



ReLeaf Petaluma

City Council Public Comment, In Recognition of Arbor Day

Monday, April 8, 2024

ReLeaf is very pleased to be receiving the Arbor Day award from the Petaluma City Council. Thank you. It means so much to us to know our efforts are appreciated and valued. We couldn't have achieved this honor without the help and guidance of the City Council and Staff who have enabled ReLeaf's work over the past three and a half years. We would like to thank a few people who have been so helpful along the way.

First, we must thank *Cindy Chong*, who guided and inspired us before we even became an organization, and reminded us as part of our reach for excellence to keep focused, resist bright and shiny ideas and ventures that distract from our goals, be realistic about our capabilities and plan for the long term.

We thank *Drew Halter* for his wisdom, leadership, vision, and proactive assistance. He and *Delana Bradford*, have helped us navigate our work with the City, and Drew provided key ideas and inspiration for the concept development of the USDA-Forest Service Petaluma Canopy Grant. ReLeaf could not have performed as we have without the backing of the entire Recreation and Parks group, including its Commission and Tree Advisory Committee.

We thank *Peggy Flynn's* City Manager's office for faith and support of our mission to build a greater and healthier tree canopy throughout the City. In particular *Patrick Carter* has supported our efforts from the earliest days, and was simply essential in the landing of the \$1M Petaluma Canopy grant.

We also thank *Ken Eichstadt*, Engineer in Public Works, *Ingrid Alverde*, Director of Economic Development, *Jeffery Bart* in Parks, and *Jamieson Bunn*, Communications Program Manager for interrupting their normal duties and squeezing in time to help us help the trees.

Lastly, we recognize with deep appreciation *Heather Hines'* excellent work on a very challenging, year-long assignment of writing the new Tree Protection Ordinance.

We look forward to working together with the City staff and Council again this year. Thank you so much.

From: [Maureen Gottschall](#)
To: [Kevin McDonnell](#)
Cc: [Barnacle, Brian](#); [Mike Gottschall](#); [Karen Nau](#); [John Shribbs](#); [Peggy Flynn](#); [Bjorn Gripenburg](#); -- [City Council](#); [Mike Healy](#); [Dennis Pocekay](#); jcarderthompson@cityofpetaluma.org
Subject: Re: Statement - D Street Bike Lane Meeting April 8, 2024
Date: Friday, April 12, 2024 12:54:17 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Hi Kevin and all Councilpersons.

Thank you for reaching out. A special thank you to John Shribbs for meeting Mike and I today at our home.

This is not a matter of simply winning or losing. Rather, it pertains to the City Council failing to fulfill their responsibilities before making decisions that directly impact the lives of their constituents. It is an integral part of their job to conduct thorough research and analysis.

As previously mentioned, the study used by the City Council for voting purposes fell significantly below the standards required for a project of this scope. Council members are citing parking data on D Street from a single source, a city staff member and a friend, who conducted only three counts in March. It should be noted that some schools were on break during that month, potentially skewing the results. This study barely scratched the surface of D Street's parking situation. In fact, I personally conducted a count today and found 33% usage of the parking spots between Sunnyslope and 8th Street.

We are requesting a pause on the implementation of the bike lane. It is crucial that an independent third party, consisting of experts in the field, be hired by the city to thoroughly evaluate all the concerns related to D Street. This issue extends beyond the loss of parking spaces; it poses high-risk scenarios that could potentially harm citizens. We firmly believe that the safety and well-being of our families and neighbors should not be compromised.

By neglecting to perform due diligence, the City Council is exposing the city to numerous lawsuits and significant liability. Therefore, we kindly implore you to reconsider your stance on this matter.

Mike and Maureen Gottschall

[REDACTED] D Street

On Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 8:00 AM Kevin McDonnell <kmcdonnell@cityofpetaluma.org> wrote:

I hear you and the points that you are making. As I noted at the Council meeting, I do feel like the two perspectives are seeing things and saying things that do not resonate with the other perspective. The challenging responsibility of the Council is to really hear all sides and then making a decision or no decision on the necessary path forward.

This is why I listen and try to understand all input brought to us; why I visit with all who invite us to learn more. This is why I make a point of stating that we are doing just that - lots of listening and understanding - before a decision.

