

# GPAC Meeting Summary

*March 17, 2022, 6:30-9:00 PM*

# Introduction

## Meeting Access

All GPAC Meetings are public and are accessible via Zoom and television (PCA channel). Meeting information, meeting recordings, and materials are posted on the City's Meetings site:

[www.cityofpetaluma.org/meetings/](http://www.cityofpetaluma.org/meetings/).

## Agenda

- Welcome
- General Public Comment
- Project and Staff Updates
- 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element Update
- GPAC Working Groups
- General Public Comment
- Final GPAC Thoughts

## Attendance

There were 15 total members of the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) members in attendance, as well as members of the public. The following GPAC members were present:

- |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Dave Alden            | 9. Bill Wolpert          |
| 2. Jessie Feller         | 10. Phil Boyle           |
| 3. Sierra Downey         | 11. Ali Gaylord          |
| 4. Kris Rebillot         | 12. Mary Dooley          |
| 5. Bill Rinehart         | 13. Erin Chmielewski     |
| 6. John Shribbs          | 14. Delia Diaz           |
| 7. Joshua Riley Simmons  | 15. Roberto Rosila Mares |
| 8. Janice Cader Thompson |                          |

The following GPAC members were absent:

1. Stephanie Blake
2. Yensi Jacobo
3. Roger Leventhal
4. Iliana Inzunza Madrigal

The following City and consultant staff were present at the meeting:

### City of Petaluma:

Heather Hines – Community Development Director, *City of Petaluma*

Christina Paul – Principal Planner, *City of Petaluma*

David Garcia – Associate Planner, *City of Petaluma*

Eric Roberts – Planner, *City of Petaluma*

Christina Guerrero and Maria Galvez – *Spanish Interpreters*

**Consultant Team:**

Ron Whitmore - *Raimi + Associates*

Michelle Hernandez - *Raimi + Associates*

Dave Javid - *Plan to Place*

Paul Kronser - *Plan to Place*

Veronica Tam - *Veronica Tam & Associates*

## Meeting Summary

The focus of the 11<sup>th</sup> GPAC meeting was to provide a briefing on housing-related community input and preliminary housing element analysis.

### Welcome

The Spanish interpreter, Maria Galvez, explained how to use the simultaneous interpretation tool on Zoom for attendees who wanted to listen in Spanish. Dave Javid followed by taking roll call attendance for GPAC members.

### General Public Comment

The following public comment was presented at the beginning of the meeting.

- The GPAC needs to be aware that the proposed changes to the IZO layer will impact the work GPAC has been doing. The changes seem to allow City staff to approve more developments in the floodway by subdividing a large lot into smaller lots that are then allowed to develop. GPAC needs to go to the upcoming City Council meeting where this issue will be discussed.

### Project and Staff Updates

Ron Whitmore presented project and staff updates.

The Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles were informed by public input and multiple rounds of revisions and comments from the GPAC. At the February 17<sup>th</sup> GPAC meeting, the GPAC voted to recommend the approval of these Visioning materials. There will still be opportunities for further refinement of these materials as the General Plan Update process continues. These materials were presented to the Planning Commission and Climate Action Commission in March and were met with positive comments and suggestions for further refinement. The Visioning materials will be presented to the City Council on March 21<sup>st</sup>.

Public engagement around the future of the Fairgrounds will occur in Spring 2022, and the site's technical analysis is currently ongoing. There will be a Parking Study Session on March 28<sup>th</sup> focused on how to improve parking and achieve community goals. A Cross-town Connector Workshop and the Sidewalk Gap Closure Inventory will occur in Spring 2022.

Please see the presentation slides and the meeting recording for more information about the project and staff updates.

## GPAC Clarifying Questions

The following are questions and comments from the GPAC following the project and staff updates presentation.

- What is a joint study session and what is the goal?
  - A: It is a joint meeting of the Planning Commission, City Council, and pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee to discuss the existing gaps between the City's parking code and the community's vision of reducing car dependency, in addition to the various approaches the City could take to remedy the gaps. The ultimate goal is to update the parking ordinance, but no decision has to be made at the joint session.
- What is the importance of GPAC involvement with the Housing Element when many steps and sections are mandated by the State?
  - A: Even though there are many parts mandated by the State, the GPAC and the public will have a chance to provide feedback throughout the process, especially on the Element's programs and policies. Input will inform both the Housing Element and the more comprehensive General Plan Update, especially the Land Use Element.

