow format of last two workshops because people are familiar with it
• Allow voting for or against each policy with dots
• Will non-conforming uses be grandfathered?
• Are there annexation policies—policies that specifically address the transition period?
• Will you be presenting conflicting policies to choose from? Or will the policies be your or the community’s recommended policies?
• Cultural flavor of the area is important
• Mom and Pop shops are key to this distinct flavor—how do we retain them?
• How do we keep food trucks?
• What happens when we annex? How can we foster/keep local flavor and not encourage franchises?
• How can we restrict formula retail and chains?
• This room requires amplification for any presentation
• We should do an orientation presentation at beginning of the Open House
• Some attendees need an orientation—can you create something like that?
• Arrange for others (youth in Boys’ and Girls’ Club) not to be in space during open house to keep noise down
• Define terms used, avoid jargon
• Have clear a feedback loop for further information and to see the results of the Open House input
• Include table for “Friends of Roseland”
• Include General Plan and Specific Plan Land Use maps
• Invite other agencies: Recreation and Parks, City Bus, Library, Law Enforcement, City Council Members
• Can people write in anything on the policy comment matrixes? Are there limits?
• How will we know what other ideas have been proposed?
• Make sure everything is bilingual, fully staff stations with bilingual assistants
• Can this plan change the General Plan?
• Send reminders to SC volunteers
• Open House format worked well
• SC members are also knowledgeable and can assist
• Quantify results and support
• What will happen with the notes and input?
• Distinguish between proposals made by the open house participants and those made by the project
• Allow more than yes/no voting, create a way for people to express their level of agreement and how important they think something is

C. Maximizing Attendance—the project team reviewed the outreach work that was already in progress for the next workshop (see attached presentation). Then they asked members to use their own organizational and personal networks to mobilize more participants. Members had a range of questions and suggestions for improving outreach and engagement:

• Organize a focused meeting just for Spanish speakers
• Has new director of outreach been involved?
• Do another mass mailing
• Distribute information and invitations at churches and health clinics
• Distribute information and invitations at the DMW
• Network through real estate agents
• Use on-line networks
• Post information and invitations at the Library and the Post Office
• Place a large sign on the street in front of the Community Center
• Reach out to the homeless community

III. Reports from Recent Community Meetings on Annexation
The project team reported on the recent community meetings with residents in the annexation islands and with representatives of the local business community. Members had a range of questions and comments:

• What is the sentiment?
• Have other businesses (off Sebastopol) been notified? We should reach light industry between Sebastopol and 12
• Should engage high school students
• Should reach absentee landlords

IV. Steering Committee and Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
The project team asked for public comment on items not on the agenda. No comments on items not on the agenda were presented.

V. Close
The project team encouraged all members to recruit participants for the upcoming Community Open House on February 4, 2016.

Adjournment: Steve Cancian, Shared Spaces, project consultant, adjourned the meeting.
AGENDA

• Preparing for Open House
• Community Outreach on Annexation
• Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
Preparing for Open House
Where We Are in the Process, What’s Next

ROSELAND AREA SPECIFIC PLAN
Ongoing outreach with community groups, stakeholders, Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee

PHASE 1
Project Initiation & Preliminary Analysis
- Present Findings to Council

PHASE 2
Community Outreach, Visioning, & Alternative Concepts
- Community Workshop 1 and 2
- Community Workshop 3
- Community Workshop 4

PHASE 3
Prepare & Assess Preferred Alternative
- Public Hearings

PHASE 4
Draft Specific Plan

PHASE 5
Final Specific Plan & EIR

20-year Implementation of the Specific Plan by the City and County

ROSELAND AREA ANNEXATION
- Ongoing Joint City/County Annexation Committee meetings
- Specific Plan Completed
- Annexation Completed

Santa Rosa Roseland Area Specific Plan & Annexation
Project Process & Timeline

December 2014 - 2015 - 2016 - 2017
Open House Format and Layout

- Welcome Table
- Refreshments
- Land Use and Circulation Station
- Implementation Action Station
- Annexation Station
- Policy Presentation Wall
### Policy Recommendations for Topic 1
*(Topics may include: Housing, Businesses, Circulation, Public Facilities, etc)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Recommendations</th>
<th>Your Comments and Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Approach to Presenting Policies

