

GPAC Meeting Summary

April 21, 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/.

Agenda

- Welcome
- General Public Comment
- Project and Staff Updates
- Housing Workshop Presentation, Public Comment, and GPAC Discussion
- "What If" Scenario Presentation, Public Comment, and GPAC Discussion
- GPAC Working Groups Discussion
- Final GPAC Thoughts

Attendance

There were 14 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 | 8. Janice Cader Thompson |
| 2. Yensi Jacobo | 9. Bill Wolpert |
| 3. Roger Leventhal | 10. Phil Boyle |
| 4. Iliana Inzunza Madrigal | 11. Ali Gaylord |
| 5. Kris Rebillot | 12. Mary Dooley |
| 6. John Shribbs | 13. Delia Diaz |
| 7. Joshua Riley Simmons | 14. Roberto Rosila Mares |

The following GPAC members were absent:

1. Stephanie Blake
2. Sierra Downey
3. Jessie Feller
4. Bill Rinehart
5. Erin Chmielewski

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

City of Petaluma:

Heather Hines – Interim 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*

Maria Galvez and Monica Aparicio – *Spanish Interpreters*

Consultant Team:

Ron Whitmore - *Raimi + Associates*

Michelle Hernandez - *Raimi + Associates*

Troy Reinhalter - *Raimi + Associates*

Dave Javid - *Plan to Place*

Meeting Summary

The focus of the 12th GPAC meeting was to discuss the community input during the April 7th Housing Element Workshop, discuss the initial “What If” Scenarios, and discuss the GPAC Working Groups’ progress to date.

Opening

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.

- Through an ordinance, the City could install its own broadband to all homes and businesses, such as Sea Ranch’s broadband network. Can this be included in the General Plan, and have it be a part of infrastructure updates? The 2018 wireless ordinance is up for potential changes and wants to know if the GPAC is doing any changes to codifying the ordinance or any of the changes.
- How do private landowners fit into this housing conversation? If it’s about incentivization, need to bring them in and see what their thoughts are about this, and engage them to consider the residential switch. Also, there are some other infrastructure considerations needed to support more housing (such as hospitals).

Project and Staff Updates

Christina Paul presented project and staff updates.

The Community Outreach and Engagement Plan for the Fairgrounds was approved by City Council on February 28th. It includes two simultaneous engagement strategies: a lottery-selected panel and broader community outreach. The Lottery-Selected Panel will be led by Healthy Democracy and will involve 36 Petalumens that are representative of the community’s demographics. The panel will provide recommendations for the future of the site to City Council for consideration and will begin meeting on May 13th. The broader community outreach will capture input from members of the community through surveys, workshops, and a digital storytelling exhibit.

The Parking Study Session on March 28th focused on off-street private parking. City Council, Planning Commission, and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee were in attendance and voiced strong

support for the consideration of parking innovations. There will be other related study sessions in the future that are focused on public parking and public transportation.

The Climate Action & Adaptation Plan is concurrently being worked on, and the team is preparing GHG reduction strategies, the Plan outline, an implementation schedule, and a near-term completion schedule.

The Flood & Sea Level Rise modeling is underway, and staff have met with the West Consultants team to review preliminary flood model results. The focus in May will be on sea-level rise modeling with West Consultants and Sherwood Engineers.

Please see the presentation slides and the meeting recording for more information about the project and staff updates. GPAC members did not ask any clarifying questions on these topics.

Housing Element Workshop Summary

From an educational perspective, the April 7th workshop was meant to provide an overview of the Housing Element's purpose, components, and process; explain the Housing Element's relationship to the General Plan Update; educate the community about housing issues and programs; and provide an update on the sites inventory. Most importantly, the purpose of the workshop was to gather community input on Petaluma's housing strengths and challenges, appropriate heights for future housing development, and policies, programs, and actions needed to achieve community housing priorities. The input was received through live polling and small group discussion.

Please see the presentation slides, the Housing Workshop Summary, and the meeting recording for more information about the workshop.

Public Comment

The following are public comments provided by members of the public following the presentation.

- What does the implementation look like, especially with existing private landowners? If McDowell is redeveloped, there are owners of the many business parks - how do you incentivize and convince them to support conversion to residential? Can the City limit the amount of land or units that large corporations own within the city?
- What is the cycle for each element and what goes into them? Is the General Plan planning for 3 more HE cycles? Are the cycles decided by state law?

GPAC Discussion

The following are questions and comments from the GPAC following the presentation.

