

From: [suedav](#) [REDACTED]
To: [McDonnell, Kevin](#); [Barnacle, Brian](#); [Cader-Thompson, Janice](#); [Healy, Mike](#); [Karen Nau](#); [Shribbs, John](#); -- [City Clerk](#); [Ellis, Evelyn](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Vote NO on Scott Ranch development
Date: Sunday, February 26, 2023 7:50:40 PM

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

After 19 years, City Council is poised to make a final decision about the Scott Ranch project.

This plan is a very human-centric way of looking at this land. In fact the FEIR states [p 64 of exec summary] that the environmentally superior option for this land is NO DEVELOPMENT at all. No homes, no park, nothing but open space and wildland.

And this is the option that Petalumans for Responsible Planning and our community advocate for.

Over the years, we have hired experts, funded by donations from our community to evaluate the technical documents submitted for City approval.

Those experts found major deficiencies in the FEIR in these areas:

- **Biology:**
 - The studies are outdated by almost 2 decades. Special status for species have changed as have methodologies for conducting the surveys
 - Our expert (Dr. Shawn Smallwood) found 43 species of vertebrate wildlife, 6 of which are special status species on his visit
 - The FEIR should provide a detailed account of which species were seen and in what levels of abundance, what members of each species were doing and in what environmental context. Decision makers and the public need to know how much credibility to assign these surveys. The FEIR only includes maps of broad vegetation cover categories.
 - The FEIR assesses impacts to only 10 (22%) of the 45 potentially occurring special-status species of birds, thereby neglecting 36 (78%) of special-status species of birds.
 - The FEIR includes a map of the CRLF habitat that is outdated. Note the habitat that the 2022 general plan references. The CRLF is shown on almost the entire parcel. This cannot be mitigated.
- The FEIR states that the increased **traffic** is significant and unmitigatable. There is no reference to how this increased traffic will impact wildlife.
- The FEIR claims that large mammals use Kelly Creek as the **wildlife corridor**
 - The expert survey shows that the corridor covers most of the parcel.
 - The plan places two streets for houses radiating from Windsor St., and the park paths along the creek, the parking lot and tot lot to the south of the creek, would all impinge on any wildlife activity on this land.
- **Climate:** 2019 Petaluma adopted Climate Emergency Framework to reach carbon neutrality by 2030, ambitious goal in many respects.
 - With rising temps and reduced moisture, **Fire** is an issue: FEIR states that the property is not in a 'very high hazard severity zone', yet, this property has been identified by the

City as Very High Risk Fire Area

<https://www.petrp.org/petaluma-fire-risk-map>

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ea880f6d9a2075c7b7f54af/t/5f442db7e5b7e62d6c2c49e0/1598303674228/Wildland+Urban+Interface.pdf>

- The **VMT** projected for this project exceed mandated levels and are un-mitigatable. Furthermore, 28 homes is always cited, when actually, the 28 homes + 9 ADUs result in 37 families with their corresponding numbers of vehicles.

The City of Petaluma is committed to doing our part to hit the targets for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (**RHNA**) determined by the state. However, looking at the latest RHNA report, we can see that these luxury homes will fill the Above Moderate RHNA category, which is already way over capacity.

You have all of the expert testimony

You have years and years of public comment opposing this project.

You have years and years of citizen input into what we want Petaluma to look like and be like, from all of our thoughtful participation in City committees and commissions, not to mention public meeting attendance, public comment, surveys, and other outreach efforts. We have participated and codified all that we can, after weighing the risks and benefits. All in the name of giving you direction from the public.

Furthermore, Council direction limited development on this site to 28 homes. The Staff Report, page 8 introduces an additional 9 ADUs. That's NOT 28 homes, that's 37 homes.

A general plan amendment needs to be made as well as a zoning map amendment and zoning text amendment (page 12 of Staff Report).

When is enough, enough? When will the public's voice be recognized for its worth?

Page 30 of the staff report sums it up:

'Though the project will have significant and unavoidable impacts related to the generation of VMT, the statement of overriding considerations demonstrates that the project benefits outweigh the potential adverse impacts.'

Six individuals will decide the fate of this land. Three of them recently voted onto the City Council by only the population in their District, not by the entire Petaluma public. And the one Council member who represents the district in which this project is located has to recuse himself.

A yes vote signals a blatant disregard for the public process, public input, wildland preservation, and any creative alternate solutions.

We have an opportunity to make Open Space a priority in Petaluma. Once it's developed, it's gone forever.

Please listen to all of us in Petaluma and vote NO on this Scott Ranch project.

Sue Davy