## 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element Update

Please see the presentation slides and the meeting recording for more information.

The Housing Element is a required element of the General Plan that must be updated every 8 years and certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The statutory deadline for this 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element is January 31, 2023. A Housing Element contains two basic components: it must identify adequate housing sites to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and include strategies to advance equitable housing production. To create these two components, five building blocks are used: the Evaluation of 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Programs, Needs Assessment, Constraints Analysis, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) assessment, and the Site Inventory.

The Evaluation of 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Programs is meant to evaluate the progress and continued appropriateness of Housing Element programs. The Needs Assessment analyzes the housing needs of the city and describes the resources available to address these needs. The Constraints Analysis identifies the actual and potential constraints to housing development, such as governmental constraints and nongovernmental constraints (e.g., financing, construction costs, sensitive environmental areas). The purpose of the AFFH is to combat housing discrimination, eliminate racial bias, undo historic patterns of segregation, and lift barriers that restrict access to fair housing choices.

The Site Inventory must demonstrate that the City has adequate housing site capacity to accommodate the city's total RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation) units. Identification of sites on this inventory does not automatically authorize construction, nor does it require the City to build or finance the housing. The inventory is still being prepared, and the final version will include a detailed data table of characteristics of all the sites, the buildout by income category, and the viability of each parcel to build housing.

The community has already provided housing-related input during the Visioning engagement activities (Area Meetings, Pop-ups, Visioning Workshop) and in the 2020 City survey, but there will be opportunities for more community feedback in the upcoming months. There will be a Housing Element 101 Community Workshop on April 7<sup>th</sup>, the consultant team and city staff will be working with the housing focused GPAC working group in the review of the draft element, and once the Public Draft Housing Element is ready, another public workshop will be held.

## GPAC Clarifying Questions

The following are questions and comments from the GPAC following the Housing Element (HE) presentation.

- Who determines the rate of growth of the City and the RHNA units?
  - A: The State government and ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments) make the regional allocations based on financial analysis and trends data. Local governments and county-level representatives are consulted in the development of the RHNA units.
- Since the draft inventory shows the City can accommodate all units through current zoning, does this take away the incentive to upzone and prioritize infill development?
  - A: The inventory does not mandate where housing will be built, and the programs and policies of the Housing Element guide the development of housing. These policies can include up zoning areas of the city, changing land use designations, and more strategies that align with the values and goals of the community.
- What studies does the Needs Assessment look at?
  - A: There are specific data points the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) requires the analysis to include, like demographic data from the American Community Survey (ACS) and the needs of special needs populations (like homeless folks, seniors, families with young children, etc.).
- Does zoning fall under the Constraints Analysis?
  - A: Yes, zoning and permitting processes.
- Are the affordability levels focused on the very low-income level?
  - The State mandates the Housing Element to address the housing needs of people at all income levels, but there is a new extremely low-income level that cities must address.
- To promote housing choice in the goals, does this work towards removing racially exclusive language and connotations from local housing agreements?
  - A: The direction and specifics of the goals are up to the community and can shape the programming language.
  - A: If someone buys a house where an HOA has racial exclusions, State law allows them to be removed in the title change process.
- Where does the (Area Median Income) AMI come from? Also, housing and economic trends have changed a lot from 2019 to now -- does the data reflect these new changes?
  - A: The HE has to use the county-wide AMI, not the local one. The analysis does have to use the most recently available ACS data, but the consultant team does look and incorporate local and current market trends and data points.
- Will there be more opportunity for the GPAC as a whole to give more input?
  - A: Yes, GPAC will be updated and engaged throughout the process. There will also be other public engagement opportunities to provide input.

## Small Group Discussion

The GPAC and members of the public were split into two small groups to discuss the following questions:

- How well do the goals in the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle Housing Element reflect the Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles?
- What characterizes sites where you think future housing should be developed? Why? What densities and heights are appropriate at those sites?
- What policies or programs should the City prioritize to make sure future housing reflects community priorities?