### Policy Recommendations for Topic 1
*(Topics may include: Housing, Businesses, Circulation, Public Facilities, etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Recommendations</th>
<th>Your Comments and Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attract a grocery store to the Roseland area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Food truck/carts and mobile vendors will continue to be allowed with a conditional use permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide social gathering places in large commercial projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide outdoor dining along Sebastopol Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allow small neighborhood stores, such as corner food markets, within residential areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maximizing Open House Attendance

- Email All Past Attendees
- Send Invitations Home with Students
- Distribute and Post at Businesses
- Distribute through Personal and Organization Networks
- Other Steps We Can Take?
Annexation Outreach

• Recent Meetings
• Ideas for Additional Outreach
Comments
On Items Not on the Agenda
Thank You!

Jessica Jones
City of Santa Rosa
(English)
jjones@srcity.org
(707) 543-3410

Steve Cancian
Outreach Coordinator
(Spanish and English)
canciansteve@gmail.com
(707) 543-4689

srcity.org/roseland
MEETING OVERVIEW

The purpose of the first Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was to provide an introduction to the project, clarify the role of the TAC, and present and discuss existing Specific Plan area conditions, issues, opportunities, and constraints.

Following introductions, the project team gave a presentation on the purpose, process, and schedule of the Specific Plan project. The Plan Area context and project objectives were described and TAC members’ roles and responsibilities throughout the project process were identified. In addition, the project team presented a number of maps and figures summarizing the key findings of the existing conditions assessment, including information on demographics, land use, circulation, and environmental and market conditions.

A list of meeting attendees begins on page 7 of this summary.

MEETING OUTCOMES

TAC members provided input on existing conditions, opportunity sites, and key transportation corridors. The following discussion points were noted by the group:

- **Constraints to new development.** Contaminated sites and the presence of protected habitat are a constraint to new development. TAC members expressed interest in preserving the southeast industrial area, parks, schools, and established residential areas. Concern was raised regarding the negative perception of the schools in the area, which may not be reflected by academic scores.

- **Circulation and connectivity.** East–west connectivity through the project area should be improved, including opportunities to connect discontinuous road segments. TAC members felt that continuous bike routes are needed to close existing gaps in the network. Additionally, they felt that street improvements should be focused along existing arterials.

- **Opportunities for development.** TAC members identified a number of opportunity sites in the project area, including:
  
  o Sites adjacent to the Bus Transfer Center and along Burbank Avenue
TAC MEETING #1 SUMMARY

- At Hearn Avenue and Dutton Avenue
- At Stony Point Road and Bellevue Avenue
- Along Sebastopol Road

**Relationship of Specific Plan to other initiatives.** TAC members asked a number of questions related to the role of the Specific Plan relative to annexation. Additionally, TAC members volunteered information about other planning efforts, such as the Sebastopol Road Urban Vision Plan.

The remaining summary provides additional detail about each meeting activity and discussion, including a transcript of all comments provided during the discussion.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND KEY ISSUES

A discussion with the committee followed the presentation of the key findings to identify their concerns, issues, and questions. Individual comments are listed below.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS**

- Hazardous sites – Where does this information come from? What is the status of each site?
- Are any of the vacant sites listed as contaminated sites?
- Check the GeoTracker website, as it may underestimate the total number of hazardous sites. Need to include both closed and open sites.
- Tiger salamander is a deterrent to planning.
- Contaminated sites – Not all are equal. EIR should differentiate. Is there a Superfund site?

**TRANSPORTATION CONCERNS**

- SMART connectivity – Ensure safe crossings along local arterials are addressed.
- SMART path – Channels pedestrians and bicyclists across arterials.
- Bellevue interchange needs to be removed.
- Hearn Avenue improvements, interchange, and overcrossing need to be acknowledged.
- Three routes serve the Transfer Center: Routes 12, 15, and 19.
- Provide wider roads that can serve bikes, pedestrians, and autos.
- Street widths are too narrow; improve road widths.
Priority = focus on the arterials. Improves livability and value of the area.

Provide more linkages for bicycles, especially near schools and along creek.

Roseland Creek will be a Class 1 SMART corridor for bikes/pedestrians.

