

From: [anwurr](#)
To: [-- City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Petalumans for Responsible Planning](#)
Subject: No \$\$ to KCPP
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2024 4:09:42 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.--
-

Dear Members of Petaluma City Council,

I am opposed to allocating Open Space acquisition funds to Earth Island Institute/Kelly Creek Protection Project for the Helen Putnam Park Expansion Project.

The land should remain as open space. Helen Putnam Park should not be paved over with parking lots and paved trails, except for a simple park entrance near the Red Barn with a trail away from the sensitive frog habitat.

It was a huge mistake to have approved building those luxury homes in a wildfire-prone zone. How will the new owners obtain Homeowners Insurance when already several insurance companies are refusing to cover California homes?

Yours sincerely, Anne Wurr

[REDACTED], Petaluma CA [REDACTED]

From: [barbara \[REDACTED\]](#)
To: [Kevin McDonnell](#); [Barnacle, Brian](#); [Janice Cader-Thompson](#); [Mike Healy](#); [Karen Nau](#); [John Shribbs](#); [Dennis Pocekay](#); -- [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Protect our Greenspace!
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2024 5:09:31 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 members:

I am writing to you to convey my opposition to providing any City Open Space funds to the KCPP Project at Helen Putnam Regional Park.

The KCPP was a bad idea to begin with and should never have been approved. That they have reneged on their original assurances that they had the necessary funds to implement their plan and are now requesting City funds only reinforces the true folly and inappropriateness of this project.

Do not throw good (and scarce) money after bad!

Rescind your approval of the project and let the land remain open space.

Our public funds are too scarce and too valuable to be wasted on such an ill-conceived and misrepresented plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Pollack

From: [Beverly Schor](#)
To: [-- City Clerk](#)
Subject: Item #4, Pledging funds from our Open Space acquisition fund
Date: Monday, April 15, 2024 11:36:01 AM

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 Council members and Staff,

I support PLEDGING \$250,000.00 to KCPP from our Open Space fund with the following stipulations:

1. This is a **PLEDGE** and not a transfer, to become available to KCPP when they have confirmed that they have secured the entire necessary financing to proceed to beginning and completing Phase One
2. This money, from our Open Space funds should only be used for open space uses as defined by our General Plan
3. There be a date certain and timeline for Phase One start/completion

Sincerely
Beverly Schor
Former Parks Commissioner

From: [Diane Gentile](#)
To: [Kevin McDonnell](#); [Barnacle, Brian](#); [Janice Cader-Thompson](#); [Mike Healy](#); [Karen Nau](#); [John Shribbs](#); [Dennis Pocekay](#); -- [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Davidon
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2024 9:14:36 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.---

To: Petaluma City Council

After reading the update of the proposed Davidon development, it came as no surprise that the developer, who claimed to have all the money needed, is now asking for funding from our city - -contrary to the promise made in order to get this development approved.

There have been red flags throughout the entire history of this project and yet it has been pushed through. Petalumans are asking why we should bail this company out? With the majority of Petalumans voicing their preference to leave the land as Open Space, why would we pursue this bad deal even further?

This extremely rare fragile riparian area has already shown signs of degradation with the relatively few hikers and groups that have been exploring the area. Stream banks have been trampled, causing worsening erosion, wildlife that once found refuge here have been pushed out and this is only a tiny prelude to the destruction that is to come.

Why are we giving Davidon such special treatment?

By reducing the number of homes and restricting direct access to Kelly Creek, our city could achieve its goal to increase accessibility to Helen Putnam Park while offering a small chance for nature to survive.

I hope you will consider this position.

Thank you,

Diane elise Gentile

From: [Robert Bailey](#)
To: [Kevin McDonnell](#); [Barnacle, Brian](#); [Janice Cader-Thompson](#); [Mike Healy](#); [Karen Nau](#); [John Shribbs](#); [Dennis Pocekay](#); -- [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Proposed allocation to Kelly Creek project
Date: Monday, April 15, 2024 9:02:48 AM

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.---

I am writing you to express my concerns regarding a resolution for a \$250,000 allocation to the **Earth Island Institute/Kelly Creek Protection Project (KCPP)** for the **Helen Putnam Park Expansion Project**. (Item #4 on the April 15th agenda).

It is unclear to me that the City has evaluated priorities for spending **Open Space Acquisition Funds** and wonder why the Kelly Creek project is the chosen priority. There are other projects, (for example Petaluma River Park) that have demonstrated capacity to execute a plan. KCPP has not demonstrated their ability to raise funds to support the development of the project. They do not appear to have raised money beyond the acquisition. There appears to be no financial plan or assessment of the feasibility of raising funds on the KPCC website. Nor have I found any financial data that is required of a registered charitable 501(c)(3) to be reported.

