

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN – STRATEGIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
HELD ON JULY 25, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moore opened the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members present: Kitty Moore, Chair and City Councilmember
 Tessa Parish, Vice Chair and Chair, Housing Commission
 Liang Chao, Vice Mayor
 Steven Scharf, Chair, Planning Commission

Commissioners Members absent: None

Staff present: Luke Connolly, Senior Planner
 Piu Ghosh, Planning Manager
 Chris Jensen, City Attorney
 Cyrah Caburian, Administrative Assistant

Outside Panelists: Ande Flower, Principal Planner, EMC Planning Group
 Kylie Clark, Public Policy Coordinator, West Valley Community
 Services (WVCS)
 Lee Robinson, Be The Diversity

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Subject: Approve the June 6 Community Engagement Plan – Strategic Advisory Committee Special Meeting minutes

Recommended Action: Approve the June 6 Community Engagement Plan – Strategic Advisory Committee Special Meeting minutes

Parish moved and Chao seconded to amend minutes with amendment to wording regarding website feedback and meeting in the box from previous meeting (Chao). Motion was withdrawn.

Discussion that minutes be brought back to include more detail, and Chair asked Committee to have edits prepared before discussion of item.

Motion by Scharf and second by Chao to table item until next meeting with edits suggested by Chao.

AYES: Moore, Parish, Chao, Scharf

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

VOTE: 4-0-0-0

POSTPONEMENTS

None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Jenny Griffin spoke about potential upzoning and rezoning in surrounding Cities and the County for their respective Housing Element cycles.

Lisa Warren spoke about potential rezoning in surrounding Cities and commented on item #1 motion for approval of minutes.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

OLD BUSINESS

2. Subject: Approval of Previous Community Engagement Plan - Strategic Advisory Committee Minutes (continued from May 16, 2022 Special Meeting)

Recommended Action: Approve Minutes from the March 30, April 7, and April 25 Community Engagement Plan - Strategic Advisory Committee Special Meetings

Chao will not provide edits to draft items already provided and will not support item.

Discussion by Committee and City Attorney Jensen about policy of summary minutes adopted by City Council. For legislative bodies, action minutes are encouraged if automatic transcripts from recorded broadcasts are made available as supplemental information to members of the public.

Moore requested for summary minutes to be drafted moving forward for this Committee. Suggestion by staff to approve minutes as is with inclusion of transcripts.

Motion by Moore and second by Scharf to approve minutes as is with inclusion of transcripts.

Modified motion by Moore and second by Scharf to approve minutes as is and include Chao's suggestion to only include instructions on how one can download the transcript from YouTube.

AYES: Moore, Parish, Chao, Scharf

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

VOTE: 4-0-0-0

NEW BUSINESS

3. Subject: Report from staff and EMC Planning Group regarding: 1) the July 20 Community Meeting focusing on students and older adults; 2) the Draft Housing Element Survey; 3) Remaining Community Engagement Plan events, including receiving input from the Advisory Committee on the focus of the third Community Meeting; 4) and update and changes to the engagecupertino.org website and Balancing Act.

Recommended Action: Receive report and provide input to staff on plans for additional community engagement and for engagement consistent with compliance with State Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements.

Mr. Connolly briefly reported out about activity since the June 6th meeting, namely that the Planning and Housing Commissions' joint meetings were held and approved recommendations to City Council on the Housing Element Update site selection inventory; the second Community meeting (virtual) that was held on July 20th; and the balancing act tool now live on EngageCupertino.org.

Mr. Flower led discussion on the recently held Community virtual meeting addressing student and senior housing needs, along with Ms. Clark and Mr. Robinson. Emphasis was on breakout room discussions from the meeting focusing on how to attendees can better support neighbors. The recorded meeting is currently being edited by staff and will be made available following the meeting.

Next steps that may be brought forth to the Housing Commission at a future meeting are the report from both Community meetings, sharing the results from the Housing Surveys and whether an additional survey shall be conducted, a review of prior Housing Element programs, the AFFH report prepared by Root Policy, and creation of a tool for policy suggestions.

Discussion was held on Housing Survey #2, which implemented questions from other Cities in the state and fill needs of questions proposed by Committee.

Member of public, Jennifer Griffin, suggested two separate surveys be conducted for residents and for non-resident participants.

Mr. Flower clarified that HCD guidelines take into consideration those who not only live in City but also those who would like to live in Cupertino; questions posed in survey may help differentiate between the two groups and gain demographic insight.

A PDF of the draft survey questions (with exclusion of question #24 that was kept on erroneously and not removed prior to meeting) was forwarded to the Committee during the meeting and will be included in written communications for this item.

Feedback from Committee was to launch survey as early as tomorrow and incorporate results that will inform Housing Commissions' policy discussion. Committee members who wish to address concerns from survey may contact staff offline.

Motion by Scharf and second by Chao to launch survey immediately, with a deadline for end of August, and include survey results to the Housing Commission to help in policy discussion.