Driveways along arterials.

Lack of right-of-way for widening.

Roads need to accommodate fire apparatus.

Parcels are already built out, which makes road widening difficult.

Keep traffic on the arterials.

ADA accessibility needed on circulation paths.

East–west connectivity causes long travel times for transit.

Vision for Sebastopol Road – plan identifies it as a main street.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

- Colgan Creek park – Identify planned improvements to the park and creek.
- Bayer Farm – Integrate planning into the plan.
- Roseland Creek Elementary – Lots across the street are being acquired by the City for a park.
- Joe Rodota linear park should be acknowledged.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

- How will the maintenance of infrastructure be addressed in the plan?
- Explain why schools are an issue. Perception is not consistent with the academic results.

OPPORTUNITY SITES

- How are approved developments treated? Ensure opportunity sites exclude planned and proposed projects.
- Does this include a “development feasibility analysis,” excluding hazardous sites, salamander habitat, etc.?
• Substandard building stock inventory?
• High ratio of older structures and substandard structures.
• Unreinforced masonry standards in the city but not in the county.
• Seismic program in the city but not in the county.
• How will older structures in substandard condition be addressed in the plan?

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/PAST EFFORTS

• Coordinate other planning efforts.
• Coordinate community engagement from the Roseland Village Shopping Center engagement and Sebastopol Road Urban Vision Plan.

MAPPING ACTIVITY

The committee split into three small groups to engage in a mapping activity to identify key opportunities during the plan horizon (20 years):

• Key opportunity sites for new development
• Key intersections and corridors for circulation improvements
• Areas of no change

The results of the mapping activity are summarized below.

KEY OPPORTUNITY SITES

• East of Meadow View Elementary School and south of Hearn Avenue, Dutton Avenue, and Colgan Creek (noted for retail or mixed use)
• Vacant site east of Bus Transfer Center and north of Meadow View Elementary School (noted for commercial)
• Southwest corner of Specific Plan Area, at Stony Point Road and Bellevue Avenue, west of Elsie Allen High School
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- West of Sheppard Accelerated Elementary School (noted for housing)
- Vacant sites along Sebastopol Road, including the John Muir Charter School
- Vacant site south of Roseland University Prep
- Transit enhancements at the Bus Transfer Center

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

- Colgan Park
- Joe Rodota Park
- Park east of Roseland Creek Elementary School (note to create a plan)
- Roseland Village Shopping Center

KEY INTERSECTIONS & CORRIDORS FOR CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS

Potential new connections

- Burbank Avenue (bike lane noted)
- Connect Northpoint Parkway to Leo Drive
- Connect Dutton Avenue north and south of Hearn
- Connection over Highway 101
- Improve access to Highway 101 southbound
- Connection between Northpoint Parkway and Leo Drive
- Connection to SMART along Corby Avenue

Corridors to improve

- Sebastopol Road (improve non-motorized vehicle access)
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- Hearn Avenue (bike/pedestrian access)
- Bellevue Avenue
- Roseland Creek (bike and pedestrian trail noted)
- Dutton Meadow (noted for bike lanes and sidewalks)
- Burbank Avenue (noted for bike lanes and sidewalks)

Intersections to improve

- Bus Transfer Center
- Bellevue Avenue at Dutton Meadow, at Stony Point Road, at Dutton Avenue, and at Moorland Avenue
- Olive (600 block)
- Hearn Avenue at Highway 101
- Bike/pedestrian crossing at Hearn Avenue and Colgan Creek

AREAS OF NO CHANGE

- All parks
- The industrial area centered along Dowd Drive in the southeast corner of the Plan Area
- Residential areas
  - Bellevue Ranch
  - Lazzini Avenue, west of Roseland Creek Elementary School
  - Between Dutton Meadow and Colgan Creek
- Schools
  - Elsie Allen High School
  - Midrose High School
  - Meadow View Elementary School
  - Roseland Accelerated Middle School
  - Sheppard Accelerated Elementary School
  - Roseland Creek Elementary School
SPECIFIC PLAN VERSUS ANNEXATION

A number of questions and comments were raised regarding the relationship between the Specific Plan and the annexation processes during the meeting. Below is a summary of the comments.