While I support the preservation of the property and creating access to Helen Putnam Park from the property, KCPP's proposal incorporates components that are, in my opinion, extraneous and expensive. In short, I believe the scale of their plan is too large. Restoration and a trail to Putnam Park, along with (limited) parking are most important. I note from their proposal that the trail to the park doesn't occur until Phase Three.

Finally, this project is a County park not a City park and in my opinion the County should be coming up with the money to develop it. The City, by funding this is opening the door to being dragged into funding a major project.

I am unable to attend the meeting on the 15th due to a prior commitment and I urge you to withhold support for the allocation until the KPCC can demonstrate they have the capacity to execute the project.

Thank you

Robert Bailey



From: [susan kirks](#)
To: [-- City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Item 4 April 15 Scott Ranch
Date: Monday, April 15, 2024 3:25:35 PM

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

For the Mayor and Members of the City Council,

The request before you for \$250,000 from the Open Space Acquisition fund is not a pledge. It is a request to approve allocation.

This appears to be a new financial development and is a circumstance that should have been disclosed in the EIR and subdivision certification/review hearing

The Kelly Creek Project group appears to be seeking added funding from the Coastal Conservancy and the Wildlife Conservation Board and others. Political influence may help them obtain Conservancy funds, but it shouldn't. If the ECB does any due diligence on the level of habitat impacts and destruction that will occur on this property and the inappropriate park extension plan, not a dime will be allocated to this.

There's no Resolution in your packet for the choice to deny this request. Why is that?

The Kelly Creek Project group wants to use the City's allocation (not a pledge) to leverage seeking added funding.

My guess is you'll approve this, giving the funds as requested. You certified an inadequate EIR and approved a luxury housing deal for the developer, many of you stating this is the best that could be done. Not one of you asked one question of the applicant's biologist.

I want the Petaluma community to understand how the Kelly Creek property could have been prioritized for full conservation and pursuit of funds for that, with minimally impactful and beneficial education and environmental programs. The biological resources of this property strongly support that. All of the deals, the grant funding pledged and PR could have been declined, in support of a different direction, supported by the greater community. If the developer opted to not become a willing seller, then the community could continue to encourage that until the developer did. Just because a developer/owner indicates no willingness to sell does not mean that will not change. There must be sustained leadership with political will to achieve what is best for the property, the habitat and multiple species, and the greater community.

The park extension plan, housing development and this request now for \$250,000 from the City's fund are not what is optimal, but a continuation of a decision your Council should not have made.

For the community's edification, we can likely expect a unanimous approval with loads of compliments and justifications for this Resolution by the City Council.

Very unfortunate, especially for the land, natural features and species who have no voice.

Susan Kirks
Petaluma



Petalumans for Responsible Planning

PetRP@comcast.net

www.PetRP.org

April 15, 2024

To Petaluma City Council

We are opposed to awarding Kelly Creek Protection Project (KCPP) Open Space Acquisition funds totaling \$250,000 for Phase I of the development of the park.

The public first had an opportunity to review Kelly Creek Protection Project (KCPP) plans for the extension of Helen Putnam Park in 2021. The public was presented with a beautifully designed park. (Attachment 2 of the Agenda item.) The park plan had numerous amenities including barn center, playground, parking lots, bridges, Class 1 trail, nature center, etc.

The estimated cost for acquisition and Phase 1 park improvements as communicated by Earth Island Institute (EII) and KCPP is \$9.5 million. To date EII/KCPP has raised approximately \$4.1 million.

The \$4.1 million is the same amount raised by 2021 when the project was presented to the public.

In every meeting and communication leading up to the City's approval of the development, KCPP was confident that they could secure the funds to build out Phase 1 of the Park Extension plan. KCPP repeatedly stated the park would have "no cost to the city." (*On the last page of this letter is the research of various city meetings with video reference points to the comments about "no cost to the city."*)

At the City Council meeting on February 27, 2023, KCPP stated that it had "assembled over \$5.5 million." (*See attached reference*).

What does this request for \$250,000 from City coffers tell the citizens of Petaluma?

- If KCPP hasn't raised even 1 penny more than they had when the project was approved, how did they actually plan to pay for Phase I? Was the plan all along to ask for Open Space funds from the City?
- If KCPP hasn't raised more money by now, why are we throwing good money after bad? Did KCPP actually have \$5.1 million in the City Council presentation (2023) or were they exaggerating the amount to get the project approved?