The notes from these discussions are included in the Appendix.

## GPAC Working Groups

The GPAC Working Groups provide an opportunity for GPAC members to collaborate with other knowledgeable and active community members to make topic-specific recommendations in support of the General Plan Update. This work will complement the work of the General Plan team and related City and community-based initiatives. During the February GPAC meeting, GPAC members decided to form the following working groups:

- Climate Action, Resilience, and Sustainability
- Equity (crosscutting across all topics)
- Open Space (and Parks? Or be renamed to Natural-based Systems & Wildlife)
- Mobility
- Sense of Place and Quality of Life
- Economic Development
- Housing.

The Working Groups are self-directed and self-facilitated and at the April 2022 GPAC meeting will share their defined topic niche, initial research questions, concepts that could be explored in the Alternatives process, and topic-specific constraints on future development patterns.

At this meeting, each group provided an update on their progress so far and answers to the following discussion questions.

- How can Working Groups best identify non-GPAC members while keeping the Working Groups representative yet manageable?
- How can Working Groups best complement (rather than duplicate) the work of other City and community-based groups by focusing on recommendations that advance the General Plan Update?
- Since Working Groups will be self-coordinated, what types of support from the General Plan Update team would be most helpful?

Most groups have met at least once and have begun brainstorming the outside organizations they would like to collaborate with. Notes from this discussion can be found in the Appendix.

## Public Comment

The following is a summary of comments received from members of the public during the final round of public comment.

- The neighborhood along Petaluma North and near the Lucky's supermarket has 5 low-income housing projects, lots of struggling businesses, and many vacant storefronts. As the Housing Element is developed, be mindful about not marginalizing and placing all low-income units in solely one area of the city.
- The goals of the Housing Element are so general and could be applied to any city, but the policies and programs discussed in the breakout rooms were better because they were local and relevant to Petaluma.
- The City's ADU policies need to be reviewed, updated, and made more accessible because this member of the public has faced multiple barriers in constructing an ADU, and these barriers likely block others from constructing ADUs and increasing the density of their lots.
- It would be great to have a publicly accessible spreadsheet with the meeting times of all the working groups so that members of the public can drop in.
- Some industrial parks can be redeveloped as mixed-use industrial parks with actual parks and with residential uses. We do not need to build on areas that haven't been built before, such as the Fairgrounds. Many sites were developed badly and can be redone.
- There is an opportunity for the redevelopment of the Lucky's center, but the northern part of Petaluma Blvd is an area that hasn't received much attention and needs to have current open space preserved. As a rural transition area, it is important to preserve wildlife and to connect to other rural transition areas.

## Final GPAC Thoughts

In response to the earlier comment about the IZO, Heather provided more information. The completed floodwall project led to new flood modeling, and FEMA reviewed and adopted new floodway and 100-year floodplain maps. The zoning code says that when the maps are updated, they are adopted by reference into the zoning code. The riverbend project that has been approved by City Council was approved based on the new floodplain FEMA maps. The maps come back as final to the Monday night City Council meeting.

There were various comments and considerations brought up at the end of the meeting by GPAC members:

- Need to be aware of how we are encouraging the use of renewables under Goal 10 of the Housing Element.
- There is interest in learning more about the "no residential density controls" strategy Santa Rosa is considering.
  - A: It is a feature of form-based codes that do not have an upper limit to density.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:15 PM.

# Appendix

## Small Group Discussion Notes

In two breakout groups, GPAC members were asked the following questions:

- How well do the goals in the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle Housing Element reflect the Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles?
- What characterizes sites where you think future housing should be developed? Why? What densities and heights are appropriate at those sites?
- What policies or programs should the City prioritize to make sure future housing reflects community priorities?

The first question only received one comment, and it was specific to Goal 3: Minimize constraints on housing development to expedite construction and lower development costs

- Comment: What are the impacts going to be? What will be the percentage increase in population? What will be the impact on water? What due diligence are we going to do to anticipate and mitigate the impacts of expedited housing construction?

