

From: [Teresa Franklin](#)
To: [City Council Public Comments](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Senior Zoning Overlay Ordinance, public comment
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 4:22:50 PM
Attachments: [SRMOA City Council ltr.pdf](#)

Please find an open letter ATTACHED to be included for public comment 1/27/26.
I will request an in person opportunity to share comment as well.
Thank you,
Teresa Franklin

Sent from my iPhone

Santa Rosa City Council
100 Santa Rosa Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Email: citycouncil@srcity.org

To Whom it May Concern:
Santa Rosa City Council, Staff, Attorneys, Planners and Commissioners

Seniors in Santa Rosa are a rapidly growing demographic and voting block. We senior mobilehome owners invested in purchasing our homes and most are living out their days on fixed incomes. Yet, the rented land our homes sit on in 55+ mobilehome parks (MHPs) is subject to park owner actions that threaten our housing security. Generally, our homes cannot be relocated. Santa Rosa senior MHPs are needed for housing security, social contact, mental health, affordability and community stability.

Affordable housing stock in Santa Rosa is already woefully limited and our 55+ MHPs are a valuable city resource, we must preserve them now! Without your action they are vulnerable to an unseemly nationwide trend. Predatory tactics are used to intimidate residents, then convert senior MHPs to all ages and impose exorbitant land rent increases for the sole purpose of investor profits which profoundly destabilizes seniors in our community.

Santa Rosa City Council paused a vote to pass our senior zoning overlay ordinance pending the outcome of Petaluma's senior zoning ordinance process. Petaluma has proven successful and it's time for the Santa Rosa City Council to act. Please **DON'T DELAY!** Pass the Senior Zoning Overlay Ordinance for all Santa Rosa 55+ Mobilehome Parks by putting it on the agenda and preserve affordable senior housing in Santa Rosa now and for the future.

Sincerely,

Name

Mobilehome Park

From: [Edward G](#)
To: [_CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment 1/27/26: Gaps in Coordinated Entry & Housing Navigation - Edward Gathercole
Date: Friday, January 23, 2026 2:41:02 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

My name is Edward Gathercole. I am a lifelong resident of Santa Rosa, a student leader at Santa Rosa Junior College, and a Gold Star family member. My younger brother was the first from our community to fall in Afghanistan, and he is honored on the memorial here at City Hall. I also grew up in the Sonoma County foster care system and was emancipated homeless the day I graduated from Piner High School.

Despite my roles as a student ambassador intern and a leader organizing a college resource fair for Transitional Age Youth (TAY), I am currently without stable housing. For years, I have consistently participated in local homeless services, including weekly check-ins at the Caritas Center, and I remain on multiple waitlists for the Rosenberg, South Park Commons, and Canary apartments.

I am writing to highlight a "Stability Paradox" in our current system. Because I manage my permanent disabilities through SSDI and avoid emergency room utilization, my priority score remains too low for direct assistance. Essentially, because I am not in an active crisis, I am not a priority for housing. Furthermore, while my income is fixed, I cannot afford market rent, yet I am ineligible for many behavioral health housing supports because I do not meet specific crisis or substance use criteria.

The current system penalizes those of us who work hard to maintain stability while rewarding those with high utilization of services with housing first. We should not have to reach "rock bottom" to merit a roof over our heads. I urge the City Council to advocate for Direct Navigation Services for individuals who are ready to be housed but are trapped in this scoring vacuum. Please support those who are doing the work to better their lives before they are forced into a crisis to receive help.

The shortage of affordable housing disproportionately affects individuals with foster care history and psychiatric disabilities. Stable housing is crucial for effective mental health treatment and breaking the cycle of homelessness. Without affordable housing options, many individuals with mental health conditions face an increased risk of homelessness, which in turn exacerbates their psychiatric symptoms.

I plan to deliver remarks at the council meeting next Tuesday. Please ensure this correspondence is included in the public record for the January 27th meeting and distributed to all Council members.

Sincerely,

Edward Gathercole

From: [Helen Evans](#)
To: [Stapp, Mark](#)
Cc: [CityCouncilListPublic](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Alvarez, Eddie](#); [MacDonald, Dianna](#); [Fleming, Victoria](#); [Banuelos, Caroline](#); [Rogers, Natalie](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 2023 National Warning Follow-Up: Federal Grants, Resident Consent & Urban Planning
Date: Saturday, January 24, 2026 3:58:29 PM

Dear Mayor Stapp and Council Members,

In 2023, a nationwide citizen effort sent letters to every U.S. Conference of Mayors (USCM) city (including yours) raising concerns about federal sustainability mandates, smart-city-style planning, and the lack of resident consent. Nationally, ~84% of cities gave no response — a pattern that shows how quietly these agendas advance.