- There have been new, large housing structures going up in town - are we catching up with affordable housing, considering these new projects? GPAC needs some more details about where the housing projects are, how many units are affordable, and the affordability levels of each.
- Protecting viewsheds: There is an inherent conflict between increasing heights and protecting viewsheds, but wouldn't want to see a tall, affordable housing building be stopped by a wealthy property owner with the "concern" of viewshed obstruction.

- Given that 50% of concerns expressed at the workshop were about price and affordability, there should be a deep dive discussion about how affordability will be addressed and what levels are included.
- For the dense units in Downtown, how are we planning to accommodate traffic and other possible issues?
- Curious about the water plan release – Will it be considered for the Housing Element? Or will it be delivered before HE?
- RHNA units: Are we looking at supplementary information on strengths & weaknesses, like can we accommodate that number of units with the current infrastructure?
- Demographic tracking questions: could divide up the over 100k income level to get more granular demographic results
- ADU: How are they being approved? Some that have been approved have not been designed or placed appropriately. There needs to be more rules and regulations for small lots (ex. of a landlord renting out a single-family house and then landlord adding an ADU in the small backyard, within 4 ft of the back windows).
- Should reach out to all types of groups (landlords, small property owners, tenant groups) to get a balanced view on housing issues and potential solutions.
- Need to be thoughtful about the placement of housing in sea level rise areas
- Do we know what the vacancy rate is for single-family homes and multi-family buildings? How many actual homes are owned by corporations? This is a problem, but does it exist here? In Corte Madera, ADUs have been very successful in creating more housing options
- ADU: Allowing composting toilets and pre-installed electrical lines can lead them to have a cheaper footprint. We could also think about allowing alternative housing structures (geo-domes, yurts, etc.) where needed.
- There will be more electricity needed for new housing and more outlets for electric vehicles. The city needs to plan for these infrastructure needs within housing and need to plan for the electric transportation/mobility needs.

What If Scenarios

To inform the development of the Land Use Alternatives, the planning team has been preparing “What If Scenarios” modeling. This involves testing concepts and ideas for hypothetical future settlement patterns at a citywide scale by comparing land use mixes and densities. In contrast, the Alternatives are meant to compare three implementable settlement patterns that are focused on the Areas of Discussion and involve land use mixes, transportation considerations, climate adaptation strategies, and other physical planning components.

The What If Scenarios were created in UrbanFootprint and were based on the recently adopted Vision, Pillars, and Principles and built upon previous environmental constraints mapping and assumed climate adaptation strategies. Each scenario tested new “place types” and building heights that are consistent with the community input heard at the Housing Workshop. Those place types were applied in different locations to prepare four initial scenarios that accommodate projected residential growth: “Focus on the Core,” “Focus on Corridors,” “Focus on the Corona SMART TOD,” and “Expand into the UGB.” Built-in UrbanFootprint analysis modules were then used to compare scenario outcomes, including land consumption, development in high hazard areas, walk access to amenities, and VMT.

Please see the presentation slides and the meeting recording for more information about the inputs that went into the scenarios testing.

GPAC Clarifying Questions

- This presentation made them feel well-grounded in the process. There is an understanding of the differences between the what-if scenarios and the alternatives (a set of alternatives is created and then one is selected).
- These units aren't 1:1 with population and vehicle increase, it would be cool to see a satellite image of how parking would work in that area, where overflow might go? Having a visual would be helpful to communicate the immediate impacts of unit increases.
- There was an appreciation for the base map containing hazards and environmental concerns since it will impact all the future development. The VMT average was for the city and when represented that way, the change will be small, but it would be more impactful to show the VMT per household in the scenarios and alternatives, which would be more drastic than the city average.
- Very helpful to see it in UF, visuals get you thinking, the constraints map was an excellent start to the process & we want to get the conservation and hazards right. The open space working group wants to see the map to confirm the environmental base layers.

Public Comment

- In the scenario maps, where are the housing goals coming from? Is it just from RHNA or larger goals decided through the GPAC? Does the GPAC see Petaluma staying the same size or becoming larger? With the City considering the question of expansion, what limitations exist?
- What data set is being used for sea-level rise and groundwater reservoir rise modeling?
- There is support for the base layer being the natural environment and hazards since this General Plan must approach development from this environmental perspective. Susan Kirks has the latest data on wildlife corridors in Petaluma Valley that will show the importance of wildlife corridors going through Petaluma and could be included in the mapping process.
- Another member of the public supports the ecological base layer mapping. Some corridors that were on the map were very close to the river, want to know if that will be adjusted with the results that come out of the other floodplain and sea-level rise mapping the City is conducting.

Small Group Discussion

The GPAC and members of the public were split into two small groups to discuss the following questions. The themes of the discussion are summarized below each question. The notetaker's "raw" notes from these discussions are included in the Appendix.

