CITY OF PETALUMA

POST OFFICE BOX 61
PETALUMA, CA 94953-0061

Mike Healy
Councilmember

November 17, 2015

Mr. Alon Adani
Cornerstone Properties
5401 Old Redwood Highway, Suite 110
Petaluma, CA 94954

Re: East Petaluma SMART Station

Dear Mr. Adani:

Thank you for your letter of November 12. We respectfully disagree with your conclusion that the Adobe Lumber site is preferable to the long-identified Corona site, either from the perspective of SMART or that of the City of Petaluma.

As you note, on November 3 the Petaluma City Council directed City staff to bring forward a proposed modification to our Traffic Impact Fee program to include SMART station improvements at the Corona site. All six council members present at that meeting articulated the superiority of the Corona site. The requested work is expected to be completed in several weeks, and will then return to Council for adoption. There was nothing improper about the Council's November 3 direction. The matter was added to the agenda at the request of three council members, consistent with the Council's procedural rules. Proper Brown Act notice was provided in the agenda. And there is no requirement in state law or local rules for a staff report.

As you know, the Corona station site was identified and analyzed in SMART's 2006 EIR. A new CEQA process and document would be needed to change the station site to Adobe Lumber. Moreover, your citation to employment density near the Adobe Lumber site is insufficient to establish that it would generate higher SMART ridership. SMART ridership analyses show that the Novato Narrows bottleneck, which unfortunately will persist for many years, provides a huge incentive to ride the train. Conversely, to the extent that employees of the businesses near Adobe Lumber commute from out of Petaluma, most likely come from the north and have the benefit of the already widened segments of Highway 101. Their incentive to ride the train is far less. The Corona site is also far more convenient to East Petaluma residents commuting to Marin, which would get cars off of the Narrows and 101 in Marin. This just underscores the need for a rigorous ridership analysis in a new CEQA document if the SMART Board is interested in changing the site of the East Petaluma station.

Petaluma City Hall
11 English Street
Petaluma, CA 94952

Phone (707)778-4345
Fax (707) 778-4419

E-Mail mthealy@sbcglobal.net

The Adobe Lumber site is entirely within the FEMA 100 year flood plain; it would be unwise to place a station in such a location. Additionally, the City of Petaluma has long been concerned about the 11,400 cubic yards of fill imported onto the Adobe Lumber site many years ago.[1] In July 2002 the Petaluma City Council authorized water and sewer service to the site, but only if the 11,400 yards of fill was removed; the fill has not been removed, which is why there is still no city utility service. In keeping with the City's "zero net fill" policy to prevent landowners from harming nearby properties, and to preserve the integrity of the Corps flood fix, we anticipate that the City would continue to insist that, at a minimum, the fill be removed before annexation or the provision of water or sewer service. It would also be difficult to justify annexation or outside utility service for uses inconsistent with the City's General Plan. The County does not have the ability to provide water or sewer service to the site for the 200 housing units you discuss.

Neither is the Corona site as problematic as you suggest. The soil contamination issues at Corona are limited to discrete "hot spots" and are well understood. The developer is proposing a lot line adjustment so that a contamination-free parcel can be gifted to SMART for a parking structure. The remainder of the site would be remediated prior to building apartments. Nor does the ownership status of the Corona site create an impediment. Lomas Partners has a binding option and is prepared to move forward once an agreement with SMART is achieved. Moreover, Lomas Partners has a successful track record of obtaining entitlements on complex projects in Petaluma.

The direction the City Council provided at our November 3 meeting was intended to assist SMART in achieving its and the City's longstanding goal of achieving a SMART station at the Corona Road site. That goal is now well within reach, especially if SMART does not unreasonably delay its decision.

Sincerely,

Mike Healy
Councilmember

Kathy Miller
Vice Mayor

Attachment

[1] See the analysis by Miller Pacific Engineering Group dated April 26, 2001, attached.