The table below has the unedited notes from both small group discussions, and the maps below show the place-based comments given during the discussions.

### Transcription of Small Group Discussion Notes

<b>What characterizes sites where you think future housing should be developed? Why? What densities and heights are appropriate at those sites?</b>	<b>What policies or programs should the City prioritize to make sure future housing reflects community priorities?</b>
<p>Avoid Sensitive Environments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The way we are going about this is backward - should be discussing all environmental features, wetlands, sensitive areas and should have all available and overlay housing opportunities over this. Relationship between open space, clean air, and water for everyone.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A: Steps around review/analyzing sites - these are being taken into consideration and currently identified sites currently allow residential. City can prioritize.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Near Infrastructure and Transit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider increasing developer fees to use for low market-rate housing, and consider increase the % of low-income housing they must provide (currently 15% for certain projects)</li> <li>• Current City fees are applied per unit, difficult to encourage smaller units because fees are the same regardless of size and number of units being developed</li> </ul>



- critical to have sites near existing infrastructure, readily available to transit

#### Redevelop Some Commercial Centers to Add Housing

- Old Lucky's (Petaluma Blvd. north). - a lot of opportunities, would that have to be rezoned? Should be looking at shopping centers to get more density and Fairgrounds has a crossing east to west along with services. We should also look for increased density around rail/transit and increase height/density. Scott Property is not within City limits but would give more housing

#### Faith Institutions

- Jessie - services needed in the fairground area but key for transit and walkability. Faith-based sites, opportunities that could be transformed into housing opportunity sites - space next to Unitarian - a huge lot (possibly owned by City?). Densify single story bldgs. with parking, stagger daytime use with nighttime use. More strategic with mixed-use around downtown.
  - A: State law makes the inclusion of religious sites or schools.

#### Help Make Completed Neighborhoods with Diverse Housing Types

- small sites in older neighborhoods can be complete neighborhoods if they add other types of residential uses

#### Prioritize Higher, Denser Housing Downtown and on Corridors

- 5 stories, R-4 types that could be increased with the state density bonus in the downtown/transit corridors (or further), have some feathering out from the core
- Downtown has small businesses that could close soon, is there any way to survey possible locations that are in transition and be identified for new housing/dense usage? A-- in existing downtown zoning, there is much more flexibility. can keep or expand this with GP alts/land use designations

#### Transitions to New Types should not be Abrupt

- no neighborhood should be exempt from change, but no neighborhood should be subject to sudden change

#### Transform Declining Neighborhoods

- less and larger pays out more than more and smaller, want to fit that and incentivize more, smaller units that are affordable - don't charge fees per unit or a way that doesn't penalize density? change in fee structure can be included as policy/program in HE

- not just infill, the older homes near the freeway that are declining - is there a group of houses that could be transformed into larger buildings, affordable housing? A- many of these neighborhoods are zoned for lower densities, are there programs that could encourage the collection of smaller lots into a bigger one, while also updating the land use designations and reimagining their use to affect change
- would be helpful to have clear direction on how to help identify specific, smaller sites

#### North Petaluma Blvd Challenges

- North Petaluma Blvd. on west side of it outside UGB - how can we work with the county to modify any of that area to increase housing/density? how can we take the initiative and be proactive about identifying sites to get the convo going instead of waiting for the county to take the first step A-- can't include county sites in inventory unless there is an active plan to annex/develop them. do get a notification if the county wants to rezone/develop, and any of these would need to be annexed, but do have to wait for the property owners

#### Approach to Fairgrounds

- Are the fairgrounds off-limits?
  - A: We can discuss the fairgrounds - a distinction between HEU and General Plan. Might have to do some re-zoning to get HEU certified, but now we can find enough already zoned for housing. For Fairgrounds - City could decide to allow residential or not. If we do allow, EIR would have to be completed. If done in GP process, we would have to re-do the zoning.

#### Other

- taking off sites from the inventory (and if they are currently zoned for residential) doesn't mean that no res development could/would happen. but the land use/alts discussion can change that, just not this inventory
- removing the housing from this map hopefully means that it will not instead be replaced with commercial

## Miro Board Comments – Group 1

### What characterizes sites where you think future housing should be developed? Why? What densities and heights are appropriate at those sites?