In some cases, compromise can be found that satisfies all parties. In other cases, some parties are unsatisfied. However in all cases, all parties have been listened to and all

perspectives respected.

I'm sorry that this sometimes leaves us with frustration.

Kevin McDonnell

From: Maureen Gottschall [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2024 9:00 AM
To: Barnacle, Brian <bbarnacle@cityofpetaluma.org>
Cc: Mike Gottschall [REDACTED]; Kevin McDonnell
<kmcdonnell@cityofpetaluma.org>
Subject: Re: Statement - D Street Bike Lane Meeting April 8, 2024

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM
OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

The citizens of Petaluma are feeling frustrated and angry due to their sense of exclusion in this process.

As someone who has worked as an accountant for over 20 years, I must point out that the study presented does not adhere to generally accepted audit practices. It lacks independence, the scope of surveys falls far below the required level for the population, and the field audit of only three examples is insufficient. This flawed study was used as the basis for advocating Option 1 to the Council and the town. Voting in favor of this option is not an honorable or responsible choice; it is misguided. Option 1 only benefits a mere 10.95 bikers per day (calculated as 4,000 divided by 365 days), rather than the broader community that you claim to serve.

A more reasonable approach would be to implement other measures first, such as slowing down the road, and then engage in discussions regarding the installation of bike lanes. Your disregard for ADA rules and willingness to put the most vulnerable members of our community at risk is a serious concern. Instead of prioritizing the well-being of those who rely on ADA accommodations, it appears that you are more interested in observing the outcome and only pivoting if you are wrong. This approach not only jeopardizes the safety of all residents, but also demonstrates a lack of consideration for the needs and rights of individuals who require ADA accommodations.

I find it increasingly difficult to communicate with members of the community who hold unreasonable views, as it feels like a futile exercise. However, please understand that we, as a community, are actively exploring all available options because we genuinely care about our neighbors. They are real people with genuine needs and problems, and they should not be treated as mere test subjects.

Mike and Maureen Gottschall

On Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 8:41 PM Barnacle, Brian <bbarnacle@cityofpetaluma.org> wrote:
Maureen,

I've tried to listen and have read every email on this. I'm not claiming superior knowledge. Based on the inputs I have received, I disagree with you. It doesn't mean I didn't truly listen. It means I disagree. Making decisions that people don't like is part of

being on council. We all want to please everyone all the time, but we have to make decisions and they are not always popular with everyone.

Make no mistake: it would have been politically beneficial to me to not vote for this. I pissed off a bunch of my D6 voters in an election year. As uncomfortable as it is to know I lost several potential votes on Monday, I believe in the city's adopted policies and the merits of this project, and I can wake up knowing I stayed true to what I believe is right, even if it's not easy and it costs me a second term.

I'll continue to care about your concerns, and if I'm wrong I'll advocate for a change of course. That's my commitment here.

Best,
Brian

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 10, 2024, at 7:25 PM, Maureen Gottschall

[REDACTED] > wrote:

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Thank you for taking the time to respond to our email.

We acknowledge that there are certain points we agree on, such as the fact that good people can have differing opinions and that safer streets are a shared goal. However, I must express my strong objection to the patronizing tone you employed and your characterization of our concerns as mere inconveniences. These actions indicate to me that you have not genuinely listened to the residents of D Street, and that you are not representing the interests of all Petalumans.

I believe that your claim of superior knowledge about D Street compared to those who have lived here for decades is presumptuous. It is disappointing that our concerns were not adequately addressed in the decision-making process, which comes across as arrogant. Our mention of special interest arises from the lack of a truly independent, third-party study. Since the proposed changes would significantly impact our daily lives, it would have been appropriate to bring more effort to your surveys and maybe give some weight to those who make this street special.

By neglecting to do so, there is a perception that the decision was influenced by special interests. Furthermore, we believe that your safety documentation is biased and fails to consider all the relevant facts. It is evident that this decision was rushed to meet a specific timeline and was not thoroughly vetted.

In terms of our property values, we are currently gathering concrete data to substantiate our claims. Your facts, although appreciated, do not adequately account for the unique circumstances of D Street.

Thank you for providing us with the documentation, but we hope that you will

consider our concerns seriously going forward.