Miller Pacific
ENGINEERING GROUP

165 North Redwood Drive
Suite 120
San Rafael, California 94903
F 415 / 491-1831
T 415 / 491-1338

April 26, 2001
File: 814-01.ltr

Channel Lumber
100 West Cuttings Boulevard
Richmond, California 94804-2014

Re: Geotechnical Evaluation
Existing Fill Pad
Adobe Lumber
5400 Old Redwood Highway
Petaluma, California

Introduction and Scope of Services

This letter presents the results of our evaluation of an existing fill pad located at the southerly end of the Adobe Lumber property in Petaluma, California. The site location is shown on the attached Figure 1.

The purpose of our evaluation is to determine the quantity of fill previously placed for the pad and to provide comment on the overall quality of the fill material. Miller Pacific Engineering Group (MPEG) is providing services for this project in accordance with our Agreement for Professional Services dated March 15, 2001. Our services have included:

- Logging nine backhoe test pits within the fill pad to determine fill thickness;
- Performing 13 field density tests to determine in-place density of the fill material;
- Use the data from our test pits along with topographic data for the site, provided by CSW/Stuber-Stroeh, to determine the quantity of fill in the pad;
- Perform laboratory determination of maximum density and optimum moisture content of a representative fill sample;
- Evaluate fill quality (i.e., Relative Compaction, debris content, etc.); and,
- Summarize the results of our evaluation in this letter report.

Project Background and Site Conditions

Fill has previously been placed to create the relatively level pad shown on Figure 1. The fill was apparently placed without a grading permit or inspection/testing. We understand that subsequent remedial grading was performed to improve surface drainage around the site.

We determined fill thickness at nine test pit locations within the pad on April 11, 2001. At that time we also performed field density testing at the surface of all nine test pits and at approximately 2 feet below top of pad at four of the pits. The approximate locations of the test pits are shown on Figure 1. The fill depths observed and the results of our field density testing are summarized in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1
TEST PIT SUMMARY

Test Pit	Fill Thickness	Relative Compaction* (Percent)		Comments
		FG	FG – 2 Feet	
TP-1	4.5 Feet	85	82	Concrete and Wood Debris in Fill
TP-2	3.7Feet	86	--	--
TP-3	4.0 Feet	85	82	Concrete Debris in Fill
TP-4	4.0 Feet	92	--	--
TP-5	4.5Foot	78	80	Asphalt Concrete and Wood Debris in Fill
TP-6	5.0Feet	85	--	--
TP-7	5.0 Feet	82	--	--
TP-8	2.7Feet	86	--	--
TP-9	3.5 Feet	85	85	--

* Relative Compaction (RC) refers to the in-place dry density of soil expressed as a percentage of the maximum dry density, as determined by laboratory test procedure

Quantity of Fill

Our fill quantity determination is based on the observed fill depths in the nine test pits and topographic information for the site provided by CSW/Stuber-Stroeh. With this information, we generated several cross sections through the pad and used the End Area method to determine volume. Based on the above analysis, the total volume of fill of the subject pad is approximately 11,400 cubic yards.

Quality of Fill

In addition to fill quantity determination, our field density testing, test pit observations, and laboratory maximum dry density determination (see attached Laboratory Compaction Test sheet) provided data for evaluation of fill quality. Our filed density testing indicates a range of Relative Compaction of between 78 and 92 percent, with a majority of tests falling between 82 and 86 percent. For reference, 90 percent RC is typically required for structural fills to support building foundations, 85 percent is typically acceptable for "landscape" area fills, and 95 percent is typically required for pavement subgrade and base. We also noted old wood, concrete, and asphalt pavement debris at several locations in the pits. This material is typically excluded from acceptable structural fills.

April 26, 2001

We trust that this provides the information required at this time. If you or others have further questions or comments, please call us.

Yours very truly,
MILLER PACIFIC ENGINEERING GROUP

Timothy J. Reynolds
Civil Engineer No. 58622
(Expires 12/31/02)

Reviewed by,

For Dennis H. Furby
Geotechnical Engineer No. 326
(Expires 12/31/01)

Attachments: Figure 1, Site Plan
Laboratory Compaction Curve

5 copies submitted