Since 2023, public records and FOIA requests in cities like Lexington, KY, reveal how federal grants work in practice:

\$80M+ in federal funds (RAISE, SS4A, CPRG, etc.) with strings requiring less driving (VMT reductions), equity priorities, and Complete Streets (lane removal/bike/ped focus).

Zero public comments at key grant hearings.

Developer support (50+ letters) vs. zero resident opposition.

This is top-down federal overreach: cities accept money with mandates that change how people live — often without residents fully understanding or consenting. USCM membership quietly seeds the vision (networking, "best practices") without officials grasping the full scope.

I urge the city to adopt safeguards to protect resident consent and constitutional rights:

Require public hearings and resident input on grants >\$5M with VMT/equity strings.

Mandate clear disclosure of implications (lane removal, parking loss, slower traffic) in grant applications.

Create a citizen oversight process for planning/grant decisions.

These steps ensure progress honors local control and liberty. Please respond (or address at a council meeting) with how these concerns will be handled moving forward.

In addition, Real-world technologies like Flock cameras (automated license plate readers that capture and store vehicle data) are already being adopted in some cities for public safety. While they can help solve crimes, they also raise legitimate privacy concerns — tracking movements without warrants or resident consent. Without safeguards, these tools can expand into broader surveillance. I urge this city to adopt protections to ensure progress honors resident consent and constitutional rights.

Thank you for your service. I am a concerned citizen — no lobbyists or donations — who believes sustainability policies must respect the Constitution. The Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, and Fourteenth Amendments protect privacy, property, and liberty — no policy or goal can override them. Please consider resident referendums, disclosure, and oversight on grants with

VMT/equity strings.

Sincerely,

Helen Gallegos Evans

Begin forwarded message:

From: Helen Evans <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Mayor Rogers & Council Members, please consider carefully before implementing any Smart City Technology. Thank you.
Date: April 24, 2023 at 7:18:27 PM EDT
To: nrogers@srcity.org
Cc: citycouncil@srcity.org, ealvarez@srcity.org, mstapp@srcity.org, dmacdonald@srcity.org, vfleming@srcity.org, crogers@srcity.org, jokrepie@srcity.org

Dear Mayor Natalie Rogers:

I am greatly concerned about the current trajectory Santa Rosa elected and non-elected officials are pursuing to make Santa Rosa a Smart City. Although Smart Cities are being touted as “Sustainability” and “Equitable” and “Convenience,” Smart Cities are not being accurately described for what they really are - they are mass surveillance cities, which remove any sense of individual privacy. In fact, a euphemism for “smart cities” could be called “surveillance.” This means that Santa Rosa will deploy surveillance technologies powered by automatic data mining, facial recognition, and other forms of artificial intelligence at a scale never seen before. As you know urban surveillance is a multibillion-dollar industry, with Santa Rosa readily handing out money to contractors and nonprofits and creating new divisions in the city government to build the smart city industry and maintain it. While “smart cities” have been described by proponents with soothing promises of greener energy solutions, lower-friction mobility, and safer streets, the honest fact is these cities will be supercharged surveillance that encroach on free speech, privacy, and data protection. And, the facial recognition and related technologies at the scale that smart cities will employ are extremely worrisome. Moreover, the deployment and integration of surveillance technologies, such as sensors and biometric data collection systems - electronic, infrared, thermal, and LIDAR sensors form the basis of the smart grid. They do everything from operating streetlights to optimizing parking and traffic flow to detect crime. Therefore, these cities will become a veritable thicket of video surveillance. Identity collection devices will become commonplace, exploding across public and private spaces.

Can you imagine a world where you’re watched every second? Is that what you want for Santa Rosa? While we do have these technologies now, we don’t have them at the scale that Smart Cities employ. I am asking that you rethink the Smart City plan for Santa Rosa. I am asking that you remember a time when privacy was valued. I am

including an article that I ask you to read. I know that many of the council members are approving everything with a rubber stamp that has to do with Smart Cities, but I wonder if they are really considering the future they are creating for us residents?

I am expressing my extreme concern about Santa Rosa and am asking that you and the council members reevaluate making Santa Rosa a Smart City. I know I'm just a regular person, but I needed to express myself to you. You appear to be very reasonable and "Holistic." Surely, it cannot be your dream to bring this massive surveillance state to Santa Rosa. Smart Cities are the "shiny new button" that are being touted as the best thing around. However, there appears little thought for the implications smart cities bring and nobody would vote for digital prisons if they understood how vast the surveillance will be in smart cities. As previously stated, I know that money is being handed out like water and many of those who represent us are caught up in the euphoria of being on this new trend, but I can't help but think this Pandora's Box is going to bring great regrets in the future. I've done considerable research on this, using my own free time because I care about the future of Santa Rosa. I don't have any lobbyists or campaign donations to rush after - I'm just a concerned person.

