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Item 4.C

From Dave Alden:

When the Council was first briefed about the Station Access Road alternatives, Councilmember Healy asked about traffic flows. He was told by staff “We haven’t gotten that far yet.” (Granicus, 10/7/19, about 2:59.) We never did get that far, but we should have.

The Station Area Master Plan determined that Station Access Road and Transverse Street were essential to the traffic patterns near the station. I served on the Citizens Committee for the Master Plan and was impressed by the analysis of the traffic engineer who has since been hired by Mayor Breed to head SFMTA.

Nonetheless, the proposed SMART agreement rejects his conclusions without understanding his reasoning.

Petaluma would be badly harmed. My three minutes won’t allow maps and laser pointing but consider this. Under the now proposed traffic scheme, car travel from most directions would require multiple additional turns and reentering an arterial after leaving an arterial before reaching the station. This isn’t good traffic planning. We’d have broken the traffic system in a critical part of town.

A friend suggested that perhaps it’d be better if traffic flow were impeded. It might encourage alternative transportation. I respect her optimism, but she’s wrong.

When most of a town is configured to require a car, everyone who can afford a car will own one. If we then make driving inconvenient in one small but crucial part of town, we don’t reduce traffic but only create congestion and accidents.

Furthermore, the additional turning movements by drivers would impede bicyclists and pedestrians while also risking their safety. Everyone loses.

I understand the City chose not to acquire the additional street right-of-way because of SMART’s price tag. It reflects poorly on SMART that they tried extortion on a fellow municipality. However, there are other ways to approach SMART. If the City were to tell SMART and the other parties that the Hines project wouldn’t be approved without a safer plan for accessing the station, SMART would be forced to reconsider their position.

I ask the Council to remove Paragraph 5 from the agreement and to work toward a better solution.

_________________________

From Barry Bussewitz:

Please accept my seconding of the comment from Dave Alden on Agenda Item 4.C.

Thank you very much. I will be Zooming my Solano College Class meeting tonight. I wish you well.
Dear Mayor Barrett and Council Members,

I am writing to ask that you not adopt the proposed Resolution approving an Agreement between the City of Petaluma and the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit District for the construction of Corona Station Improvements.

There has been widespread public opposition to this project. The community is concerned that safety and traffic impacts were inadequately studied, that the project is inconsistent with the City’s General Plan, that public funds are being improperly used, and that it is not consistent with State laws and guidance regarding land use and transportation. These are only a few of the many issues that the community has raised and that have been ignored by the City.

I and other members of the community urge you to not continue entitling this flawed project.

Regards,
Brian Barnacle