Considering your Working Group(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?

- The Planning Team should coordinate with the Open Space Working Group to confirm constraints mapping, including access and corridors for wildlife within the city (e.g., along waterways).

- The watershed, wetlands, and local hydrology should be understood as a constraint.
- There is a significant trade-off between intensified development downtown and in the city core and avoiding the impacts of sea level rise.
- Consider mobility and access constraints.

What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns? Considering your Working Group(s): What concepts could be explored or tested?

- Prepare a build-out analysis for comparison to existing conditions and scenarios.
- Is it possible to consider scenarios/alternatives for a series of incremental phases of population growth and then build phased, performance-based policies into the General Plan?
- Consider place types that include multi-generational housing or co-housing.
- Consider both vertical and horizontal mixed-use, especially for adaptive reuse of existing commercial centers and for the first floor of multi-story developments.
- Can the metrics analysis be done at a variety of scales to distinguish results in areas across the city (e.g., downtown vs. eastside residential)?
- Consider as part of alternatives (i.e., beyond the land use-focused limitations of UrbanFootprint):
 - Design, look, feel, the culture of a place – the sense of place.
 - A just transition and what it means for employment and shifts in non-residential uses.
 - Non-residential development generally.
- Other ideas not specifically related to scenarios and alternatives:
 - Consider regulatory changes to avoid future mixed-use development in name only and to increase the likelihood of development truly reflecting community priorities (e.g., accessible neighborhood centers of public and private services).
 - Accommodate all body/ability types in housing, employment, and public spaces to reduce spatial inequalities
 - Advance a research/innovation center for both professional and economic development.

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
- Equity and Intersectional Justice
- Open Space and Natural Resources
- Mobility
- Sense of Place and Quality of Life
- Economic Development

- Housing

The Working Groups are self-directed and self-facilitated. At this meeting, each group provided an update on their progress so far and answers to the following discussion questions.

- What is going well, and what is going not-so-well?
- 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?
- Which Working Group(s) could be ready to lead a GPAC discussion of your topic at the May 19 meeting?

Notes from this discussion can be found in the Appendix.

Final GPAC Thoughts

A GPAC member provided a final comment.

- If working groups want more participation from members of the community, there needs to be better outreach about what each working group is doing and when they are meeting. If it is better publicized, working groups can get more information and ideas from the public.

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:

- What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns?
- Considering your Working Group(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?
- Considering your Working Group(s): What concepts could be explored or tested?

The table below has the unedited notes from both small group discussions.

Transcription of Small Group Discussion Notes

What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What concepts could be explored or tested?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the scenario the open space working group is interested in is a mapping approach bringing together natural wildlife corridors to showcase the larger network/system and create a constraints map - built as a starting point as a land-use scenario (can include hazards and privately owned lands) for the scenario/alts building • research or innovation center to bring in sponsorship and other types of jobs/internships, especially to expand opportunities for JC, K-12 students • spaces: home, work, the city shared -- consider spatial inequalities, there are many barriers to making the city inviting and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLR - do we want to put more development that will have to deal with later? things will change and how will we acknowledge and react to it • maybe the UGB needs to be alterable as things/current conditions change (ex. SLR, shoreline changes) • UGB changes should be a last resort, infill development as priority • constraint: watershed, water movement thru town, wetlands, many already stated by open space group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • jobs for Petaluma residents: how do we check that? how do you know what that will look like? A- do have econ consultants on the team, ECRs do have some jobs-housing-commute patterns data. will continue exploring in the GPU process • adding in alternatives to retail jobs - changing the retail on the 1st-floor idea, replacing with other uses and job possibilities • could develop what-if scenario based on job

What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What concepts could be explored or tested?
<p>accessible to everyone with all kinds of bodies and have a right to use and be in public spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to understand that urban life isn't just about humans, have real access to rivers, parks, open spaces with multiple methods of reaching those spaces • there are fragmented wildlife corridors, there are many trade-offs that the city has to take on - there aren't any initial constraints everything should be tied to since there are so many issues to consider but could be expanded to include multiple hazards (like SLR) and have a balanced approach • what is a wildlife corridor that exists in Petaluma that is broken/disrupted and could impact the development of Petaluma right now? 101 and underpass development are example blockades (for all living things, including humans) • laying out the constraints and going from there in scenario development (considering all types of human-caused disruptions, not just impacts on wildlife, but considering it all) • Constraints about mobility and access to resources • Think about Mixed-use horizontally and vertically, especially considering some of the challenges to filling mixed-use on the first floor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • would moving the UGB be a way to protect certain natural areas, or altering it to be beneficial for the enviro and humans? • mobility: corridor development, to what extent can we move people from cars to transit? the biggest challenge and schools are a large constraint. limit ourselves from solving this mode shift issue • Looking at the quality and sense of place and how that works for different communities and different realities • How do we deal or support a just transition with changing job patterns? • Consider business parks and light industry - how are these things zoned now? Could they support growth in industries and changes as we deal with climate goals? Glad to hear that we have not talked about adding housing to these areas because they are far from resources 	<p>numbers/increases (intensity of jobs)</p>