Mike and Maureen Gottschall

On Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 6:14 PM Barnacle, Brian
<bbarnacle@cityofpetaluma.org> wrote:

Maureen,

I'm sorry that your family is going to be inconvenienced by this.

While I did not vote how you wanted, I can assure you that I do not take votes like this lightly and I am 100% committed to a safe, inviting D street. For me, I think that a lot is going to be learned by implementing the pilot, and I am looking forward to that. I also think that delaying bike lanes would have essentially halted them altogether, and we'd learn nothing in advance of the larger capital project.

I have a different take on some of the issues you raised below. I would be happy to meet with you and discuss my views.

Special Interests – I say to people all the time that good people can disagree on policy. I think that certainly applies here. The pro-staff proposal people feel passionately that the pilot needs to include bike lanes and you feel passionately that it is a bad idea. That makes it a tough vote for the council, but it should not make you enemies. The pro-staff proposal people are not a nefarious group of citizens who are trying to ruin your quality of life, and you are not a citizen who unequivocally opposes bike lanes and doesn't care about the safety of children. Rather, you both agree on 95% of what is included in the staff proposal. The only contentious item is parking removal for bike lanes. The "special interest group" you reference advocates for safe streets for all modes of transportation across the city, including the 95% you agree with. They have our city and its residents best interest at heart, even if you disagree with them at times. If this pilot does not make the street safer, or if there are additional measures that will make it safer, the group of advocates will be pushing for those measures too. They want your street to be safe for all people who travel it, and will not stop until it is. Their advocacy is partially to thank for the 95% you agree with in this project, because they have been doing a ton of leg work to make projects like this a priority for the city.

Safety – I agree with the notion that "trucks and bikes don't mix." However,

the fact is that currently trucks and bikes *are mixing*. Strava data tells us that there are over 4K bike trips per year on D street (more than double B street). Adding bike lanes is going to make it safer for these 4K+ trips per year, and the thousands of other bike trips that occur on D street each year that we don't track. The staff proposal is actually separating bikes and vehicles, and council members Nau and Healy voted to keep bikes and vehicles mixed. Also, this is not "a few bike riders" as you suggest. The 4K bike trips we know about each year + the thousands more we don't know about is likely equal to or greater than the D street residents, visitors, and church goers combined. I'm not trying to be a turd here, just asking that you recognize that thousands of bike trips are occurring on D street each year and the current condition is way more unsafe for those trips than it will be with the staff proposal. Moreover, truck accidents mostly happen from turning, and trucks rarely turn off of D Street. I asked after the meeting and learned that we have not had a truck accident in a decade or more on D street. The big threat on D Street is speeding – and this project is implementing multiple measures to reduce speeding.

Home Value – With all due respect to your realtor contacts, I highly doubt that this is going to decrease your home value. Here is a [study](#) that found that homes closer to good bike lanes sold for more than those farther away, and that homes with proximity to multiple good bike lanes had an even higher premium (bike lanes on B+D street). Beyond the theory, I'd also like to point out that there is a major new park entrance opening 0.6 miles from your house and that three years from now the city will have invested \$10M+ into new paving and several permanent safety and beautification measures on D Street. Thus, I would assume that having a safer street, with fresh paving, and close (and safe!) connection to a new park access point just 0.6 miles away will actually cause your home value to increase (significantly). I'm pasting the [Redfin value](#) in this email so that hopefully we can look back in 2-3 years at what Redfin says once the new Helen Putnam entrance opens and you have fresh pavement with permanent safety measures: "817 D St is a 1,384 square foot house on a 7,500 square foot lot with 3 bedrooms and 1.5 bathrooms. This home is currently off market - it last sold on December 02, 2003 for \$565,000. Based on Redfin's Petaluma data, we estimate the home's value is \$1,096,581." I would be stunned if your home sold for less than \$1,096,581.

Being on the council involves several tough decisions and this was certainly

one of them. I am not going to get it right every time, but I need to do what I believe is best for the community. I realize I may be wrong on what I stated above and what I voted for on Monday. If I am, I am sorry in advance and I will take the criticism when the time comes. But right now I think I did what is best for the community.

