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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.
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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.
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- **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 (stop 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
Please join us at two community workshops!

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

¡Por favor acompañenos a dos talleres comunitarios!

Queremos escuchar sus ideas sobre el futuro de la zona de 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 B: COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 1 DATA AND PHOTOGRAPHS
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 | |

<p>| A welcoming community that is clean, safe, affordable and inviting | 33 | 23% |
| Inviting/welcoming/strong community/caring | 14 | |
| Clean/bright | 6 | |
| Beneficial | 2 | |
| Better Police (foot patrol, less discrimination, more education for cops) | 6 | |
| Reduce Crime | 5 | |
| Affordable housing | 9 | |
| Affordable | 6 | |
| No gentrification | 3 | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</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:
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.
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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/roeland

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.
APPENDIX D: STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #2 SUMMARY
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 approved”)
- 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.
STEERING COMMITTEE #2 MEETING MINUTES

- 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
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

Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan & Annexation

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

**Alternative B**
- Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands
- Add sidewalks where missing
- On-street parking both sides
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.

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

### Alternative B
- Bike lanes
- Mini-roundabouts at West /Leo and West/ South
- Bulb-outs at other crossings

### Enhanced Option
- Pedestrian-scale lighting
- Bus pull-outs and shelters
- Remove parking on one side of the street

---

**Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road SPECIFIC PLAN & ANNEXATION**
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>Requires property acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS

Alternative A

Sidewalk on one side of the street

Burbank Avenue (between Roseland Creek and Hearn)

Sidewalks on both sides of street

Multi-use path/rural sidewalk on one side of street with landscaped buffer

Bike lanes

Remove parking on both sides of the street

Remove parking on both sides of street

ENHANCED OPTION
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
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Corby

Divided

Divided

Clear Direction

Santa Rosa Roseland Area Projects
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS - West

Clear Direction

Divided
TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Local Residential Streets

Clear Direction

Clear Direction

Divided

Divided

Santa Rosa Roseland Area Projects
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
Selected 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>Alternative A</td>
<td>Alternative B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Widen sidewalks to meet minimum standards
- Wider sidewalks that exceed minimum standards
- Landscaped buffers where possible
- Mini roundabouts at larger intersections
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES ACTIVITY

City of Santa Rosa Roseland Area Projects
— 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
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>TRANSIT NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGNATION GUIDELINES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing mix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-rise, townhomes, mid-rise and small lot SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station area Total units Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500-4,000 (currently 5,000 in plan area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Project Density (for new housing)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-50 du/acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Jobs Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</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)  
jjones@srcity.org  
(707) 543-3410

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

srcity.org/roseland
APPENDIX E: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2 SUMMARY
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.
**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.*

**MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS**

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

**Alternative B**
- Bulb-outs at major crossings with high-visibility crosswalls
- 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.*

**MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS**

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

**Alternative B**
- Two-way left-turn lane and raised median islands

**ENHANCED OPTION**

- Add sidewalks where missing
- On-street parking both sides
### 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**

Barbank 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/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
**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.
TAC MEETING #2 SUMMARY

- 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
  ○ Jessica Jones (Senior Planner)
  ○ 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)

• Utilities
  ○ Danielle Dugre (Associate Civil Engineer)

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

• Fire
  ○ Toby Rey (Fire Inspector)

• 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
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