What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What concepts could be explored or tested?
<p>- beyond the 4 floors with commercial uses on the first floor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uplift the areas of town that are mixed-use in name only - referring to this comment from Ali • Important to define what is mixed-use, and consider what you can do to support the type of development you want near the resources you want like parks, and shopping? (example of Home Depot wanting to take over the K-Mart Site) • It seems like the model considers the number of units, VMT, - we need to look beyond and consider challenges of feel, culture, and neighbor perspectives • Consider the steps in this - Population growth is stabilizing in CA, so Petaluma could grow or not, but we need to be particular about this reacting to changing demographic realities - consider all the scenarios and the order - Phasing in steps to consider these realities • In the downtown Area, SLR will impact some of those potential development • Wildlife corridors are slightly different than models - consider different animals who use those, so we need to make sure to capture that richness and the diversity around rivers and creeks especially • Inspiring - What If Questions • Question - what are the needs for housing? Has it been done? 		

What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?	Considering your Working Group(s): What concepts could be explored or tested?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Council meeting - Multiple families and multigenerational families live in one dwelling, how can we accommodate these needs? How do we consider the type of development like small amounts of builds near to each other - tiny villages? Consider creative ways of offering this. • Who knows what families or housing are going to look like in 100 years? • We need to have some out-of-the-box conditions that allow us to change things up. • The scenario where we grow the city to the absolute maximum and then move back. That way we can consider where we can place those jobs and people very far in the future to accommodate jobs, schools, services, and other resources? decide if we want to go there and then look at how we disperse these resources strategically. What is the maximum population density? What does it look like to us? 100 Year plan • Two methods of analysis - downtown, and distribution, so consider what happens if housing is dispersed, what happens? Or if everything is downtown, would the problems downtown limit access to people who do not live there? What would be the impacts if you disperse downtown? 		

Miro Board Comments – Group 1

What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns?

- the scenario the open space working group is interested in is a mapping approach bringing together natural wildlife corridors to showcase the larger network/system and create a constraints map - built as a starting point as a land use scenario (can include hazards and privately owned lands) for the scenario/alts building
- research or innovation center to bring in sponsorship and other types of jobs/internships, especially to expand opportunities for JC, K-12 students
- spaces: home, work, city shared -- consider spatial inequalities, there are many barriers to making the city inviting and accessible to everyone with all kinds of bodies and have a right to use and be in public spaces.
- need to understand that urban life isn't just about humans, have real access to rivers, parks, open spaces with multiple methods of reaching those spaces
- there are fragmented wildlife corridors, there are many trade-offs that the city has to take on - there aren't any initial constraints everything should be tied to since there are so many issues to consider, but could be expanded to include multiple hazards (like SLR) and have a balanced approach
- what is a wildlife corridor that exists in petaluma that is broken/disrupted and could impact the development of petaluma right now? 101 and underpass development are example blockades (for all living things, including humans)
- laying out the constraints and going from there in scenario development (considering all types of human caused disruptions, not just impacts on wildlife, but considering it all)

Considering your Working Group topic(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?

- SLR - do we want to put more development that will have to deal with later? things will change and how will we acknowledge and react to it
- maybe the UGB needs to be alterable as things/current conditions change (ex. SLR, shoreline changes)
- UGB changes should be a last resort, infill development as priority
 - constraint: watershed, water movement thru town, wetlands, many already stated by open space group
- would moving the UGB be a way to protect certain natural areas, or altering it to be beneficial for the enviro and humans?
- mobility: corridor development, to what extent can we move people from cars to transit? the biggest challenge and schools are a large constraint. limit ourselves from solving this mode shift issue
-

Considering your Working Group topic(s): What concepts could be explored or tested?

- jobs for petaluma residents: how do we check that? how do you know what that will look like? A- do have econ consultants on the team, ECRs do have some jobs-housing-commute patterns data. will continue exploring in the GPU process
 - adding in alternatives to retail jobs - changing the retail on 1st floor idea, replacing with other uses and job possibilities
 - could develop what-if scenario based on job numbers/increases (intensity of jobs)
 -

Miro Board Comments – Group 2

What other land use scenarios might we explore? How else might we achieve the community vision through future development patterns?

