

ATTACHMENT 1

December 20, 2017

City of Santa Rosa
Office of Community Engagement
637 First St.
Santa Rosa CA 95404

RE: Cover letter to accompany Appeals (3)

Dear Office of Community Engagement,

Thank you for the opportunity to serve my neighbors and community overall. I appreciate the opportunity to work with the Community Advisory Board (CAB), and look forward to my positive impacts.

We are disappointed that we were not awarded any grants to address important health and safety issues in our neighborhood and beyond. Unfortunately, our analysis of the process is that it is deeply flawed, and arbitrary. In disregard to the stated mission of the Community Improvement Grant process to include worthwhile public improvements (Resolution 28686, 28442, and 28174), we did not receive a "fair" hearing from CAB about the grassroots programs we proposed to unite property owners with low-cost professional contractors to fix defective sidewalks. There is ample evidence from the dollars spent by the City to perform temporary repairs, litigation handled by the City Attorney regarding trip and fall accidents, public expression of support received during CAB's recent outreach events in the neighborhood, and visual evidence gain by walking upon our sidewalks, that the sidewalks we all use need urgent repairs, and that property owners have a role to play in fixing them. But the City must work with the owners to facilitate permanent repairs (I'll go into this in more yet brief detail in our Letter of Appeal - attached covering our requests #1701-1715.) Also, two additional Letters of Appeal will be for the Dog Walker Information Pack (#1718), and the GCSNA Communications Package (#1720).

The members of CAB should be able to clarify for the Council the tremendous chaos due to the lack of process has on applicants since they had a sub-committee working session on this question a couple weeks ago. Also, their excitement over hiring an outside consultant is another indication that they lacked sufficient guidance and instruction to process CIG applications.

Our appeals are timely, given that we were told by the City coordinator to the CAB, Ms. Ronshausen, that our period for filing an appeal would be 30 days after receipt of a denial letter. Later, by email 11/20/2017 she claims that the appeal process is codified within the Ordinances 28174, 28442, and/or 28686. Also attached was an undated sheet detailing an appeal process, as well as the denial letter dated 10/3/2017.

Page 2,

We did not receive the original denial letter, after it was allegedly sent 10/3 . The PO Box for correspondence is correct.

We did not find any mention of an appeals process within Ordinances 28174, 28442, nor 28686. Curiously, we did find a document of the City's website (posted 11/20/17 - the same date as my inquiry to the City regarding the status of our grant requests) that appears to just be some procedures for appeal made outside of public scrutiny and input, and perhaps made just to address our concerns specifically on that day. We also did not read about any appeals process in the CIG info pack distributed prior to the grant request deadline.

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on these important health and safety problems.

Looking forward to being of service to our community,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric Fraser', with a stylized, overlapping 'E' and 'F'.

Eric Fraser
Community Organizer
Greater Cherry Street Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 1113
Santa Rosa CA 95402
707.479-8247

November 20, 2017

City of Santa Rosa
Office of Community Engagement
Attn: Community Engagement Coordinator
637 First St.
Santa Rosa CA 95404

RE: APPEAL for CIG Grant Requests #1701-1715, individually and separately

Dear Community Engagement Coordinator;

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this timely appeal for the denial of Community Improvement Grant requests submitted to address defective and hazardous sidewalks in our neighborhood and beyond. Our specific requests include:

1701 - Sidewalk Condition Survey	1708 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 5
1702 - Sidewalk Info Pack	1709 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 6
1703 - Verge Remediation	1710 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 7
1704 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 1	1711 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 8
1705 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 2	1712 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 9
1706 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 3	1713 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 10
1707 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 4	1714 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 11
	1715 - Sidewalk Repairs - Section 12

We are including all of these grant requests on the same letter, as the issues are basically the same. Those being:

A) Sidewalks need to be professional and thoroughly inspected (1701) to ascertain exactly who is responsible for fixing and paying for the repairs. Also, since the premise is to unite property owners into larger scoped contracts in order to reduce the cost to each property owner individually, it is necessary to conduct this analysis as a starting point.

B) Property owners largely are not aware about what they are responsible for in regard to sidewalks, street trees, curb and gutter, nor they may not be aware of the City's temporary repair program (1702).

C) Working cooperatively, residents should also be shown incentives for remediating the verge areas in front of the properties (1703). Co-operative programs when seeded by City resources (including competent information from staff and CAB), could help unite City residents to clean up their spaces and also determine who in the neighborhood needs assistance to meet a goal of clean landscape, with hazards reduced or eliminated.

