

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [-- City Council](#)  
**Subject:** RE: GPAC Appointments  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 12:55:22 PM

---

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

Dear Council Members, Janice Cader-Thompson and John Shribbs were a tremendous asset to the GPAC, particularly their critical attention to our natural resources. As a town built on a watershed, it is essential that citizens who would elevate the importance of our flood risk and natural setting, and its much-needed preservation, serve on the committee advising the General Plan update. To that end, I hope the City Council will strongly consider appointing the following individuals for the GPAC (several, inexplicably, whom did not receive high scores from the M Group consultancy):

- Lizzie Wallack, green architect
- Brent Newell
- Hal Bohner
- Ron Chestnut
- Lance Kuehne

Additionally, as both a Petaluma citizen and State of CA employee, I am concerned about the conflict of interest represented in having the M Group consultancy score the GPAC applicants, for the following reason: the General Plan (GP), a required element of the State, is a public deliverable funded by us taxpayers. The M Group are paid consultants for this deliverable and, unlike the Raimi + Associates consultancy, the M Group also function in our City government. The M Group meet privately with a select group of "stakeholders" (i.e., Hines, LaFranchi, Merlone Geier, Johnsons, Keegan and Copin, etc, etc) and the public are not privy to these exclusive meetings and what is transacted. It's wholly in the interests of these landowners, commercial real estate companies, and developers to influence the direction/scope of the GP process, AND what transpires in regards to the GP greatly impacts the fiduciary fitness of the M Group (their bottom line). The M Group are therefore, by no means, a disinterested party. At the State, where I work, this would be an egregious and untenable conflict of interest - and disallowed. Further, it is troubling that our town paid \$600,00K+ for an organization like Healthy Democracy to oversee the selection/process of the committee to redevelop the fairgrounds, when the GPAC selection process is both heavily biased and, further, the M Group consultancy has declared that they do not even have to accept the recommendations of the GPAC committee. Again, the General Plan is Petaluma's deliverable. It should be entirely the choosing of the City Council members to vet the GPAC applicants and decide on their fitness for the task.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Moira Sullivan