Sid Commons Apartment FEIR Running Errata as of January 27, 2020

This Errata provides clarification on formatting and minor corrections to language and information presented in the FEIR. These changes are for clarification purposes only and do not change the analysis or conclusions of the FEIR.

Table of Contents:

Chapter 8: Strike reference to Chapter 8 (For Report Preparers and References, see DEIR Chapter 20).

Appendices: Add Appendix C: 2019 Supplemental Traffic Evaluation, Fehr & Peers, April 2019

Chapter 4:

Page 1: Add Final Bullet to read:

Effects of train-related noise and vibration and concern about Graylawn and Jess Avenue traffic noise.

Chapter 5:

- Letter K: Comments K-15 and K-16 (which follow K-12) should have been labeled together as K-13. K-17 should not have been labeled, as it is a comment on merits of project and not a CEQA comment.
- Letters S and T: Strike label S-2/T-2 on letter; these are comments on merits of project and are covered by the concluding comment of Response to Letter S and Response to Letter T.
- Response to Letter Y: Strike "Response to Comment Y-4" line; retain the subsequent sentence regarding the merits of the Project.
- Letter AD: Response to Comment AC-1 and AC-2 should read Response to Comment AD-1 and AD-2

Appendices:

Add Appendix C: 2019 Supplemental Traffic Evaluation, Fehr & Peers, April 2019

Throughout:

Mitigation Measure/Recommendation to Read:

Recommendation Transp-B, Introduce Traffic Calming and Enhance Livability along Graylawn and Jess Avenues: The Revised Project shall implement a Traffic Calming Plan, which may include bulb outs, street tree planting, pavement marking and other roadway livability improvements and traffic calming features to minimize conflicts with "livability" standards for local streets that exceed the 2,000 ADT design standard for this roadway. Prior to SPAR review at the Planning Commission, the applicant shall coordinate with City Public Works staff on the preferred Traffic Calming approach and design (anticipated to be similar in nature to Concept 3 as shown in the draft Traffic Calming Plan of Appendix A). The preferred Traffic Calming Plan shall be shown on the plan set for SPAR review. The Public Improvement Plan set for the Revised Project shall include the finalized Traffic Calming Plan.

Update Floodway Line:

The Floodway line is mis-located base maps presented in FEIR Figures 2-2, 2-6, 3-1, and 3-4. Its correct location is shown on Figure 4-2: 2014 FEMA Floodplain Designations. At no point does the Floodway extend farther upland than the floodplain. Thus, the existing Oak Creek Apartments play structure that the applicant, at the November 19, 2019 Planning Commission hearing, offered to update for neighborhood public use is located outside of the Floodway. This base map error of the Floodway line also occurs on Figures within the DEIR.

Correction of the Floodway line alters the net acreage sums of the Sid Commons project site (APN 009 and 006) to 16.1 net acres (from a 15.45 net acres when the Project included the Shasta extension and an estimated 15.7 acres after the Shasta Avenue extension was eliminated from the Project) and of the Oak Creek Apartment project site (APN 007) to 7.5 net acres (from 6.58 net acres). This results in the FEIR's revised 205-unit project proposing a calculated density of 12.7, which is similar to the FEIR's statement at Page 6-8 that the proposed 205-units of the on the approximately 15.7 net acres yields a density of approximately 13.1 units to the acre. With the newly-revised 180-unit concept on the 16.1 net acres, the density yield is approximately 11.1 units to the acre. Correction to the Floodway line on base maps and corresponding refinements to the calculated density does not alter the analysis or conclusions of the EIR.

Clarify extent of Floodplain in EIR's modeling of the 100-year event (FEIR Figures 4-3 through 4-8 and DEIR Figures 11-6 and 11-9)

The City's consulting hydrologist has confirmed that the EIR's hydrology modeling maps depict the "raw" xpstorm model results and provided the attached Memo (Exhibit A dated January 27, 2020). Like other modeling prepared for the City, the EIR's hydrology modeling maps were not manually post-processed. Post-processing the raw data consists of the following two additional steps: 1) the area protected by the floodwall downstream of the constriction weir would be removed manually as final work on the Payran-area flood work was completed in 2015 and the hydrology model includes its geometry and 2) isolated ponding shown on the maps would be removed manually as these areas are unintentionally mapped during the GIS process. To demonstrate the results of post-processing, the City's consulting hydrologist has prepared Attachment 1 of the attached Memo demonstrating post-processing results; it documents that the Payran-area (FEMA's mapped A99 area) is not located within the 100-year floodplain.