AYES: Moore, Parish, Chao, Scharf
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
VOTE: 4-0-0-0

Discussion was then held regarding the planned third Community meeting, tentatively set for Tuesday, September 20 (virtual; to be rescheduled as it falls on the same evening as the City Council meeting) with will focus on outreach to faith-based communities, including conducting individual interviews and videos, client recruitment and leadership, and client involvement and feedback. Guideline from the Committee was to also focus on employees and house-rich residents, and is seeking additional participants, panelists and ideas for this meeting.

A quick recap was held regarding panelists for the first two Community meetings held. The first meeting, held May 23rd, included panelists from WVCS representing disabilities, neurodivergence, homelessness, affordable housing and discrimination. The previous meeting panelists respresented disabilities and discrimination concerns that students and senior residents may face.

Public comment period was opened by Moore to discuss Community meetings and feedback.

Member of the public, Jennifer Griffin, expressed concern faith-based communities are being included in outreach without proper representation.

Member of the public, Lisa Warren, asked for clarification on what “employees” would be considered at the upcoming Community meeting and concern on the term “house-rich”.

Member of the public, Susan Moore, wondered where first responders, teachers, and medical personnel would be considered in future Community meetings.

Chao suggested Project Sentinel as a potential panelist, and suggestion of including service employees, developmentally and intellectually disabled residents in discussions, and requested a list of the panelists from the previous two meetings. Staff addressed that panelists from the second meeting addressed that specific need and not necessarily needed to be specifically addressed at the next meeting.

Moore requested clarification of the term “house-rich”. Staff clarified that the group was meant to capture residents who are not necessarily low-income, but also do not have disposable income (and can be used in conjunction with “house-poor”).

Scharf wondered if outreach can be made to other cities outside of the school districts regarding housing insecurities of their students and faculty.

Parish suggested Project Sentinel as a potential panelist. Also requested were the figures of other outreach and community meetings held by other Cities to gain insight as to the factors that led to approval of their respective Housing Elements, and a mechanism by which different organizations can be tracked for outreach if that agency can aid in the approval of the City’s Housing Element.

Chao also suggested Housing Choices and other parent groups that may have been represented from the previous meetings. Ms. Clark suggested focus group of various disabilities and housing needs they may face. Would also like to see community input on what type of homes and assistance are being sought out.

Chao asked to include employee unions, and performance of current Housing Element; staff clarified while the Kit in the box concept would involve more time, the expectation was for the survey to fulfill request to push out and engage the public with as much time as possible.

Agreement was made by the Committee to include performance of the Housing Element in all Community meetings and present to the Community what has been completed.

Moore requested a QR code for the public to complete the survey, and in inclusion of free-form comment sections after several questions; staff clarified that the fliers will already include a QR code linking to the survey and that a comment section is already included at the end of the survey.

Mr. Flower continued discussion on technical updates to the website; visitors can go directly to each site in Cupertino, where they can interact with the balancing act and submit feedback for neighborhoods in the site selection and view sites by location or spacially. Also included for viewing and feedback are the approved pipeline projects and sites listed as tier 1 (recommended for site inventory), or tier 2 (sites that are not necessary recommended but can be included to meet housing number allocations). The goal is to collect as many comments before the next City Council meeting.

Member of the public, Jennifer Griffin, welcomed more public input and concerns of marginalizing residents.

Member of the public, Lisa Warren, wondered how public input regarding the website already received is being tracked and how many comments have already been received. Asked for instructions to be moved to the top of the page.

Member of the public, Susan Moore, commended website improvements.

Member of the public, Scott Connelly, asked if the August 4 Council meeting was a placeholder or was intended to be held to discuss the Housing Element, and asked about the addition of height requirements, and if and where any questions for the website can be forwarded, concern of lack of community involvement at the previous two Planning and Housing Commission joint meetings.

Regarding meeting attendance, staff noted that the Community meetings saw more turnout than the joint Commission meetings. Discussion with other cities also saw that the turnout and community involvement increase once sites were selected; therefore staff are anticipating a higher attendee and participation rate for the Council meeting. Feedback gathered from all meetings that have already taken place will be included in the Council presentation.

Chao noted questions about survey regarding selection of ethnicities and suggested inclusion of height allowances as well as clearly defining August 4 as the deadline for public comment.

Scharf suggested for the question of ethnicities to allow for participants to select all that apply, so that all ethnicities can be accounted for. Scharf also noted the City is not limited to approving housing only on those sites in their housing element, but that other housing sites counts towards the total amount of units, not including density bonus, which would mean more units will be built than was needed to meet RHNA allocations.

Parish asked for pipeline projects to be clearly defined to the public as sites already approved and are pending permit applications to build.

Mr. Flower concluded presentation with suggestion to ask this Committee to review and approve the draft Housing Element to expedite the process for HCD to review and certify if accepted. Staff suggested further discussion internally between Consultant and staff since the main focus of the Committee was to focus on solely on outreach.

STAFF UPDATES AND COMMISSION REPORTS

None

Committee Updates

None

FUTURE AGENDA *(limitation, cannot discuss)*

- Next meeting: Friday, September 16th 1:00 p.m.
- Bring back June 6 minutes for consideration

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:23 p.m. to the next special meeting.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/Cyrah Caburian
Cyrah Caburian
Administrative Assistant