- Specific Plan EIR will be shared with the annexation project.
- Specific Plan goes forward regardless of whether the City proceeds with the annexation.
- Staff to provide graphic explaining relationship between the two project processes.
- Shade the map to clarify those areas within the Specific Plan boundary that are under consideration for annexation.
- South Park County Sanitation District – Annexation of a portion of the district creates a remnant and an uneconomical situation. Annexation needs to take all of the district.
- How will roads be dealt with in the annexation? Who has jurisdiction? Currently, some portions of roads/intersections are in the city and other portions are in the county. Makes it difficult for emergency services to respond. Helpful if full roadways are either in the city or the county—one jurisdiction—so there are no jurisdictional questions.
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CITY OF SANTA ROSA DEPARTMENTS
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  - Lisa Kranz (Supervising Planner)
  - Chuck Regalia (CD Director/Assistant City Manager)
  - Mark Setterland (Building Official)
- Transportation and Public Works
  - Rachel Ede (Transit Planner)
  - Carol Clark (Associate Civil Engineer)
  - Nancy Adams (Transportation Planner)
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- Utilities
  - Rocky Vogler (Senior Water Resources Planner)
  - Danielle Dugre (Associate Civil Engineer)

- Recreation and Parks

- Police
  - Megan Basinger (Administrative Services Officer – Police)

- Fire
  - Scott Moon (Fire Marshal)
  - Paul Lowenthal (Assistant Fire Marshal)

- City Attorney’s Office
  - Molly Dillon (Assistant City Attorney)

- City Manager’s Office – Violence Prevention Program
  - Khaalid Muttaqi (Program Manager)

COUNTY OF SONOMA DEPARTMENTS

- Transportation and Public Works
  - Mitch Simson

- Health Services
  - Beth Dadko
  - Kelly Elder

- Permit and Resource Management
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- California Highway Patrol
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  - Therese Trivedi (Program Manager)
- Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit
  - Linda Meckel (Senior Planner)
- Sonoma County Water Agency
  - Michael Thompson (Assistant General Manager)
Meeting Held on June 17, 2015
Finley Community Center
2060 W. College Avenue, Santa Rosa

MEETING OVERVIEW

The purpose of the second Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was to present and discuss the Specific Plan alternative plan concepts.

The project team first gave a presentation summarizing the results of Workshop #1 and explaining how the alternative concepts were developed. PMC and W-Trans then presented the land use and circulation alternatives and engaged the group in a discussion. Committee members were asked to provide technical expertise on each of the alternatives and input on whether each one was feasible.

A list of meeting attendees begins on page 9 of this summary.

MEETING OUTCOMES

TAC members provided input on the viability of the land use and circulation alternatives. The following main discussion points were noted by the group:

- **Constraints to removing on-street parking.** Loss of on-street parking is a concern, particularly along Corby Street in the Auto Row area. Previous commitments have been made to retain this on-street parking.

- **Feasibility of installing roundabouts.** Roundabouts might not be a viable option, as land would most likely need to be acquired to install them.

The following section provides additional detail about each meeting discussion, including a summary of all comments provided during the discussion.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND KEY ISSUES

A discussion with the committee followed the presentation of the alternative circulation and land use plan concepts to identify their concerns, issues, and questions. Individual comments are listed below.
CIRCULATION CONCERNS

Local Streets
- Transit needs at least 11-foot travel lanes to accommodate buses.
- Use phasing/enhance streets over time.
- People use a lot of on-street parking in the area.

Dutton Avenue (Sebastopol to Hearn)
- Need to talk to people who live/own property before removing on-street parking.
- Need to look at bike lanes globally and prioritize where they should go.
- The SMART path provides a Class I bikeway facility, so may not need bike lanes on Dutton.
- Need to maintain intersection capacity.
- Need to increase single path of travel – streetlights, accessibility per ADA requirements (significant cost).

Corby Avenue (Hearn to Bellevue/Auto Row)
- Dealerships do not want to remove street parking, since employees park on the street.
- TDW is working with dealerships/property owners – need to reflect what is already under way.

