



COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE- Summary Minutes

Zoom Webinar

July 21, 2020, 6:00 PM

CAC Members Present: Rick Duncan, Jon Belcher, Louisa de Heer, Kate Perle, Mary Leontovich, Ed McMahon, Michele O’Leary, Ann Vaughn, Cameron Ewing

Community Members Present: Carleen Reilly, Jolene Siemsen, Harry Sanger, Lorri Harrison, Kevin Jones, Don Heady

Staff Present: Terri Harding, Chelsea Hartman, Elena Domingo, Lindsey Eichner

Agenda items

1. Standing Items

- Introductions: What’s a favorite meal you’ve made recently?
- Zoom meeting protocol/ground rules – Elena discussed the possibility of recording the CAC meetings and everyone agreed we would not plan to record the meetings at this time.
- Agenda review – Chelsea asked that the implementation update occur before the project charter update and everyone was okay with that.

2. Public Comments

- Harry Sanger - said he is an RRCO board member and is here to learn more about the neighborhood plan.
- Carleen Reilly - said she’s listening to stay informed about the neighborhood plan.
- Jolene Siemsen - said she’s listening to stay informed about the neighborhood plan.
- Lorri Harrison - said it was her first CAC meeting and she’s listening to stay informed about the neighborhood plan.
- Kevin Jones – joined on video with Kate, SCCO member joining to stay up to date.

3. Ongoing Implementation Update from Staff and Discussion

- Terri - gave an update about planning and neighborhood plans and talked about the interest in better aligning these efforts with other city topic areas by improving coordination and structure and possibly setting an annual planning and info share meeting across departments that both neighborhood organizations could join.
- Chelsea – said staff will be sharing the Action Plan Intro with the CAC soon and we will continue the conversation about implementation.

4. Discuss Project Charter Update

- Chelsea– went over the new edits in the Project Charter and asked if people were comfortable with the changes. She said once approved by CAC the next step would be to take the changes to City and County executives and RRCO and SCCO to sign.
- Talked about which development standards might be adopted concurrently with the plan. Chelsea said most will be related to the corridor study, but many land use actions have development standards as well.
- Discussed how the amendments made took into consideration the concerns raised.
- **Motion:** Michele, seconded by Ann, moved to approve the charter as newly amended.
- Not everyone felt comfortable voting before reviewing the changes.
- **Friendly Amendment to the Motion:** Rick moved to allow those who have the ability to vote now to do so **and keep the vote open until next Monday at 5:00 p.m.** for everyone else, barring any substantive changes. If there are substantive changes, then CAC will come back to discussion and the vote tonight will hold no water.
- **Vote:** Rick, Louisa, Kate, Ed, Michele, Ann, and Cameron voted tonight to approve the Project Charter as newly amended. Jon and Mary will vote later by email.

5. HB 2001 CAC Subcommittee Update

- Discussed a draft document with 5 main items the letter might address: 1) Middle housing and parking 2) Homeownership 3) Maximum unit size and/or maximum average size for aggregate units 4) Fear of moving away from comprehensive planning 5) Making sure the HB 2001 and HB 2003 processes are working together.
- Terri – said the rulemaking is happening very quickly and suggested that a letter from the CAC would be powerful to hear from citizens focusing more broadly about wanting to finish the neighborhood plan and adopt code that responds to the work that has been done through the neighborhood plan.
- **Jon/subcommittee will finish the HB 2001 testimony letter before Rick leaves town, send to CAC for concurrence, and then send to DLCD.** Kate confirmed this would be the process.

6. Action Plan and Adoption Package Outline

- a. Discuss Action Plan – Priorities, Changes, Questions, Concerns
 - i. Process for RRCO/SCCO edits
 - SCCO has been reviewing by topic area and RRCO is planning to do the same process. All community recommendations will then come back to the CAC to rectify the differences and substantive changes may need to go through the TAC.
 - Talked about inviting individuals who have been participating in the neighborhood plan process, not just board members, to join the topic area reviews.
 - It was suggested that CAC review each board's edits as they come in so they don't pile up.

- ii. Community – New Priorities
 - The group talked about the importance of adding community priorities around hate and bias prevention trainings and response in the neighborhoods.
 - Many discussed what type of training, who would pay for it, and how often it would be required, etc.
 - Everyone was okay with **promoting the two identified community actions to priorities.**

- iii. Transportation – New Priorities and Suggested Changes from SCCO
 - Discussed transportation action plan highlights, improving Beltline is mentioned, but not River Road. SCCO suggested adding language to Goal 5 that currently says “Promote a connected and efficient multi-modal transportation system that is equitable and affordable” with addition of “and addresses traffic congestion on River Road.”
 - Talked about how some RRCO members may not like this because people see it as adding capacity. Some actions might not improve traffic flow, though improving safety.
 - **Proposed separate statements in action plan highlights about Beltline and River Road**, they are different types of roadways with different jurisdictions.
 - Talked about separating River Road North vs. South of Beltline and suggested talking with Rob Inerfeld with transportation about congestion issues to see if the backup is North or South or on both sides of Beltline and what current volume and wait times are.
 - Discussed new action: **4.1.4(c)**: “Install crosswalks at bus stop amenities and river access streets.” **No one opposed this addition.**
 - Discussed adding **Spring Creek at Aubrey Park Elementary School as an example** in relation to **4.1.4(b)** installing user activated pedestrian signals near schools.
 - Initial discussion about not siting a specific example of an existing signal, but then realized this was an example of somewhere where an installation was needed and **people were okay with adding this language.**
 - Discussed addition of action **4.2.9** “Ensure all paths and access points are maintained for use including the removal of vegetation and debris.” **No one opposed this addition.**
 - Mentioned that RRCO will likely have a discussion and possible pushback about 4.2.1 about lighting the bike path.
 - Went back to discussing the wording of Goal 5 and not wanting to focus on motor vehicle use above other modes of transportation. **People liked the idea of taking out the work “traffic”.**
 - Reminded each other that each goal, policy, or action needs to be clear and readable standing alone.
 - At 8:00pm there were still outstanding agenda items. Kate asked CAC members to finish reviewing the [transportation edits from SCCO](#), as well as the documents for the two items we didn’t get to: Code Actions to Consider Including in [Draft Adoption](#)

[Package Outline](#), and [Map of Taxlots for Potential Rezoning](#) – C-2 and R-2 Properties Outside Corridor Study Area (large church properties in Santa Clara)

- **Asked for the detailed version of the Draft Adoption Package Outline** that includes the actions that correlate with code amendment areas. Chelsea said we'd send this out.
- Chelsea recommended bookmarking the CAC google drive folder so it's easily accessible.

7. Adjourn.