

SR 37 Policy Committee

Project Delivery Policy Recommendations:

Project Delivery/Corridor Plan

Policy Questions: Project Delivery/Corridor Plan – January 2017

Note that previously detailed considerations regarding the unsolicited proposal received have been folded into larger policy categories, as outlined below.

The following policy questions were derived by the SR 37 Policy Committee over the previous 6 months:

1. Which entity will be responsible for various phases of the project (i.e. PID, Environmental, Design and Construction? How will the proposer address Right of Way and property condemnation? What role does the SR 37 MOU Group have in the process, if any?
2. What provisions does the proposer provide to ensure qualified employees and contractors throughout the life of the project?
3. Who will be the CEQA/NEPA lead?
4. What level of control should the local agency or JPA maintain? For example, should toll collection for the entire alignment and possibly revenues from other sources (development fees, etc.) be the responsibility of the local agency or JPA?
5. Will the flyover at SR121/SR 37 intersection and the Mare Island Interchange enhancements be considered for Phase 2 staging?
6. How does a proposal address SR 121 and Mare Island intersections?
7. What are the metrics used to assess sea level rise in regards to when Phase 2 will be initiated for construction? How will the existing facility be replaced if sea-level rise occurs quicker than the anticipated 2040 date?
8. Aside from the bike lanes proposed, what other modes of transportation are being conceived as part of this proposal, such as rail, bus transit, and pedestrian?
9. What is the traffic revenue being assumed by this proposal?

Recommendations:

I. Corridor Plan

1. **SR 37 Policy Committee** acts in an advisory role for the development the SR 37 Corridor Plan

- i. Corridor Plan will identify independent, but inter-related projects within the corridor that will address adaptation to Sea Level Rise and Congestion.
- ii. Corridor Plan will identify the implementation schedule for the SR 37 Corridor due to Sea Level Rise and Congestion.
- iii. Specific components or improvements along the corridor would be grouped into independent projects based on the timing of when the improvements must be made to address Sea Level Rise and Congestion; or grouped based on necessity due to geometric conditions of planned improvements and the effect they have on the corridor components.
- iv. The Corridor Plan should address logical termini for each project and related components. For example, should a bike facility be part of the project, it will have to consider the ultimate network connection and have a logical end point.
- v. The Corridor Plan will identify initial sea level rise metrics which will inform the implementation schedule for projects that address Sea Level Rise.
- vi. Corridor Modes, such as transit, and rail only options will have to be evaluated as part of the environmental document. Bicycle and Pedestrian needs will be assessed throughout the corridor. The projects that build new or reconstruct large sections of the corridor need to evaluate non-auto facilities as part of the project. Additionally, these projects need to address bike continuity along the corridor. The Corridor Plan will initiate this planning.

1. **Four North Bay County Transportation Authorities**, in coordination with Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the four North Bay county transportation authorities will provide staff support for evaluating and considering the corridor adaptation strategies and timing of necessary improvements to address Sea Level Rise and congestion.

I. Implementation of Corridor Projects

1. **SR 37 Policy Committee** would be the forum for consideration and input into the Environmental Decision process. They will be kept informed as to the progress of the corridor projects as they are being implemented through the phases of the project (environmental, design, right-of-way, construction).
1. **Four North Bay County Transportation Authorities**, Caltrans, and other relevant agencies would take the lead for the implementation of the projects. Each project is likely to be unique, thus the actual partnerships and leads within the partnerships will vary depending on which agency is best suited to implement a specific project. However for all projects, at least one of the transportation authorities would be a primary partner. These lead agencies would provide regular financial and schedule updates to the SR 37 Policy Committee MOU Group. Should a project cross county lines, then one agency would take the lead with an agreement between the primary partners or a JPA could be formed to implement the project if the facility is relinquished to more than one county by Caltrans.
1. **CEQA/NEPA, Design, Right of Way and Construction** leads would be determined based on the specifics of an individual project. The Project Lead would be a public agency or JPA. If the project is on SR 37, which is owned and operated by Caltrans, then Caltrans would be the lead for CEQA/NEPA and will have a role to play in the other phases too – either as lead or oversight. A local agency may be best suited to be the implementation agency with Caltrans oversight.
1. **Toll Facilities/Toll Collection/Operations** should be administered by responsible agencies with proven track records of successful administration (i.e., Caltrans, Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA)).

I. Corridor Financial Plan

- 1. SR 37 Policy Committee** should develop a Preliminary Financial Plan based on the Corridor Plan. This Preliminary Financial Plan would identify potential funding resources for each component of the corridor.
- 2. SR 37 Policy Committee** will consider public and private financing, tolling, and traditional transportation funding sources as part of the Preliminary Financial Plan.
- 3. SR 37 Policy Committee** will oversee tolling policies if the Policy Committee is the financing lead. If the corridor financing lead is a regional agency (e.g. BATA), then that agency would oversee the tolling policies with input from the SR 37 Policy Committee. If a private venture is financing lead then the review and approval of tolling policy would be from the SR 37 MOU Group, a JPA made up of two or members of SR 37 MOU group, BATA, and/or the State.

Policy Questions: Proposal Evaluation Criteria

1. How does the SR 37 Policy Committee intend to evaluate and approve any unsolicited proposal to determine if this proposal is acceptable or not?
2. Which requirements (i.e. statutory, regulatory and goals) and evaluation factors (i.e. environmental, technical and financial) will a proposal be evaluated?

Recommendation:

1. The SR 37 Policy Committee will act in an advisory role to the implementing agency that has the authority to advance any project proposal to toll or improve the SR 37 facility.