The City's consulting hydrologist confirms that, in the 100-year event, areas behind the Payranarea floodwall downstream of the constriction weir (left and right overbank) are not at risk of flooding in the existing condition, with residential development and terracing of the Sid Commons development (FEIR Figures 4-7 and 4-8), or in the future condition with cumulative terracing upstream of the weir and detention at the north of town (FEIR Figures 4-3 and 4-4).

The modeling and mapping provided to date in the DEIR, FEIR, and in the attached memo have been accurate for their specific intended use, and consistent with all modeling that the city's consulting hydrologist has performed for the City, including the FEMA map revision. The calculated water surface elevation data for the Sid Commons evaluation meets the same standard as the modeling reviewed and approved by FEMA. The City's hydrologist provides the Memo and post processing maps to help clarify information presented in the FEIR. It does not alter any analysis or conclusions therein.





Project:	Sid Commons Hydraulic Evaluation
Subject:	100-year Flood Boundary Post-Processing
Date:	January 27, 2020
То:	Gina Benedetti-Petnic, City of Petaluma Olivia Ervin, City of Petaluma
From:	David S. Smith, P.E., WEST Consultants, Inc.

WEST Consultants, Inc. (WEST) completed a memo on February 22, 2017 for the City of Petaluma (the City) to evaluate the effect of proposed grading and terracing of the Petaluma River on the right bank adjacent to the proposed Sid Commons development.

The flood boundary mapping in the WEST 2017 memo was intended to highlight the difference between existing and proposed conditions and not for comparison to effective FEMA floodplain mapping which involves additional post-processing. Map results displayed were the "raw" xpstorm model results created using Geographic Information System (GIS) processing by subtracting the xpstorm water surface elevation results from the ground surface data. The only way to account for the presence of the floodwall is to manually remove floodplain areas protected by the floodwall after the initial "raw" model results are processed. Post-processing the 100-year flood boundary mapping for better consistency with the effective FEMA floodplain mapping would primarily involve two additional steps: 1) the area protected by the floodwall downstream of the constriction weir would be removed manually, and 2) Isolated pockets of flooding that are artifacts of the mapping process would be removed manually (a GIS mapping artifact is defined as an area of isolated ponding that is not connected to a modeled overflow from a stream, but is mapped due to the GIS process of creating the floodplain).

The City has requested this addendum to the WEST 2017 memo to address the 100-year event graphics as described above. The revised graphics with the described post-processing are included as Attachment 1. Areas that were previously mapped behind the floodwall for the 100-year event downstream of the constriction weir (left and right overbank) are not at risk of flooding for the following conditions: existing conditions, proposed conditions with the Sid Commons development, or proposed conditions with cumulative future detention and/or terracing elsewhere in the City. The revised

mapping shown in Attachment 1 does not change previous summary data summarizing the effect of terracing and detention providing a 25% decrease in the flood boundary (180 acres).

The City has also requested additional clarification regarding xpstorm model accuracy, effects of potential river sedimentation, and possible fluctuation in storm events due to climate change. First, the xpstorm modeling methods used to evaluate the Sid Commons development are consistent with all other past modeling conducted by WEST for the City including the FEMA map revision. The calculated water surface elevation data for the Sid Commons evaluation meets the same standard as the modeling reviewed and approved by FEMA.

Second, potential future sedimentation could result in increases in water surface elevation downstream of the turning basin. However, the increase would be occurring in both existing and proposed conditions models effectively cancelling out.

Third, regarding future climate change, the previous argument also applies—that any increase in flow rates due to climate change would be occurring in both existing and proposed conditions effectively cancelling out.

Attachment 1

Flood Boundary Comparison Map for 100-year Storm (2 sheets)