West Avenue
- Target West Avenue as a priority – it is heavily used by families.
- Need to consider school pick up/drop-off. Need passenger drop-off points.
- Alternative B will cost a lot from an accessibility perspective. ADA accessibility should be considered. This also affects right-of-way and needs to be discussed with other committees.
- Slow down traffic.
- Need higher visibility signage.
- Mini-roundabouts were not successful on Humboldt. Roundabouts were difficult for pedestrians/children to understand.
- Keep existing crossings, particularly near Bayer Park. Consider new crosswalks to connect schools and parks.
- Bike boulevard concept might not work on a street with bus transit. Does this work?

Burbank Avenue
- Constrained width. Bike lanes would require property acquisition.
- Scenic road classification?
- Might be a good road for a bike boulevard.
- Doesn’t have too many midblock crosswalks.
### TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

**Dutton Avenue (between Sebastopol and Hearn)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ENHANCED OPTION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Alternative B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks</td>
<td>Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove passing on one side of the street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Tarakand Street/Sebastopol Road SPECIFIC PLAN & ANNEXATION**

---

### TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

**Dutton Avenue (between Hearn and Bellevue)**

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ENHANCED OPTION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Alternative B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands</td>
<td>Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking both sides</td>
<td>Add sidewalks where missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-street parking both sides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Tarakand Street/Sebastopol Road SPECIFIC PLAN & ANNEXATION**

---
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### Transportation Alternatives - Corby Avenue (between Hearn and Bellevue)

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add sidewalks that meet minimum standards</td>
<td>Add sidewalks with landscaped buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on east side of roadway</td>
<td>Remove parking on east side of roadway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation Alternatives - Burbank Avenue (between Sebastopol and Roseland Creek)

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides</td>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires property acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Santa Rosa
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TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

Burbank Avenue (between Roseland Creek and Hearn)

Which transportation treatments do you prefer for this street? Please circle the improvements you would like to see, from either Alternative A or B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
<th>ENHANCED OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Alternative B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on one side of the street</td>
<td>Sidewalks on both sides of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use path/fused sidewalk on one side of street with landscaped buffer</td>
<td>Blue lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
<td>Remove parking on both sides of the street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road SPECIFIC PLAN & ANNEXATION

LAND USE

- Commercial to the east might be more viable since it is closer to jobs.
- There is already a lot of multi-family housing in this area, which has led to comments/issues of overconcentration.
- How will multi-family housing option A work with realignment of Ludwig and Bellevue?
- Places along the SMART corridor are better location for multi-family housing.
- Need to link multi-family to transit. There is currently a project going on called Reimagining CityBus. Rachel noted that the Southwest Bus Transfer Center might not always be in that location. Roseland residents say they often go downtown to transfer and then come back. There are future transfer opportunities in other areas. They are seeking feedback from riders now to determine how the center is currently working for riders, and how it can be improved.
- Share info about CityBus and the proposed Roseland Creek Park at workshop #2. Unify these efforts as much as possible.
- Like the idea of civic uses around the park, and in both locations (Sebastopol and Hearn). People want a pool at Southwest Community Park, but there may not be enough space.
• Crossroad development – how does this work with the Leo Drive extension?

**LAND USE ALTERNATIVES**

**Commercial/Retail**

- **Option A**: Concentrate retail on Sebastopol Road, with corner stores and food trucks throughout.
- **Option B**: Distribute new retail development between Sebastopol Road and Hean Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center).

**LAND USE ALTERNATIVES**

**Civic/Social/Community Services (e.g. library, youth center)**

- **Option A**: Focus community and civic uses along Sebastopol Road.
- **Option B**: Focus community and civic uses on Hean Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center).
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Family Entertainment Uses (e.g. bowling alley, movie theater)

Please choose Option A, B, or C for the general location of where family entertainment uses should be allowed.

**A** Focus family entertainment on Hean Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)

**B** Focus family entertainment on Dutton Ave south of Hean

**C** Focus family entertainment along Sebastopol Rd

LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Multi-Family Housing

Please choose Option A or B for the general location of where multi-family housing should be allowed.