Sincerely,
Brian

From: Maureen Gottschall [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 9:54 AM
To: John Shribbs <jshribbs@cityofpetaluma.org>
Cc: Mike Gottschall [REDACTED]; Peggy Flynn <PFlynn@cityofpetaluma.org>; Bjorn Gripenburg <bgripenburg@cityofpetaluma.org>; Kevin McDonnell <kmcdonnell@cityofpetaluma.org>; Barnacle, Brian <bbarnacle@cityofpetaluma.org>; -- City Council <citycouncil@cityofpetaluma.org>; Mike Healy <mhealy@cityofpetaluma.org>; Karen Nau <knau@cityofpetaluma.org>; Dennis Pocekay <dpocekay@cityofpetaluma.org>; jcarderthompson@cityofpetaluma.org <jcarderthompson@cityofpetaluma.org>
Subject: Re: Statement - D Street Bike Lane Meeting April 8, 2024

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

That is very disheartening to hear. We were looking forward to your visit to our home. The optics on all of this leads many to believe the city council has been taken over by a special interest group with a singular mission and are disregarding facts that do not align with their agenda. All we are asking for is a cautious and measured approach to address the safety concerns on D Street and to take serious account of those who have lived on the street for decades.

The majority of residents on D Street are against removing parking to add a dedicated bike lane (Option 1). Unfortunately, not all of their voices were heard during the meeting on Monday. Many of our senior citizens, who make up a significant portion of our community, were unable to stay until the end of the meeting due to the excessively long agenda. The slide presentation did not even begin until after 10:30 pm, and the vote took place close to 1 am. It would have been more appropriate to postpone the vote so that all citizens of Petaluma could have had a chance to speak.

We have expressed our concerns about how removing parking for a bike lane will encourage jaywalking on the most dangerous street in our town, putting our loved ones, visitors, contractors, and businesses at risk. It is not sensible to place a bike lane on a truck route, especially when there is a viable alternative on B Street. Our neighbors have provided studies and documentation to support these concerns.

We suggested implementing other measures first and evaluating their effectiveness before considering a bike lane. However, instead of taking this approach, you are putting our community in harm's way just to see what happens. People will have a false sense of security because of the bike lane and may not realize how dangerous it actually is.

We have experienced two separate accidents in front of our home where drunk drivers crashed into the backs of our cars as they approached the 8th Street four-way stop. If we replace empty cars with bikes in that scenario, it would be horrific. D Street has an inherent high risk due to the back roads being used by drivers to avoid detection by police, who are rarely present on D Street. Speed abatement would resolve this issue and preserve the character of this community.

The data presented to the council to make this decision lacked a comprehensive "third party" review of the traffic and parking situation on D Street. The review should have included more than just three attempts without regard to the obvious patterns that create risk. And during this pilot program, who will be responsible for collecting the data and how will they present the results? We request that any review be performed by an independent third-party group without clear connections to the agenda.

There are plans to build additional residences that will use D Street as the main route to town. This will increase traffic on D Street rather than decrease it. Moreover, the study did not account for the regular traffic of fire trucks and ambulances that pass through our street at least twice a day. Cars will have to use the bike lane to make way for emergency vehicles.

Amy's headquarters recently relocated downtown, and there are plans for a hotel near Luma Fitness, as well as two more apartment complexes near Quarry Heights. We need to know the city's overall parking plan for all these new developments. How will the loss of 126 parking spaces impact our community?


Lastly, this will have a major financial impact on us. I have spoken to two realtors who agree that the value of our home will decrease due to the lack of parking access. I have attached a picture of our narrow driveway to demonstrate the limitations we face. Unlike some of our neighbors, we do not have a long wide driveway or a turnaround. Our driveway is extremely narrow and was built in the 30's- 40's when cars were much smaller. These are real damages that we will suffer.

If the city council is truly listening to us, I urge you to postpone removing parking spaces to add a bike lane for the sake of our town's safety. If you are hearing us, then I would encourage the city council to delay bike lane implementation, you

have the ability to do it for the true safety of our town. The benefit to a few bike riders does not justify all the takeaways to our community.

I implore you to reconsider your decision.