Thanks for listening and for your service. May you have a very successful term. I've cc'd the City Council Members on this email.

Best wishes,

Helen Gallegos Evans

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/04/17/smart-cities-surveillance-privacy-digital-threats-internet-of-things-5g/>

From: [Gavin W](#)
To: [CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Formal Demand: Acknowledgment and Restitution for Downtown Urban Renewal
Date: Saturday, January 24, 2026 10:57:53 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I am writing to formally demand that the City of Santa Rosa issue a public apology for the "Urban Renewal" projects of the 1970s and 80s that decimated our historic downtown to make way for the Santa Rosa Plaza.

For decades, the city has lived with the architectural and social consequences of the decision to use eminent domain to seize 140 acres of land, displace hundreds of residents, and demolish over 160 historic buildings. It is well-documented that while original owners were forced out under the guise of "just compensation," the land was subsequently handed over to developers at a massive public subsidy—a fraction of its true market value.

The "ugly mall" stands today not just as a physical barrier in our downtown, but as a monument to a historic bad decision that prioritized corporate retail over the community's heritage and the property rights of local citizens.

I am calling on the Council to take the following actions:

A Formal Apology: Issue an official proclamation acknowledging the systemic harm caused to the families and business owners who were displaced.

Restitution via Redevelopment: As the mall undergoes major transitions in 2026, the City should explore legal avenues to recoup the historic "subsidy" provided to developers. This could include implementing a **Community Benefits Agreement** or a **Special Assessment District** on the current property owners (Simon Property Group).

Community Reinvestment: The revenue generated from such measures should be earmarked for a fund to support the descendants of those displaced or to subsidize local, small-scale businesses that are currently struggling due to the mall's footprint.

The City cannot move forward into the "General Plan 2050" without first reconciling with its past. It is time to admit that the mall was a mistake and to hold those who profited from it accountable.

I look forward to seeing this item on a future Council agenda.

From: [Andrew Thornton](#)
To: [_CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Close ICE loopholes in Santa Rosa now
Date: Sunday, January 25, 2026 10:28:35 AM

Dear City Council,

My name is Andrew Thornton, I am a US citizen and a resident of Santa Rosa.

I am calling to demand that **Sheriff Engram** immediately stop providing inmate release dates to ICE. In light of the federal violence in Minneapolis, any cooperation with DHS/ICE puts our community at risk.

I want Sonoma County to close the SB 54 loopholes and end **all** notification and transfers to federal immigration custody. We cannot claim to be a sanctuary if we are still handing our neighbors over to federal agents.

Thanks,

Andrew Thornton



Santa Rosa 95403

From: [Kenneth Morrell](#)
To: [CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Monday, January 26, 2026 12:10:13 PM

Understood.

Email

Subject

Formal Complaint Concerning Racially Motivated Assault During Religious Worship on January 10, 2026

Dear Mayor,

My name is Kenneth L. Morrell, also known as Sheikh Kalimullah, and I serve in the recognized religious capacity of Sheikh and Caliph under Islamic jurisprudence. I am a resident of Santa Rosa, California, and I am submitting this letter as a formal complaint concerning a racially motivated assault committed against me during religious worship within the City.

On or about Saturday, January 10, 2026, while engaged in Ṣalāh (Islamic prayer) at a Santa Rosa masjid, I was physically struck and pushed by other individuals. This assault occurred during an act of worship, without provocation or consent, and in a space that should be protected for peaceful religious practice.

This attack involved racial animus, and I experienced the conduct as racist in nature, directed at me as a Black Muslim religious leader. The circumstances and treatment surrounding the incident reflect discriminatory hostility rather than an accidental or incidental encounter.

As both a worshipper and a religious leader, I am obligated to uphold peace and lawful conduct. What occurred was physical assault, not a misunderstanding, and the presence of racial hostility aggravates the seriousness of the incident.

Following the assault, I reported the matter to the Imam of the masjid. When I later sought accountability, the incident was minimized and characterized as a “misunderstanding.”

Racially motivated physical violence during prayer cannot be minimized or redefined.

I am bringing this matter to your attention due to:

Public safety concerns within religious institutions;

Racial discrimination and violation of civil rights;

Interference with the free exercise of religion;

The discouragement of accountability through minimization of violence.

I respectfully request:

That this complaint be entered into the City of Santa Rosa’s official record;

That I be advised of any appropriate next steps or referrals available through the City;

And that the City Council be notified, as this matter concerns the safety, civil rights, and religious freedom of residents.

I seek acknowledgment, accountability, and assurance that racially motivated violence during religious worship is not ignored within the City of Santa Rosa.

Respectfully,

Kenneth L. Morrell (Sheikh Kalimullah)

Sheikh and Caliph (Islamic Jurisprudence)

Santa Rosa, California

Email: [REDACTED]