**A** Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Hean Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & at Bellevue/Stony Point Road

**B** Focus multi-family housing along Sebastopol Rd (already planned), on Hean Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center) & on Dutton Ave, south of Hean
ATTENDANCE

CITY OF SANTA ROSA DEPARTMENTS
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  - Rafael Rivero (Community Outreach Specialist)

- Community Development
  - Jessica Jones (Senior Planner)
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  - Chuck Regalia (CD Director/Assistant City Manager)
  - Mark Setterland (Building Official)
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- Utilities
  - Rocky Vogler (Senior Water Resources Planner)
  - Danielle Dugre (Associate Civil Engineer)
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Meeting Held on September 29, 2015
Finley Community Center
2060 W. College Avenue, Santa Rosa

MEETING OVERVIEW

The purpose of the third Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was to present and discuss the Specific Plan’s draft circulation and land use plans.

The project team gave a presentation summarizing the input considered in the development of each plan. The team also presented the details of the proposed land use and circulation plans and a list of potential implementation actions. The group then engaged in a discussion of the materials presented. Committee members were asked to provide technical expertise on the information presented and consider whether the proposals were technically feasible.

A list of meeting attendees begins on page 4 of this summary.

MEETING OUTCOMES

TAC members provided input on the feasibility of the draft land use and circulation plans. The following main discussion points were noted by the group:

- **Meeting MTC targets.** Confirm that the limited changes to land use still meet the MTC targets for density and residential units.

- **Location of the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) path.** The most recent design for the SMART path is along the eastern side of the tracks, and the draft bicycle routes will need to account for this change.

- **Additional east–west connectivity.** Desire for more east–west connectivity in the project area.

- **Accommodating transit.** Ensure that the circulation plan can accommodate transit vehicles.

- **Leo Drive, Campbell Drive, Lazzini Avenue, and Burbank Avenue.** Consider alternate designs and alignments of these streets.
Implementation actions. Clarify to the community that some of the implementation actions require the acquisition of right-of-way.

The following section provides additional detail about each meeting discussion item, including a summary of all comments provided during the discussion.

DISCUSSION OF LAND USE

A discussion with the TAC followed the presentation of the land use plan to identify committee members’ concerns, issues, and questions. Individual comments are listed below.

- What do limited land use changes mean in terms of meeting the MTC targets?
- Why is there a space between the park sites near Roseland Creek?
- Isn’t the park near Bellevue open space? Why is it shown as medium residential?
- How does the plan allow for small-scale businesses? Are only shopping centers allowed in the striped areas?

DISCUSSION OF CIRCULATION

A discussion with the TAC followed the presentation of circulation plan to identify committee members’ concerns, issues, and questions regarding circulation. Individual comments are listed below.

General
- Show which streets are already part of an approved or pending project.
- What are the designations of the streets? Arterial, local, collector? One or two lanes?
- Was school pick-up/drop-off circulation considered?
- More east–west connectivity is desired.
- When do we look at street design?
- Is the plan consistent with the City’s bike plan?
- Consider bike needs versus bus lane width needs.
- Ensure travel lanes are at least 10 feet wide to accommodate buses.
Integration with Transit
- Does the plan integrate with the need to accommodate transit service? Are the street widths able to accommodate buses?
- Leo Drive extension.
- Can western alignment change to diffuse traffic?
- The eastern extension is too close to the SMART rail corridor. Perhaps convert to a park between the road and the corridor?

Campbell Drive & Stony Point Road
- Is signalization or other traffic control needed to mitigate traffic?
- Concerned about traffic signals located at Lazzini Avenue and Campbell Drive along Stony Point Road.

Trails
- Why are there gaps in the Roseland Creek Trail? Why doesn’t it continue farther northeast?
- Show Joe Rodota Trail on the street map (currently it looks like a street and isn’t labeled).
- Concerned about the potential two new crossings of the Joe Rodota Trail. Bike paths are supposed to create conflict-free spaces for pedestrians and cyclists, and this is already an area difficult to navigate.

Burbank Avenue
- What about on-street parking?
- Would bioswales provide adequate mitigation for tiger salamander habitat? Sidewalks have been a challenge on this street due to tiger salamanders.

DISCUSSION OF IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

A discussion with the TAC followed the presentation of potential implementation actions to identify committee members’ concerns, issues, and questions. Individual comments are listed below.

- Add bus stop amenities (e.g., benches) to the list of items.
- Clarify for community workshop participants that acquisition of right-of-way will be required for some sidewalks, bike lanes, etc. Identify what the tradeoffs are.
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