

From: [Dan Lyke](#)
To: [Heather Gurewitz](#)
Cc: [Barry Bussewitz](#); [Charlene Marie](#); [Duane Bellinger](#); [Dave Alden](#); [Sharon Kirk](#)
Subject: General Plan Advisory Committee April 18, 2024, Agenda 4c Infrastructure Framework
Date: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 8:38:15 PM

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

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

Dear Heather Gurewitz:

We offer these comments for the General Plan Advisory Committee April 18, 2024, on Agenda 4c Infrastructure Framework:

AGENDA ITEM 4c —
Public Comment For Updates From Policy Framework Working Groups

We are writing to express our frustration with the Petaluma General Plan Infrastructure & Utilities policy framework document, primarily because that's the one we've read. We suspect that the others share similar flaws. What's presented there doesn't seem to be a plan as much as an aspirational laundry list, at odds with the goal of "...General Plan language that is actionable and facilitates implementation", as expressed in the Transportation Framework document.

The Existing Conditions Key Findings are expressed in ways that seem almost designed to hide usefulness. Numbers should be presented in a way that give us metrics to determine if, during the implementation of the plan, we are ahead of or behind on a particular goal, and so where staff should focus energies.

Many of the statements could be improved with specific context of why that finding is important, what the implications are, and what city policies need to change, or not.

In the recommendations, we see items which are already addressed by State and Federal policy, or which have no real meaning. In the age of ubiquitous video conferencing, what value does "Encourage the creation of public and private teleconferencing facilities" have? Given stringent FCC requirements for backup power for telecommunications providers, why would the city need to develop its own standards? If the goal is to have the city develop more stringent requirements than the federal ones, the need for that should be spelled out.

Which brings us to: We know that this isn't a problem with the GPAC. Members have expressed their frustrations with the process. This seems like the process of creating this document from recommendations from the GPAC and the public is flawed, not focused on building an actionable plan which will help the city accomplish its aspirations. Like the solid efforts of the GPAC members are being watered down into something that just checks the necessary "we did that" boxes.

A process like that doesn't respect the time and efforts of the GPAC, nor does it provide useful guidance as we move forward.

And, ultimately, creates a document which causes more frustrations and divisions, rather than

offering clear direction.

Dan Lyke, danlyke@flutterby.com 415-342-5180

Charlene Marie, charphone@gmail.com 415-342-5184

Petaluma