STEERING COMMITTEE #2 MEETING MINUTES

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:
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 land use (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 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
SC Meeting #2
Roseland Area Alternatives
June 17, 2015
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
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TRANSPORTATION TRADEOFFS
- Local Residential Streets
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– 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?
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
GENERAL PLAN
LAND USE

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TRANSPORT NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGNATION GUIDELINES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing mix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station area Total units Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Project Density (for new housing)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Jobs Target</strong></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
ACTIVITY INSTRUCTIONS

- 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

srccity.org/roseland
CONNECTIVITY QUESTIONS

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

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

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.
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.

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

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.

<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>
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 the street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

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.

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
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES
Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan & Annexation

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.

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

**Option B**
Focus community and civic uses on Hearn Ave (around the Bus Transfer Center)
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES  
Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan & Annexation

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

Focus family entertainment on Dutton Ave south of Hearn

Focus family entertainment along Sebastopol Rd