- Constraints about mobility and access to resources
- Think about Mixed-use horizontally and vertically, especially consider some of the challenges to filling mixed use on the first floor - beyond the 4 floor with commercial on the first floor.
- Uplift the areas of town that are mixed- use in name only - referring to this comment from Ali
- Important to define what is mixed use, and consider what you can do to support the type of development you want near the resources you want like parks, shopping? (example of Home Depot wanting to take over the K-Mart Site)
- It seems like the model considers Number of units, VMT, - we need to look beyond and consider challenges of feel, culture, and neighbor perspectives
- Consider the steps in this - Population growth is stabilizing in CA, so Petaluma could grow or not, but we need to be particular about this reacting to changing demographic realities - consider all the scenarios and the order - Phasing in steps to consider these realities
- In the downtown Area, SLR will impact some of those potential development
- Wildlife corridors are slightly different than models - consider different animals who use those, so we need to make sure to capture that richness and the diversity around rivers and creeks especially

- Question - what are the needs for housing? Has it been done?
- City Council meeting - Multiple families and multigenerational families live in one dwelling, how can we accommodate these needs? How do we consider the type of development like small amounts of builds near to each other - tiny villages. Consider creative ways of offering this.
- Who knows what families or housing is going to look like in 100 years?
- We need to have some out of the box conditions that allow us to change things up?
- Scenario where we grow the city to the absolute maximum and then move back. That way consider where we can place those jobs and people very far in the future to accommodate jobs, schools, services, and other resources? decide if we want to go there and then look at how we disperse these resources strategically. What is the maximum population density? What does it look like to us? 100 Year plan
- Two methods of analysis - downtown and distribution, so consider what happens if housing is dispersed, what happens? Or if everything is downtown, would the problems in downtown limit access of people who do not live there? What would be the impacts if you disperse on downtown?

Considering your Working Group topic(s): What are the constraints on future development patterns?

- Looking at the quality and sense of place and how that works for different communities and different realities
- How do we deal or support a just transition with changing job patterns?
- Consider business parks and light industry - how are these things zoned now? Could they support growth in industries and changes as we deal with climate goals? Glad to hear that we have not talked about adding housing to these areas because they are far from resources

Working Groups Discussion Notes

Housing	Open Space	Equity and Intersectional Justice	Economic Development	Mobility	Climate Action	Sense of Place and Quality of Life
General Updates						
Have identified community-based groups to partner with, housing topics and barriers to explore, and potential strategies to be included in the GP	A key idea was having a natural constraints map as the base map for testing alternatives and scenarios – happy that the planning team is a step ahead and already implementing this	Believe that intersectional justice needs to be considered in the whole GP process and be throughout the Plan	Talking to Ingrid from the City to understand where economic development stands now and how the ideas that they have can be developed into concrete actions		Have reached out to the Climate Action Committee and multiple groups involved in climate work in Petaluma to bring them all together in one meeting	
		We will be discussing the best terminology to have in the general plan (ex. Latinx vs Latine vs Latino/a) since some are constantly changing			Realized that the CAC is mostly about mitigation and GP is about land use/adaptation	
What is going well, and what is going not-so-well?						
Need guidance from the City on what deliverables are wanted from the group	Finding a time to meet has been difficult but have had excellent email communication			Have had productive meetings but mobility is such a broad topic, so they have broken it up into smaller topics per person	Group has created many draft goals, policies, guidance but doesn't want to jump ahead at the moment	Group has identified Petaluma characteristics – “what makes Petaluma, Petaluma”
	Need guidance on timeframe (the					Next steps: identifying

Housing	Open Space	Equity and Intersectional Justice	Economic Development	Mobility	Climate Action	Sense of Place and Quality of Life
	engagement steps they have in the process may take longer than a month)					which qualities we want to strengthen or add
How can working groups best identify non-GPAC members while keeping the Working Groups representative yet manageable?						
	Have found 35 stakeholders and invited them to their meeting (less than 10 attended but all were engaged)			Have identified multiple groups and contacts, will be hearing their ideas and bringing them together to avoid duplication		
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?						
	Want to hear more ideas from stakeholders, especially about controversial spaces in town, and come up with possible strategies	Hope to get in contact with more community groups and carry forth the missions and concerns of different communities in different parts of the GP				
Which working groups could be ready to lead a GPAC discussion of your topic at the May 19 meeting?						
	No, maybe later			Not ready for leading a discussion in May, possibly June		