Mike and Maureen Gottschall


<image.png>

On Tue, Apr 9, 2024 at 9:47 PM John Shribbs
<jshribbs@cityofpetaluma.org> wrote:

Mike and Maureen,

I received information from staff they would like to take lead on communicating with each of the concerned D St. residents so that there are consistent solutions developed. Therefore, I would like to delay my meeting with you and give staff the chance to resolve the issues raised. Know that the council members are watching this project very closely and do care about your concerns. I will be taking extra trips up and down D St. whenever I am downtown these next few months to do more observation.
John

From: Mike Gottschall 
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 5:13 PM
To: John Shribbs <jshribbs@cityofpetaluma.org>; Peggy Flynn
<PFlynn@cityofpetaluma.org>; Bjorn Gripenburg
<bgripenburg@cityofpetaluma.org>; Kevin McDonnell
<kmcdonnell@cityofpetaluma.org>

Cc: Maureen  Mike Gottschall


Subject: Re: Statement - D Street Bike Lane Meeting April 8, 2024

You don't often get email from  . [Learn why this is important](#)

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Thank you for acknowledging the concerns raised by residents on D Street and for reaching out to us directly. We welcome the opportunity to meet with you and express concerns shared among many residents who live on this unique and historic street.

We agree that moving forward with the project in phases rather than undertaking the whole project at once is a reasonable approach that allows for a more comprehensive assessment of the impact and better engagement with concerned residents. We would suggest phase 1 be entirely focused on speed abatement which has been the primary cause for multiple accidents in front of our residence over the last decade. Both incidents would have been potentially catastrophic had there been a bike lane populated with riders.

Improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers is undoubtedly a priority. It seems obvious to those who walk this street daily that speed abatement is the single most important issue to address safety. Those who have lived on this street for over 20 years know that a massive contributor to this issue is high traffic volume due to work on the 101 Freeway. Why not address the issue of speed first (with traffic volume surely to decrease naturally) and then assess the results in two years? This would avoid the immediate removal of parking rights that are so valued by the residents of this street and give us time to process this issue.

Moreover, not all residents have driveways that can accommodate multiple cars or alternative areas for turnarounds, which will add challenges backing in and out. This is partly an issue of cars parked but that is not the only consideration. We along with many of our neighbors have paid considerable sums to keep D Street beautiful including trees, fences and hedges that can impair visibility. Ironically, it's the 4-5 feet of buffer space beyond the sidewalk and created by parking that allows one to slowly ease back out to the street and stop part way if cars are coming. That buffer is gone with a bike path.

While the worldwide effort in micro mobility innovation is certainly commendable, it is crucial to carefully evaluate and implement these changes in a manner that suits the specific character of D Street. This is especially true for the residents who already sacrifice to maintain this historic neighborhood and keep it a draw for the wider community.

It is vital to address the concerns of all residents on D Street collectively and find solutions that work for the entire community. By engaging with residents, carefully evaluating the proposed changes, and, considering your phased approach, we can work towards creating a safe and accessible environment while minimizing potential disruptions and unintended consequences.

Please suggest times that work with your schedule. Monday, Tuesday and Fridays are better for us as those days we both work from home.

Mike and Maureen Gottschall

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **John Shribbs** <jshribbs@cityofpetaluma.org>

Date: Tue, Apr 9, 2024 at 2:36 PM

Subject: Re: Statement - D Street Bike Lane Meeting April 8, 2024

To: Maureen Gottschall <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Peggy Flynn <PFlynn@cityofpetaluma.org>, Bjorn Gripenburg <bgripenburg@cityofpetaluma.org>, Kevin McDonnell <kmcdonnell@cityofpetaluma.org>

Maureen,

We recognize that the sacrifices you listed below are a major

concern and will be similar for many living on D Street. You have a situation that exemplifies all the D Street resident's concerns. I am willing to come out to your house to get a better understanding of your existing and future conditions. I would like the project to move forward in sections rather than the whole project at once and to visit with concerned residents to find solutions for their concerns before that section is painted and striped.

I believe there are solutions that either city or resident can do. The current situation is unsafe for pedestrians, bicycles, and car drivers. There will be increased safety for all with speed reductions and the many features added in. Currently getting in and out of the driver side of the car puts them in danger since vehicles are going by fast and within a couple feet whereas the new plan has a 6.5-foot buffer of a bike lane to protect those getting in and out of the car. Most residents have either long driveways that could accommodate several cars, areas behind the house to make K turnarounds, and a few have turn in and out driveways. When there are no cars parked on your side of the street, then getting out of the driveway is easier with greater visibility up and down the street. On the side of street with cars parked we could look at adding no parking curbs a few feet on either side of the driveway to improve sight lines which do not exist now.