D) Lastly, the analysis of individual sections (1704-1715) would determine the actual costs the property owner needs to meet, the correct assignment of the repair to the responsible party (property owner, City, County, Water District, Utility, and so on.). Within each section are

Page 2

seniors on a fixed income, people with disabilities, churches, schools, non-profit organizations, as well as financially capable property owners, businesses, and so on.

Admittedly, we do not have the analysis for 1704-1715, since that was request 1701, which was also denied. However, much of the supporting information that was prepared for the grant application process by us was not included by staff (or if included was not reproduced in a legible format) for consideration by CAB. The day CAB was to decide which requests to fund, we were given only a couple minutes (7-10 minutes) to discuss all 15 grant requests for the first time, a process I and my neighbors find diminishing to the effort we expended to submit said requests.

Within this process (e.g. grant submission and appeal), we looked to also show what other jurisdictions are doing to fix defective sidewalks in their communities. This ranges from being responsible for all sidewalk repairs created by street trees (San Francisco) to having a set-price contract worked out with a professional (many jurisdictions), so property owners could avail themselves of repair costs that make sense and that have been worked out cooperatively (essentially our proposal).

We also submitted a skilled financial analysis to show double and triple bottom line impacts along with the property owners' financial involvement. CAB appeared not to have the time, patience, willingness, or professional training to consider this information.

We look forward to being successful with our appeal to have some or all of our grant requests funded, but if again denied we would look to have the appeal denial be part of the public record so we can show that we are acting in our neighbor's best interests to mitigate a known risk from defective sidewalks.

Looking forward to being of service to our community.

Warm Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric Fraser', written over a horizontal line.

Eric Fraser
Community Organizer
Greater Cherry Street Neighborhood Association
707.479-8247

November 20, 2017

City of Santa Rosa
Office of Community Engagement
Attn: Community Engagement Coordinator
637 First St.
Santa Rosa CA 95404

RE: APPEAL for CIG Grant Requests #1718

Dear Community Engagement Coordinator;

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this timely appeal for the denial of our Community Improvement Grant request submitted to address the lack of concise information for residents and visitors with pets to use as reference when using our City's sidewalks.

Our grant request was denied, with no reason given, other than the lack of funding available, while others were awarded. Our request for \$1000, with matching assistance of \$1500 from participating businesses and residents could save our residents and guests from unpleasant and potentially damaging interactions with pets and pet owners.

The lack of professional discussion on this matter by CAB, the lack of responsiveness to as why our request was denied, and the assault on our community's health and safety from pet owners who may not know the laws or best practices for using public spaces, compel us to push forward with this appeal process.

Again, thank you for your consideration for a fair hearing regarding our appeal.

Looking forward to being of service to our community.

Warm Regards,



Eric Fraser
Community Organizer
Greater Cherry Street Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 1113
Santa Rosa CA 95402
707.479-8247

November 20, 2017

City of Santa Rosa
Office of Community Engagement
Attn: Community Engagement Coordinator
637 First St.
Santa Rosa CA 95404

RE: APPEAL for CIG Grant Requests #1720

Dear Community Engagement Coordinator;

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this timely appeal of the denial of our Community Improvement Grant request submitted to address the need for assisting our neighborhood group to communicate with the hundreds of residents, off-site property owners and managers, elected officials and staff, and visitors and enthusiasts of our historic neighborhood.

Our grant request was denied, with no reason given, other than the lack of funding available, while others were awarded. Our request for \$5000, with matching assistance of \$10250 from participating businesses and residents could have a huge impact on communicating important information about emergency preparedness, neighborhood safety and beautification, and opportunities for community involvement.

The lack of professional discussion on this matter by CAB, the lack of responsiveness to as why our request was denied, compel us to push forward with this appeal process. It was our hope then and is also our hope now to work with CAB to create a cost-effective way for ALL neighborhood groups to cost effectively communicate with their stakeholders via US Mail, website, email, social media, door-to-door, and whatever other ways that make sense financially, so that as many are tuned into information as possible. Our goal is a strong, informed community.

We did find, and availed ourselves of the opportunity, to have the City print our newsletter once, but this opportunity is not widely known by other neighborhood groups we polled, and again is another example of incomplete and biased letting of resources that many qualified groups should be invited to participate in.

Again, thank you for your consideration for a fair hearing regarding our appeal.

Looking forward to being of service to our community.

Warm Regards,



Eric Fraser
Community Organizer
Greater Cherry Street Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 1113
Santa Rosa CA 95402
707.479-8247