- critical to have sites near existing infrastructure, readily available to transit
- small sites in older neighborhoods can be complete neighborhoods if they add other type of residential uses
- removing housing from this map hopefully means that it will not instead be replaced with commercial
- 5 stories, R-4 types that could be increased with the state density bonus in the downtown/transit corridors (or further), have some feathering out from the core
- no neighborhood should be exempt from change but no neighborhood should be subject to sudden change
- not just infill, the older homes near freeway that are declining - is there a group of houses that could be transformed into larger buildings, affordable housing? A- many of these neighborhoods are zoned for lower densities, are there programs that could encourage the collection of smaller lots into a bigger one, while also updating the land use designations and reimagining their use to affect change
- downtown has small businesses that could close soon, is there any way to do a survey of possible locations that are in transition and be identified for new housing/dense usage? A-- in existing downtown zoning, there is much more flexibility. can keep or expand this with GP alts/land use designations

- taking off sites from the inventory (and if they are currently zoned for residential) doesn't mean that no res development could/would happen. but the land use/alts discussion can change that, just not this inventory
- would be helpful to have clear direction on how to help identify specific, smaller sites
- north petaluma blvd on west side of it outside UGB - how can we work with county to modify any of that area to increase housing/density? how can we take the initiative and be proactive about identifying sites to get the convo going instead of waiting for the county to take the first step A-- can't include county sites in inventory unless there is an active plan to annex/develop them. do get notification if county wants to rezone/develop, and any of these would need to be annexed, but do have to wait for the property owners

### What policies or programs should the City prioritize to make sure future housing reflects community priorities?

- consider increasing developer fees to use for low market rate housing, and consider increase the % of low income housing they must provide (currently 15% for certain projects)
- Current City fees are applied per unit, difficult to encourage smaller units because fees are the same regardless of size and amount of units being developed
- less and larger pays out more than more and smaller, want to fit that and incentivize more, smaller units that are affordable - don't charge fees per unit or a way that doesn't penalize density? change in fee structure can be included as policy/program in HE

### Other Comments on Miro Board

- office building owner that is interested in transitioning to housing, and a vacant parcel across from building, are currently zoned for business – would need that zoning change
- R-4 type of zoning, and should build on state density bonus in downtown core, feathering out from downtown to adjacent areas

## Miro Board Comments – Group 2

### What characterizes sites where you think future housing should be developed? Why? What densities and heights are appropriate at those sites?

- Way we are going about this is backwards - should be discussing all environmental features, wetlands, sensitive areas and should have that all available and overlay housing opportunities over this. Relationship between open space, clean air and water for everyone.
  - A: Steps around review/analyzing sites - these are being taken into consideration and current identified sites currently allow residential. City can prioritize.
- Janice - Help to have an overlay. Is the fairgrounds off limits?
  - A: We can discuss the fairgrounds - distinction between HEU and General Plan. Might have to do some re-zoning to get HEU certified, but now we can find enough already zoned for housing. For Fairgrounds - City could decide to allow residential or not. If we do allow, and EIR would have to be completed. If done in GP process, we would have to re-do the zoning.
  - Old Lucky's (Petaluma Blvd. north). - lot of opportunities, would that have to be rezoned? Should be looking at shopping centers to get more density and Fairgrounds has a crossing east to west along with services. We should also look for increased density around rail/transit and increase height/density. Scott Property not within City limits, but would give more housing
- Jessie - services needed in the fairground area but key for transit and walkability. Faith based sites, opportunities that could be transformed into housing opportunity sites - space next to Unitarian - huge lot (possibly owned by City?). Density single story bldgs. with parking, stagger day time use with night time use. More strategic with mixed use around downtown.
  - A: State law makes inclusion of religious sites or schools.