- The staff report states that by approving this money, it shows local support for the project. If the City's project approval vote doesn't convey that support, how will \$250,000 make a difference toward the KCPP \$5 million shortfall?
- This housing development was approved in good faith and that KCPP WOULD be able to fund at least Phase 1 of the park. If KCPP cannot fund it, what happens to the approved housing development?
- If KCPP doesn't have the funds to support Phase 1 of their grand plan, do what the rest of us do – scale back the project. Spend only what you have in hand.

We think that this land should be a simple park preserving the environment

We support this land as a park. The elaborate, detailed park plan was made public in 2021. No public input was provided prior to the park presentation. All subsequent public meetings were devoted to evaluating the original park plan. The public questioned why the plan needed to be so elaborate (and ultimately so expensive). The public advocated for a scaled back plan. The public encouraged protecting the environment and still allowing people access to the park.

City Transparency

This request for City Open Space money was added to the agenda without an announcement to other groups that the Open Space funds are available. If the City wanted a fair and equitable disbursement of these funds, why not make a public announcement of availability of funds and ask for applications? Why award a quarter million dollars under the assumption that the public would agree these were a good use of open space funds?

If this request for \$250,000 is approved, the actions of this City Council are communicating to the public that this park project takes precedence over the other open space projects in the community.

Our organization and our hundreds of supporters have always advocated for open, transparent, honest, and a public approach to the development plans of this special land at Windsor and D.

References

In reviewing the public comments of the past, we belatedly realize that the \$4.1 million raised was to be transferred to Davidon for cost of the land. None of the \$4.1 million was available for Phase I of the park before transferring to Sonoma County Parks.

Earth Island Institute Winter 2019

“Those funds raised that were raised above the \$4.1 million level, however, will go toward the effort to convert this land into a public park.”

Quote from letter dated 4-16-18, John Brown, City Manager to Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District:

“KCPP has raised three million dollars in nonprofit philanthropic funding to assist with the acquisition and to be used as matching funds in the event of a grant award. **KCPP project has not requested nor required any City Funding.**”

Quote from editorial written by Diana Gomez and Richard Marzo published in the *Argus Courier*, June 9, 2022.

“KCPP has committed to significantly improving the parkland area before transferring it to Sonoma County Regional Parks, at no cost to the Regional Parks.”

Letter to City Council January 31, 2023

From Peter Galvin Director of Programs Center for Biological Diversity

“In addition, upon taking title to the 47 acres of the site that will be protected as public open space, the Kelly Creek Protection Project will conduct a \$900,000 program of habitat restoration and improvements that will promote the recovery of CRLF. These improvements include fencing the stock pond to exclude cows, fencing the two riparian creek beds, repairing deep gully damage to protect water quality, and planting both native trees and undergrowth for refugia.”

Email sent from Greg Colvin to the City on March 15, 2021

“Regarding the costs, funding, and intentions of KCPP and Sonoma County Regional Parks to build out the public amenities described in the three phases of work set forth in the EIR Project Description, we offer the following assurances, as best we can anticipate the future: * Phase 1 is expected to cost \$1 million to \$2 million. As we have

said, after the close of escrow and receipt of the \$1 million matching grant from Ag + Open Space District for the \$4.1 million purchase of 44 acres, we will have over \$1 million on hand, in private nonprofit donations held by Earth Island Institute, for Phase 1 construction.”

City Council meeting Monday, March 15, 2021

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECObqSBUp1s&ab_channel=CityofPetaluma

2:14: 00 - 2:14:30 – Gregg Colvin

“Able to add this land at no cost to the city.

Scott Ranch Community Meeting, February 2021

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=teOi4uCHMRM&ab_channel=ExtendPutnamPark

What's at Stake (what could be lost) - more

- \$1m in Ag + Open Space funds that expire in October 2021
- Mid-range homes for 28 families,
plus Davidon contribution to City affordable housing fund
- 84% of Scott Ranch protected by combined Putnam Park and Davidon open space
- **New measures for fire protection and resilience at west side urban/wildland interface**
- Closer access to healthy outdoor recreation for all residents, at no cost to the City
- Public ownership of the heart of Scott Ranch,
under County Regional Parks professional management
- A public interest resolution of the Scott Ranch land dispute, after 17 years
- **Our ability to secure the future, leave a legacy for generations to come.**

Greg Colvin

1:07:33 / 1:28:19

Bullet Point #5: at no cost to the City

1:06:33

Planning Commission

August 9, 2022

https://petaluma.granicus.com/player/clip/3711?view_id=31&redirect=true&h=287f9ca77d6c0e5f6551766e1d3cf8a3

1:26:26

Greg Colvin

“At no cost to the city”

City Council

February 27, 2023

<https://cityofpetaluma.primegov.com/Portal/Meeting?meetingTemplateId=5150>

3:18:29 – 3:18:40

“Assembled over \$5.5 million in Ag & Open Space money”
