**Comment on Final EIR for SID Commons Project, Petaluma**

Dear mayor Barrett and City Council,

The PUD, as you know, says no future development using Graylawn. The City Panning documents connected to the PUD creation cite traffic hazard on Graylawn and safety as reasons supporting the PUD elements: no future development 1) burdening Graylawn access and 2) without a second point of entrance/exit.

After rain, the soil holds a massive volume of water and numerous ponds cover the land. Still -- it reaches saturation and so much rain comes down from Oak Creek area. Impacts to one area can have consequences for another area. Paving over the land and collecting, routing water through drains would result in more run-off down Graylawn and faster river over capacity -- causing increased flooding and Graylawn (a current and constant problem) and increased traffic hazard. That is a key reason to not revise/remove the PUD.

Developing on even the highest elevation of that land will result in increased and dangerous run-off and flooding on Graylawn.

I urge you to not revise/remove that from PUD because:

- Graylawn is not a "standard" residential street:
  - it just 1/10th mile
  - has FIVE non-signal cross-streets and cul-de-sacs
  - 2 blind intersections that are very wide -- set back far from Graylawn, precluding a safe line-of-view for Graylawn traffic
  - curves at start, limiting visibility
  - incline, slopes down coming south from Oak Creek
  - has high crown and deep gutters and dips to handle the huge run-off that we get coming down from Oak Creek whenever it rains
  - Traffic calming such as slow bumps and bulb outs will not work on Graylawn. Why? Because every time it rains, the run-off down Graylawn is substantial and large ponds form and remain along the street, even after weeks of dry weather.
  - The Graylawn run-off and pools are a traffic hazard (hydroplaning, splashing).
  - “Traffic calming solutions" would exacerbate flooding on Graylawn.
Thank you, Taryn