

**NFO Zoning Working Group Discussion  
October 6, 2016 5:45-7pm  
North Fair Oaks Health Clinic  
Meeting Notes**

***In Attendance:***

Workgroup Members

Linda Lopez  
Morton Frank  
Janet Davis  
Kent Manske

County Staff

Will Gibson  
Joe LaClair  
Victor Gaitan

Facilitated by Debbie Schechter, Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center

***1. Framing Activity: What has been the high point and low point of your participation in the working group?***

High Point:

- Larger number of diverse participants leads to more diverse opinions
- Community Plan developed and approved by Board of Supervisors
- Responsiveness by Will to questions outside of meetings and consultation by Laura

Low Point:

- Too much email and texting among workgroup members and staff undermines the process by excluding those who are not part of the email conversation
- Lack of representation by impacted people: people who live in the rest of the area and 5<sup>th</sup> Ave
- Confusion about role in process: am I a member or not? Fulfilling responsibilities
- Disconnect with outreach, especially to 5<sup>th</sup> Ave merchants and Middlefield Ave.
- No apparent connection with Stanford in RWC

***2A. What Has Worked Well for the Working Group?***

- Staff work on the whole program
- Support from the Board of Supervisors
- Constructive comments from Kent
- There is community involvement and it sounds like our input will matter
- Workgroup members better understand what zoning is and how it will be used

## ***2B. What Can Be Improved?***

- Representation
- Fits and starts-different workgroups, communication up and down
- Disconnect with big picture—no one group overseeing the whole thing-zoning not connected to other issues under the Community Plan
- Manage public meetings more effectively
- Workgroup is not representative
- Staff moves forward despite community opinion
- Some staff not familiar with NFO
- Clarify role of invited members and public attendees
- Curb rambling of public attendees to make meetings more efficient
- Find a way to accommodate need for education and information: staff available after meeting, display boards with information
- Comments after the fact about approved community plan: need approach to handle this while still accepting input

## ***3. Recommendations for New Working Group Members***

### Working Group Ideas

- 2 from Selby Park: Marianne
- Supervisor's office representative (Irving or Carol)
- Parks representative
- Check with Beatrice
- St Francis Center
- Youth member: ask Rafael from Siena Center
- Vendors: Locksmith, Biscoteria, Coffee Connoisseur

### County Ideas

- 2 Dumbarton Oaks residents
- RWC Planner
- Owner of Key Market (5<sup>th</sup> Ave.)

## ***4. Other County Proposals for Working Group Improvements:***

- Differentiate between workgroup and public
- Conduct both work group meetings that are open to the public, but with limited public involvement, and public meetings that focus on getting public feedback on proposals developed by the Working Group and staff
- County will bring updates on other Community Plan actions and related projects like Stanford

### **5. Parking Lot**

- Stanford EIR: *County staff will provide an update at next working group meeting*
- 2 members concerned about the Community Plan: *County staff will address individually with those members*