- Bill R - Intensification needed but avoid green space. Avoid any re-zoning for inventory, therefore not talking about re-zones. Will we have another opportunity to visit housing outside of HEU?
  - A: Not trying to avoid CEQA, but if we wont have to re-zone it won't trigger EIR. This is the beginning of the conversation. Don't see the site inventory as the will of the community, but where it currently is allowed more so of the previous priorities for housing. Robust outreach for HEU in the future. Input received will be used for both the GP and HEU process.
  - Weight HEU process has - identify priority sites currently zoned for residential but aren't the priority of the community or will there other opportunities/priorities.
- Ali Gaylord - good sites close to transit that meet high quality transit in state program - links to mobility element of the general plan. Agree on faith based sites. N. McDowell site - fantastic affordable housing site. Opportunity sites on west side. Affordable housing development.
- Lisa - Water consumption - take all places for housing where there is nature deficit. Petaluma has always been a place where you could have that interaction with nature in the town and destroying what we have left. Cherish and care about it.
- Roberto - Goal 3:

- dense as reasonably possible near transit, especially in Central Petaluma
- would love to see 5 or maybe even 6 story developments near current and future SMART stations
- feel a need to overcorrect given how bad the affordability crisis has gotten
- want to see parking lots redeveloped
- one site in particular, the lot where Target etc are-which, if I recall correctly, is mixed use and was supposed to contain housing but has none to speak of

<p>Goal 3: Minimize constraints on housing development to expedite construction and lower development costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the impacts going to be, if we build here - what increase percentage is that with and impact of water. What due diligence are we going to.</li> </ul>
---	---

## Working Groups Discussion Notes

Housing	Open Space	Equity	Economic Development	Mobility	Climate Action	Sense of place and quality of life
<b>General Updates</b>						
have provided input to staff on reaching out to developers and non-profits	have a lot of GP sections that this topic, and new ideas, could apply to		Dream big - list of priorities	Have met twice, meeting 1st and 3rd Tuesday of every month	could also focus on post-disaster planning, plug that into the discussion of where to build housing	Have not met yet
Goals: review HE, provide policy-program input as needed	putting together a wish list and topic areas of town that are important in this context		Petaluma with a place all can live in	Areas of possible focus: too many - will begin prioritizing in next meeting	The next meeting is on April 6th	
providing insight to the alts and housing sites, and just addressing housing overall						
<b>Question 1: How can working groups best identify non-GPAC members while keeping the Working Groups representative yet manageable?</b>						
Working to identify other non-GPAC members	opportunities for transition for climate action, many orgs interested in this topic -- may have 2 meetings a month, as an open meeting to get as many contributors as possible, looking for submissions in written form	Have started looking at the resources the city has used for outreach but also looking at how to create new and expanded relationships (Latinx Language Center, homeless action orgs, etc.)	Start our process with 1-1's from there met via zoom and came up with co-coordinators. Group email for contacts, and bi-weekly meetings on Mondays.	List of folks to bring into the process		

Housing	Open Space	Equity	Economic Development	Mobility	Climate Action	Sense of place and quality of life
	going to reach out to the water consortium (?) to get their input as well	looking to connect with organizations that have established strategies for expanding outreach and community relationships	came up with an initial list of stakeholders but need to define outreach process	Looking for people as resources - written input.		
			collaboration with workers on economic transitions on creating green jobs	Built connections with other committees		
<b>Question 2: How can working groups best complement (rather than duplicate) the work of other City and community-based groups by focusing on recommendations that advance the General Plan Update?</b>						
Housing	Open Space	Equity	Economic Development	Mobility	Climate Action	Sense of place and quality of life
				avoiding overlap: talking to PBAC, Transit committee, being aware of what other orgs are doing	want to be a conduit for the many other climate groups in Petaluma for providing input for the GP -had a 3-hour meeting with many groups to get up to speed on what they are all working on	
<b>Question 3: Since working groups will be self-coordinated, what types of support from the General Plan Update Team would be most helpful?</b>						
Housing	Open Space	Equity	Economic Development	Mobility	Climate Action	Sense of place and quality of life

Housing	Open Space	Equity	Economic Development	Mobility	Climate Action	Sense of place and quality of life
	is the GP going to be tweaked from the old one or completely revamped? it can change how the group operates			Ask the right questions to get us focused	CAP doing a lot of work, some direction or questions to focus on	
				want the consultant team to ask/give questions that can lead the group to think harder and lead the direction of their conversations		