There is a worldwide effort in innovation of micromobility, especially for seniors and handicapped, and changes in street designs as we move toward active transportation and public transport. The goals I want to expect can be enumerated and my choice would be seeing within the next two years on a daily basis at least 100 bicycles and 25 scooters (business workers last mile to SMART, children on two wheels, and seniors on 3 and 4 wheeled mobility units) and see 4x that many in 5 years including micro delivery and work vehicles using the "micromobility corridor", my preference for what we now call bike lanes. Many cities across the world are transforming in this way. Amazon, UPS, and USPS are testing micro delivery vehicles as well as the chain pizza sellers. We can set some goals for the short term and make changes before the full reconstruction.

The changes we propose may or may not increase or decrease

property values in a future scenario. I would argue an increase in value with the level of infrastructure replacement and road improvements being piloted. This is a temporary change limited to 2 years so we can collect the information needed for our full buildout and repaving of all city streets.

John Shribbs

From: Maureen Gottschall [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 8:11 AM
To: -- City Council <citycouncil@cityofpetaluma.org>; Kevin McDonnell <kmcdonnell@cityofpetaluma.org>; John Shribbs <jshribbs@cityofpetaluma.org>; Barnacle, Brian <bbarnacle@cityofpetaluma.org>; Mike Healy <mhealy@cityofpetaluma.org>; Karen Nau <knau@cityofpetaluma.org>; Dennis Pocekay <dpocekay@cityofpetaluma.org>; jcarderthompson@cityofpetaluma.org <jcarderthompson@cityofpetaluma.org>; Mike Gottschall [REDACTED]
Subject: Statement - D Street Bike Lane Meeting April 8, 2024

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Dear Petaluma City Council,

I am deeply saddened by your decision to move forward with option 1 the removal of parking on D Street.

I am submitting my full statement that I had prepared to be included in the record from last night's city council meeting (4/8/24).

With the exception of Council person Nau and Healy, you failed to listen to the most impacted of your constituents. You could have very easily chosen option 2 and allowed more time to explore the residents of D Street's concerns. Instead, we were lectured on the sacrifice we must make for the community.

Just so we are all clear, I am listing those sacrifices.

- Reduced value of my home because we lost access to parking. The value that D street residents collectively lost is in the millions.
- Forced to walk across this dangerous street multiple times a day to reach my car. The nearest side street for us is four houses down from us. It is not realistic to think we will use it. My children will be crossing the street to get to their cars.

- Additional hazards, risks and blind spots when backing out of my home.
- Friends and loved ones will be forced to walk across the street to my home.
- My elderly handi-capped parents can not make the walk from around the block to get to my home. They will be walking across the street to get to my home.
- You have directly put everyone I care about in harm's way because D Street is still a trucking route. The trucking route needed to be addressed before the bike lane. The actions you took last night were an overreach and the cart before the horse.

Please see my attached statement.

Regards,

Maureen Gottschall



From: [Nickola Frye](#)
To: [-- City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment
Date: Monday, April 15, 2024 2:28:15 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

City Council Meeting - Monday, April 15

General Public Commit

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members:

Hello - My name is Nickola Frye, and I am the Chair of the Senior Advisory Committee.

As the Senior Advisory Committee does not have a City Council Liaison, I would personally like to take this opportunity to invite you to attend the Recreation, Music, and Parks Commission meeting this upcoming Wednesday, April 17, at 6:00, in this very chamber.

At this meeting the Senior Advisory Committee will be presenting our proposal for a Senior Playground and Outdoor Wellness Project at Lucchesi Park. In addition, we are also championing the placing of Outdoor Exercise Facilities in other Petaluma parks. The slideshow presentation will include our recommendations and proposal regarding outdoor fitness equipment and our wellness initiative to provide increased access to fitness opportunities for seniors and for all the residents of Petaluma.

Thank you for your attention and I hope that you will take the opportunity to attend the meeting on Wednesday and see the presentation by the Senior Advisory Committee regarding our proposal for Outdoor Exercise Facilities for Petaluma.

Nickola Frye
Chair, Senior Advisory Committee

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad