

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
1	Napa Workshop		Suggests further consideration of public transit options, especially bus service.	There is a north bay transit operators group that meets quarterly that the CMAs participate in; the CMAs and transit operators are also in discussion about a origin/destination study to identify home and work destination sites for users of the corridor to see if transit would be feasible. There are also TDM strategies that could be implemented on the corridor, such as vanpools.
2	Napa Workshop		Supports preserving the function of wetlands, creating HOV lanes and an expanded ferry service between Vallejo and Marin.	MTC, the north bay CMAs and Caltrans are working with the environmental community to develop design options integrating transportation, ecology, and sea level rise adaptation. Ferry service between Vallejo and Marin is currently being studied by STA. As included in the corridor plan, HOV/managed lanes are being considered.
3	Napa Workshop		Suggests increasing the production of affordable housing in Marin to alleviate traffic; opposed to a fully private road; strongly supports the creation of HOV lanes, consider rail options.	The CMAs have no authority over housing production in any of the counties. It is understood that the jobs/housing imbalance is a contributor to traffic congestion. MTC and the CMAs continue to support policies and programs that foster affordable housing production throughout the Bay Area. There have been a myriad of funding options analyzed for the corridor which include full privatization; no decision on one particular funding strategy has been made. The preferred project alternative will not impede the ability for future rail to operate along the corridor. SMART is seeking funding to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf Although SMART was not successful in 2017 there are more funding opportunities in 2018.
4	Napa Workshop		Suggests car ferries to relieve congestion and offer a first and last mile option.	TDM strategies could be implemented on the corridor such as vanpools; STA is currently studying ferry service between Vallejo and Marin.
5	Sonoma Workshop		Prioritize HWY 121 interchange and all short-term improvements, supports elevated highway option and suggests looking into rail service, consider the freight usage of road.	The 121/37 intersection contributes to corridor congestion and potential intersection improvements are included in the Corridor Plan's near-term improvements. Caltrans will be implementing some of the near term improvements at this intersection in 2018. Elevated options are also included in the Corridor Plan's mid- to long-term improvements and will be assessed in more detail in later stages of project development. Rail service will not be precluded.
6	Sonoma Workshop		Supports short-term improvements at 121/37 intersection, encourages more public transit options especially expanding smart.	The 121/37 intersection contributes to corridor congestion and potential intersection improvements are included in the Corridor Plan's near-term improvements. Caltrans will be implementing some of the near term improvements at this intersection in 2018. Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategies, including transit, will be further assessed in later stages of project development. SMART is also seeking funding to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf . Although SMART was not successful in 2017 there are more funding opportunities in 2018.
7	Sonoma Workshop		Supports short-term improvements, especially lengthening left turn lane eastbound at Lakeville road, extend 2 lanes eastbound past sears point for 2 miles, and activate passenger rail service to integrate with smart system.	Two eastbound lanes extending beyond the Sears Point intersection is included in the Corridor Plan's near-term improvements. Extension to eastbound left turn lanes to the Lakeville Highway has been added the mid-term projects. SMART is also seeking funding for a Novato Solano Hub, see response below
8	Sonoma Workshop		Support for smart train expansion along SR37 to Vallejo.	Agreed this is happening on a parallel track. SMART is seeking funding to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf Although SMART was not successful in 2017 there are more funding opportunities in 2018.
9	Sonoma Workshop		Supports toll road and widening of lanes.	Comment noted.
10	Marin Workshop		Suggests consideration of variable pricing toll lanes (express lanes). Need to study undesirable effects of tolling, such as increasing overall system congestion. Suggests creating a middle reversible lane for segment B with varying toll price.	Reversible lane scenarios have been considered in the Corridor Plan and will be further assessed in future stages of project development, where tolling concepts will also be explored.
11	Marin Workshop		Suggests doing a geotechnical survey to find bedrock, investing in ferry service, and considering floating roadway (like Bayou states).	More detail engineering will be conducted as project phases progress. STA is studying ferry service between Vallejo and Marin.
12	Marin Workshop		Encourages alternative transportation options, specifically public transit and ferries.	Agree. Any long term solutions will integrate multi-modalism. STA is studying ferry service between Vallejo and Marin.
13	Marin Workshop		Supports the protection of wildlife corridors in the project area.	MTC, the north bay CMAs and Caltrans are working with the environmental community to develop design options integrating transportation, ecology, and sea level rise adaptation.
14	Marin Workshop		Strongly supports implementation of near-term improvements to allow sufficient time for selection of long-term strategy.	Agree. Caltrans will be implementing various near term projects to address congestion and safety at Highway 121, starting in early 2018.
15	Marin Workshop		Safety should be prioritized along the corridor: the east bound lane reduction and merge before Sears Point needs to be improved for safety by adding permanent lane partitions.	Agree. Caltrans will be implementing various near term projects to address congestion and safety at Highway 121, starting in early 2018.
16	Marin Workshop		Insists on the need to lessen congestion at the 101/37 interchange.	Caltrans is updating its Highway 101 Corridor System Management Plan which addresses the continued operations of Highway 101 in the North Bay. Any future projects on Highway 37 will also necessitate formal environmental review, which will look further into any traffic impacts.
17	Solano Workshop		Opposed to tolls and private ownership of road; supports 4-lane road expansion as double-decker bridge, HWY 37 should be prioritized because of the urgency of climate change.	Comment noted.
18	Solano Workshop		SR 37 needs to be prioritized; the Sears Point intersection needs to be improved in the short-term, the economic impact of the congestion needs to be studied, suggests adding a reversible lane to segment B.	The 121/37 intersection contributes to corridor congestion and potential intersection improvements are included in the Corridor Plan's near-term improvements. Caltrans will be implementing some of the near term improvements at this intersection in 2018. Reversible lane option for segment B comment is noted and under consideration.
19	Solano Workshop		Suggests looking at Caltrans' 1990 study of SR 37 and the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department's Bay Trail feasibility study from 2005/2006. Insists on including the creation of a "quality" Bay Trail along the corridor to attract tourists.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
20	Solano Workshop		Opposed to tolling but recognizes the urgency of the situation; if tolling is inevitable preference for a toll road. Strongly opposed to full privatization, in favor of a public transit option.	Noted. There is a north bay transit operators group that meets quarterly that the CMAs participate in; the CMAs and transit operators are also in discussion about a origin/destination study to identify home and work destination sites for users of the corridor to see if transit would be feasible. There are also TDM strategies that could be implemented on the corridor, such as vanpools.
21	Solano Workshop		Concerned about the cost to senior citizens on fixed incomes.	Comment noted.
22	Solano Workshop		Suggests adding permanent barriers between lanes on eastbound 37 before the 121 intersections in the short term, and prohibiting cars altogether in the long-term to make room for buses.	Comment noted.
23	Solano Workshop		Suggests creating a 2nd eastbound lane with the shoulder room and adding permanent barriers to separate eastbound lanes before the 121 junction.	Comment noted.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
24	Solano Workshop		Strong support for a 4-lane causeway to be built urgently, and for improvements at the 121 intersection.	Comment noted.
25	Solano Workshop		Supports toll option as only realistic way to get project underway, and is in favor of creating a bike/ped path along the route.	Comment noted.
26	Solano Workshop		Encourages looking at public transit between Vallejo and Marin, such as a commuter bus.	There is a north bay transit operators group that meets quarterly that the CMAs participate in; the CMAs and transit operators are also in discussion about a origin/destination study to identify home and work destination sites for users of the corridor to see if transit would be feasible. There are also TDM strategies that could be implemented on the corridor, such as vanpools.
27	Solano Workshop		Supports widening segment B to 4 lanes, suggests building light rail tracks from Novato to HWY 12 junction, from Fairfield to Vallejo, and from Vallejo to Napa, with a free park and ride stations.	Widening segment B to 4 lanes is under consideration. Comment noted. SMART is seeking funding to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf Although SMART was not successful in 2017 there are more funding opportunities in 2018.
28	Solano Workshop		Supports a public/private finance option, as only viable solution for the corridor.	Public/Private finance options are under consideration.
29	Solano Workshop		Supports bicycle and rail solutions to ease traffic and provide access to piers and levee trails; also supports elevated roadway and increased lanes.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
30	Solano Workshop		Priority issues along the corridor are: Mare Island access ramp, merge from 2 to 1 lane, elevate and expand number of lanes, correct 121 intersection. Also in favor of tolling and providing ferry service.	Mare Island Interchange and SR 121 are included as priority projects as part of segment B with alternatives suggested being considered. Public/Private finance options are under consideration as well.
31	Solano Workshop		Strong opposition to privatization, and strong support for Class 1 Bike lanes.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
32	Solano Workshop		Supports creating a bike path along the corridor, elevating the roadway and developing hiking trails.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
33	Solano Workshop		Suggests considering realignment to SR12 and adding bike paths with viewing areas.	Comment noted.
34	Solano Workshop		Supports enjoyable bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the route, with better access to open space (mentions the east span of the bay bridge as a good example).	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
35	Solano Workshop		Supports creating a Class 1 bike/ped path.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
36	Solano Workshop		Supports a ferry service from Vallejo to Larkspur, which connects to the SMART train.	STA has a Water Transit Study underway (which includes ferry service for the SR 37 Corridor). Details regarding the STA's Water Transit Study can be found at: http://www.sta.ca.gov/docManager/1000007094/Water%20Transit%20Plan%20-%20Scope%20of%20Work%20from%20RFP%202017-7a.pdf
37	Solano Workshop		Strong support for the creation of a public transit option between Vallejo and Marin, as well as exploring a floating 4-lane bridge option with HOV lanes. In favor of tolling but strongly opposed to privatization.	There is a north bay transit operators group that meets quarterly that the CMAs participate in; the CMAs and transit operators are also in discussion about a origin/destination study to identify home and work destination sites for users of the corridor to see if transit would be feasible. There are also TDM strategies that could be implemented on the corridor, such as vanpools.
38	Solano Workshop		Suggests using RM3 funding for initial feasibility studies and alerting state legislators of the urgency of the project.	SR 37 currently has \$100 million dedicated from RM3 should the measure pass.
39	Solano Workshop		Suggests considering the no project option and putting all funds towards public transit and home creation near jobs, would like to see a full VMT analysis and growth inducing impact analysis, recommends consideration of a floating bridge option, supports Bay Trail project.	Comment noted.
40	Solano Workshop		Recommends partitioning the road prior to the crest of the hill with a barrier to separate the traffic going EB to Vallejo/Mare Island from the traffic turning north into 121 to Sonoma. Prefers funding SMART train extension than a bike lane.	SR 121/SR 37 Interchange solutions near Sears Point are being considered as priority as part of Segment B of the Corridor Plan. Comment noted.
41	Solano Workshop		Advocates for a Class 1 fully separated multi-use path that accommodates both bicycles and pedestrians.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
42	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Pages 3 and 6, 7 (3 places) - There are several instances where language reads that a section of SR 37 is "protected by levees." Protect, by definition, implies that the levee owners are shielding the highway from harm or injury. It seems more accurate to say that the highway was constructed at an elevation that is below many high tides and that the original construction relied on a variety of existing levees and berms not owned by Caltrans to keep the roadway dry under most conditions. "Reliance" is used on Page 6, which seems a more accurate term than "protected". It should also be noted that this reliance is generally not based on any formal relationship between Caltrans and the levee owners. Care should be taken to distinguish the District-maintained flood control levees from Caltrans levees or other existing levees and/or berms. It is important to note that the existing levee/berm network along Novato Creek, especially those segments downstream of the SR 37 crossing, predate the highway's construction (see USGS Quadrangle Map, Petaluma River, 1914). It is not clear if the original highway design analyzed flood protection provided by existing levee/berms along Novato Creek, especially those south of the highway alignment. The Marin County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (MFCWD) is not aware of an explicit acknowledgement or agreement that the Novato Creek levee/berms, both upstream and downstream of the highway alignment, would be maintained and operated to provide such protection. The primary use of the lands south of SR37 and downstream of highway is for irrigation reclamation/treated wastewater discharge with associated and complimentary agricultural uses (crop production and livestock grazing).	Comment noted. "protected by" will be replaced with "relies on".
43	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 3 states that Segment A is the most vulnerable to SLR -then provides the reasoning that it relies on levees for flood control. SLR is tied to daily tidal inundation, which is different than flood control, which is typically focused around rainfall events. Care should be taken to distinguish riverine flooding from inundation due to sea level rise.	Text will be revised as appropriate.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
44	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Pages 3 and 7 - The emergency work that Caltrans performed should be more explicitly described in the Plan. Page 3 - To what elevation was the roadway raised? Page 7 - How long was the segment of roadway that was raised? It should clarify that only a short segment was raised. Page 7 indicates that Caltrans used "funds to address the flooding." To "address" implies that the flooding issue is resolved. It may be more accurate to say that they used funds to "reduce the occurrence of flooding."	The intent of the document was to identify near and long term improvements. Will revise narrative as appropriate: page 7, change "address" to "reduce the occurrence". The improvements at Novato Creek included raising the elevation of about 1000 feet of roadway by two feet in both directions using lightweight material, installing 1400 feet of sheet piles 20 feet deep along the eastbound shoulder, and replacing and extending three large, cross-highway culverts. The repaired roadway elevation averages about 7.47 feet (NAVD 88) between its lowest and highest points.
45	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 7 - Exhibit 5 is difficult to read and to pull out the information about where exactly the weak links are.	Comment noted. Exhibit 5 is intended to show the general locations of the weak links.
46	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 14 - Traffic is also displaced to Atherton Avenue when SR 37 is closed at Novato Creek. There is no capacity on that two lane road for SR 37 traffic.	Comment noted.
47	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 16 - Exhibit 15. Sears Point/Infineon Raceway is north of SR 37; on this map the marker is south. And the train segment should be labeled Amtrak only (not Capital Corridor).	Graphic will be updated as appropriate.
48	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 17 -Please provide details for costs shown in Table 2.	Preliminary cost estimates were included in the corridor plan, and may be refined in later project phases.
49	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 18 - Item 2 should include the need for pump stations to move water, as gravity drainage may not work.	Comment noted. This is a planning level document, example features were included in the corridor plan, more specific designs shall be conducted in future project development phases.
50	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 19 -the embankment option will also likely require the need for pump stations to move water, because the roadway will function as a levee.	Comment noted. This is a planning level document. More specific designs shall be conducted in future project development phases.
51	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 21 - Again, it would be helpful to show and describe the weak links in more detail.	Comment noted. Exhibit 5 is intended to show the general locations of the weak links.
52	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 21- Table 3 reaches with "2050." What does that imply? The text implies the DAA will identify near-term roadway and levee improvements. What are the near-term design heights?	The corridor plan identified levee elevation needs under different 2050 flooding scenarios. Interim levee heights and specific improvements will be determined in later project phases.
53	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 23 - Exhibit 24. For this alternative, does the traffic model account for the EB portion of the roundabout being used as a third through lane for EB 37 traffic? There is no means to preclude drivers from making such a maneuver and without signal control, it becomes like any other mixed-flow lane. Any backup on EB 37 east of this location will likely encourage this behavior which will then effectively block any movement of drivers going north on 121.	The exhibit is a schematic of a potential roundabout design option. Detailed traffic operational analyses for the roundabout designs will be completed in a future project phase.
54	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 24 - Include language that some levees also need to be rebuilt due to age and lack of engineered design. Simply raising the levees may not be enough. Segment B addresses the Bay Trail. Why is there no mention in Segment A? Please include an analysis of operational issues at the SR 101 interchange due to the change in westbound traffic volumes.	The corridor plan included a recommendation to raise Segment A as part of the Mid to Long-Term Improvements. Further field assessment/survey of the existing levee system will be required prior making specific levee improvements. The limits of the traffic operational analysis are between SR 29 to US 101.
55	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 29 - Please provide details for the Segment A Flood Protection costs.	Preliminary cost estimates were included in the corridor plan, and may be refined in later project phases.
56	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 29 - Near Term Improvements Summary table: With this generic improvement it would be helpful to break this out into A1 and A2 segments or list similarly to the B segment which has project items identified for specific locations in the segment.	Comment noted.
57	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 30 - Please provide details for Segment 1 levee improvements and raised roadway costs. Please provide a basis why this work can't start in the 7-10 year timeframe.	Preliminary cost estimates were included in the corridor plan, and may be refined in later project phases. Work could start sooner for segment A should resources become available.
58	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 30 - Mid-to-Long-term Improvements Summary table. Similar to the Near Term table, with this generic improvement it would be helpful to break this out into A1 and A2 segments or list similarly to the B segment which has project items identified for specific locations in the segment.	Comment noted.
59	DAA Public Comment	Marin County, Department of Public Works	Page 31- Priority Segment. Either the heading should be changed or the first sentence truncated to state it has been identified as the priority segment for the following reasons: (and then cite the reasons). Otherwise it suggests the corridor study is primarily about capacity enhancement/congestion mitigation. Please be open to the possibility to move forward with some strategic elements in Segment A concurrent with efforts to move forward Segment B.	Improvements were identified and phased based on availability information and not intended to preclude Segment A improvements to be concurrent with Segment B in future project development phases.
60	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Improvements to the SR 37 corridor should be integrated with implementation of existing habitat goals and the extensive ecological planning for this region that has already occurred to ensure ecosystem function and landscape resiliency into the future.	The planning, design and implementation of improvements for SR 37, where possible, will aim to take advantage of and be compatible with the existing habitat goals and extensive ecological planning efforts that have already occurred in this region. The design options for potential improvements would accommodate existing habitats and land uses while anticipating future larger scale landscape changes that may occur in the future as a result of wetland restoration, habitat evolution in response to sea level rise, and land use changes.
61	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	The corridor improvement project should be defined as an array of alternatives that meet goals to relieve traffic congestion of SR 37 while adapting to sea level rise rather than assuming the road will be reconstructed in its current location. Integration of the project's transportation and ecological goals could be achieved by elevating the highway on a bridge causeway, moving traffic inland, planning for alternative transportation options, or other alternatives.	A range of design alternatives that aim to address the purpose and need of improvement(s) for SR 37 will be developed and evaluated as part of the current design alternative assessment, and it is expected the range of alternatives will continued to be further refined and evaluated through the subsequent CEQA/NEPA environmental phase.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
62	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	A thorough examination of alternatives, including an inland highway and a North Bay bridge, is needed. Since the Corridor Improvement Plan is intended to feed into the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, it important not to rule out alternatives that would avoid impacts to baylands habitats at this stage. Redesign of the highway in its current alignment should be selected as the preferred alternative only if it is determined, through CEQA analysis, to be the least environmentally damaging option.	See Response to comment #61. In addition, the corridor plan is not intended to preclude other alternatives from being considered during later phases of the project development.
63	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	In developing the alternative of reconstructing SR 37 along its current alignment, improved ecological connectivity should be a central objective. The primary means of achieving this objective is to “Elevate Highway 37 and modify or realign rail lines and other infrastructure to allow the full passage of water, sediment and wildlife.” This recommendation is found in The Baylands and Climate Change: What We Can Do, the 2015 update to the 1999 Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report. The 2015 Science Update represents the consensus of over 100 scientists representing a cross section of expertise and experience gained through studying and working in the San Francisco Bay. Historical ecology should be the starting point for understanding the San Pablo Baylands and the need for improved connectivity. To support conservation and restoration of the Baylands, SR 37 corridor improvement should include consideration of: a. Historical ecology; b. Changes that have occurred since the land was diked and drained for agriculture, including subsidence; c. Remaining historic habitats and other valuable existing habitats; d. Habitat conservation and restoration projects that have been completed or are ongoing or planned; e. The impacts of projected sea level rise on wetlands, including the need for marsh migration; and f. The needs of specific wildlife populations.	The Baylands and Climate Change: What We Can Do, the 2015 update to the 1999 Baylands Ecosystem Habit Goals report is an important reference document for the design alternative assessment work for SR 37. The technical input and advice on ecological connectivity from the scientists that are participating in the environmental working group, which was established with the help of representatives from the SR 37 Baylands Group, will also inform the various design considerations. Improving ecological connectivity is a central theme. This stakeholder process is considering and evaluating all of the factors raised by this comment (historical ecology, land use changes, existing habitat, restoration plans, effect of SLR, and wildlife needs), and identifying through collaboration with project engineers, how those factors influence the design process for a more resilient SR 37. With the support of the environmental stakeholders, these factors have already influenced the design and will continue to do in subsequent phases of the project.
64	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Direct impacts to habitats and wildlife, including endangered species, must be avoided or minimized. Any mitigation should be accomplished by supporting wetlands restoration in the San Pablo Baylands that is compatible with existing habitat goals for the area, not through offsite mitigation.	An evaluation of the direct and indirect environmental impacts of improvement(s) to SR 37, including identification of mitigations when needed, will be conducted during an SR 37 project’s environmental phase, and specific consideration of mitigation supporting restoration of San Pablo Baylands (rather than off-site mitigation) would be most appropriate during the environmental review. Through the environmental working group process, the project team has already identified a number of near-term and long-term ecological enhancements or mitigation projects that could be implemented within San Pablo Bay and more specifically along the SR 37 corridor.
65	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Near-term solutions should protect wetland resources and maintain restoration options to the maximum extent possible. They should be designed to avoid filling wetlands and the Bay and avoid placing infrastructure, such as sea walls, that would be barriers to tidal exchange. Near-term solutions that do not involve construction of new roadway elements (such as express bus service, park and ride lots and organized carpools and vanpools) are encouraged.	Near-term operational improvements are intended to address and rectify an existing traffic operations, traffic safety, or short-term flooding due to seasonal heavy storms and be implemented within a short-term period, ideally within five years when possible. Minimizing impacts to wetlands and the Bay is being considered as part of the near-term solutions design to alleviate corridor congestion. An environmental review of such operational improvements will be conducted, and the design of such improvements would aim to not preclude future design alternatives. Operational improvements such as bus service, park-ride lots, carpools/vanpools, and related demand management strategies would be pursued when possible to increase person throughput within the corridor.
66	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Near-term solutions should avoid foreclosing design options. Near-term solutions should not foster an acceptance of the status quo or a premature commitment to incremental improvements rather than open-minded consideration of a design that is significantly different from the current one. Pursuing structural near-term improvements provided on Page 26 could narrow the full range of design options and could result in foreclosure of options for tidal wetland restoration and negatively impact the connectivity discussed above.	See Responses to Question #61, 63, and 65. In addition, a goal of the environmental working group is to better understand what the long-term vision for the corridor is in terms of future land use and restoration activities so that the highway itself does not preclude any future environmental opportunities that may arise and that the highway may, in fact, facilitate those opportunities to a greater extent than exists today.
67	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Agencies leading the corridor improvement process should avoid piecemealing under CEQA. Given the limited utility of addressing current and future flood risk on one part of the highway without the others, pursuing road segment improvements as separate projects with their own environmental documents, rather than under a programmatic EIR for the whole corridor, could result in piecemealing under CEQA. CEQA does not allow piecemealing because it can result in underestimating significant impacts and can hinder development of a comprehensive solution.	SR 37 is a 20-plus mile linear transportation corridor with multiple segments that span multiple jurisdictions and features differing levels of roadway improvements. These segments, to varying degrees, feature flooding due to seasonal heavy storms, experience high traffic congestion, and exhibit vulnerability to future sea level rise. MTC, Caltrans and the four North Bay congestion management agencies (CMAs) have identified a pressing regional need to separately evaluate Segment B’s 2-lane segment of SR 37 from SR 121 at Sears Point to Mare Island interchange in Vallejo because the combination of all three issues – flooding, congestion and sea level rise vulnerability – are most acute within that segment. Because the other segments of SR 37 feature four lanes, they do not experience the transportation capacity constraints and congestion seen in Segment B. Any proposed improvements to be implemented within Segment B would have independent utility and would not necessarily trigger any need to improve the other segments. Notably, opportunities to evaluate Segment A from US 101 to SR 121 and Segment C from the Mare Island interchange to I-80 are not foreclosed with the current design alternatives assessment efforts undertaken for Segment B. In fact, Segment A and Segment C will also be evaluated separately by Sonoma and Marin CMAs and the Solano CMA, respectively. The timing for the implementation of improvements will vary across the segments, given the different scopes, budgets, schedules, available funding and approval processes (to name a few) of improvements identified for each segment. That said, any project to implement improvements to Segment B will need to evaluate all impacts that may result from that project, as well as any cumulative impacts related to other potential projects. However, the fact that a project to improve Segment B may have impacts that are similar to future potential projects to modify other segments does not mean that separately evaluating the improvements to Segment B would constitute piecemealing, as that term is used with regard to the California Environmental Quality Act. Those future projects may not be implemented for some time and will likely be undertake by different lead agencies.
68	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Project alternatives developed in the Design Alternative Assessment (DAA) for the segment between SR 121 and Mare Island should be evaluated based on their ability to achieve the following goals. a. As in the corridor-level analysis, connectivity that is restricted by the current form of the highway should be restored in areas where it is needed, based on consideration of the factors above (historical ecology, existing habitat, current and planned restoration projects, sea level rise projections and the need for marsh migration, needs of particular wildlife populations, etc.). Connectivity includes hydrologic connectivity needed to support wetland processes, such as sediment transport to enable marshes to keep up with sea level rise, as well as connectivity needed by fish, wildlife and plant communities. b. As in the corridor-level analysis, direct impacts to habitats and wildlife, including endangered species, must be avoided or minimized. Again, any mitigation should be accomplished by supporting wetlands restoration in the San Pablo Baylands that is compatible with existing habitat goals for the area, not through offsite mitigation.	See Responses to Question #61 and #63. As part of environmental working group process, the factors described (historical ecology, existing habitat, current and planned restoration projects, sea level rise projections and the need for marsh migration, needs of particular wildlife populations), along with potential direct impacts to special-status and other wildlife species, are all being considered.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
69	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Pages 8 and 19. The study uses relatively old estimates of sea level rise projections. Newer models, based on more recent observations and modeling improvements, indicate higher rates of sea level rise are likely under more extreme greenhouse gas emission scenarios. Although the mean level of sea level rise in the study is consistent with the median projection of the most recent Ocean Protection Council (OPC) report (2017), the upper limits of projections are much higher (range of NRC 2012 at 2100 17-66 inches, range of OPC study 19.2- 120 inches). As the report acknowledges, the State’s guidance to plan for a worst scenario, planning for SR 37 should include the new 10-foot projections in their planning process. An adequate assessment of project risks and costs will need to include this larger rate of sea level rise with a 100-year storm. It is also worth noting that substantial portions of sections A2 and B1 are vulnerable to inundation with only 1.6 feet of sea level rise (see www.ourcoastourfuture.org and below).	The corridor plan was prepared using the best available data, tools and models available to the preparers during the development of the plan, and the high-level assessment made based on available resources is appropriate level of detail for the purposes of this plan. Future phases of project design will accommodate the best available science at that time and would likely include an evaluation of risks and costs as suggested by the commenter. The long-term highway elevation is currently proposed to be approximately 20 ft NAVD88. This elevation is approximately 10 ft above the existing 1% annual chance tide level for north San Pablo Bay. The proposed highway facility (either embankment or structure) would accommodate the highest water levels anticipated during a 100-year coastal storm event coupled with 66 inches of SLR and provide additional freeboard of 1 to 2 ft. This means that the highway would not experience flooding during a 100-year storm event until approximately 7 ft of SLR occurred at which time minor wave overtopping onto the roadway could occur. Significant inundation (and presumably closure) of the highway would not occur until 10 feet of SLR occurred coupled with a 100-year coastal storm event. As an additional point of reference, it would require approximately 12 ft of SLR before a regularly occurring winter storm event (on the order of a 1-2 year storm) caused significant inundation of the highway. Regarding the 2017 OPC SLR projections, the upper range SLR projection (0.5% chance of exceedance) under the most extreme greenhouse gas emissions scenario (RCP 8.5) is 83" (or 7 ft). This is a scenario with an extremely low likelihood of occurrence. The new guidance provides asset managers with the information they need to perform risk-based evaluations and evaluate the design (and cost) trade-offs of different levels of SLR. Those evaluations may or may not lead to an asset manager to select the most precautionary SLR projection and that level of assessment (of risks and costs) has not yet been completed.
70	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Page 11. Add the following text to the end of the sentence in the green text box: "...using nature-based solutions."	Comment noted. Nature-based solutions will be considered when appropriate in the improvement design development process.
71	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Page 19. Add San Pablo Song Sparrow and Chinook salmon as protected species.	This technical information will be incorporated into the corridor plan as suggested.
72	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Page 20. There should be net zero wetland loss. Many of the Baylands along the B2 section of the corridor are high quality habitat that will prove difficult to mitigate given the length of time needed for tidal marsh restoration and future projections of sea level rise.	Comment noted. Reducing impacts to existing wetlands along Segment B is being incorporated into the design process. The design process also includes identifying opportunities to enhance, restore, and reconnect existing wetlands along Segment B.
73	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Pages 34. Wetland mitigation should be performed on site, not off site. Mitigation should be within the SR 37 corridor even if large-scale on site mitigation is not feasible. Smaller mitigation sites within the watershed have potential for connectivity and expanding habitat. These localized benefits would not be realized through restoration of a large, off site mitigation parcel.	See Response to #64. Please also note that offsite mitigation is included as a possible (not necessarily recommended) means for no-net loss mitigation. In addition, the project team is working to incorporate integrating wetland enhancement, reconnection, and restoration as part of the design process and agrees that wetland restoration in the SR 37 corridor is a preferred approach.
74	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	Throughout the document, the spelling for Ridgway’s rail should be corrected. There is no ‘e’ after the ‘g’.	Typo will be corrected as suggested.
75	DAA Public Comment	SR 37 – Baylands Group	The Baylands Group is developing a Preliminary Vision for the four-county SR 37 corridor (San Pablo Baylands), which will include a map depicting existing habitats, completed, current, and planned habitat restoration projects, and conceptual diagrams of ecological processes illustrating the importance of connectivity across SR 37. We anticipate working with the Policy Committee to incorporate the Preliminary Vision into the SR 37 corridor plan and design process via collaboration between the Baylands Group and MTC’s Environmental Working Group The Bay Trail connection along Highway 37 is one of these critical trail connections for the Ridge Trail, Delta Trail and Vine Trail.	Incorporate the working draft version of Baylands Group's Vision Statement and Guiding Principles as part of the Goals and Objectives section of the corridor plan (dated Aug. 16, 2017).
76	DAA Public Comment	Bay Area Ridge Trail Council	The Ridge Trail Council feels that the five alternatives shown in the plan do not address pedestrian and bicycle access in a sufficient manner. For example, none of the options accommodate pedestrians and the majority do not separate bicyclists from the 55+ mph vehicular traffic. The Ridge Trail Council advocates for a Class 1, fully separated multi-use path that accommodates both bicycles and pedestrians as a baseline with additional opportunities for robust public access tiering off of whatever roadway facility is ultimately chosen.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
77	DAA Public Comment	Marin Audubon Society	Our recommendation is that an alternative which avoids impacts to the aquatic ecosystem of the Highway 37 area be considered and evaluated before alternatives involving mitigation are considered. The preferred mitigation in the CEQA is avoidance. In compliance with that guidance, MTC should first consider alternatives that would avoid adverse ecosystem impacts. Only after avoidance is determined to be infeasible should alternatives that would minimize and/or replace wetlands on or off-site, or through a bank be considered. We note also that both the Federal 404 Guidelines and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board require an Alternatives Analysis which also must demonstrate that there is no practicable alternative which would have less environmental impact on the aquatic ecosystem.	Comment noted.
78	DAA Public Comment	San Francisco Bay Trail	We are concerned that the needs of the Bay Trail and the non-motorized users it serves are not adequately accommodated in the discussion or documents to date. Our main concerns are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety—All options need full barrier protection for non-motorized users • Pedestrians must be accommodated • That a complete and continuous multi-use pathway is a baseline element of any alternative and moves through planning, environmental review, design, permitting and construction in tandem. 	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
79	DAA Public Comment	San Francisco Bay Trail	<p>Page 19 of the current Draft Highway 37 Corridor Improvement Plan portion of the Design Alternatives Analysis (DAA) states: “There are various options to constructing a raised segment B that accommodate multi-modal transportation operations and SLR resiliency while minimizing environmental impacts and construction costs. An option of providing a 12’ barrier separated Class IV bicycle facility on the roadway connecting to the Class I bicycle facility on the Bay Trail.”</p> <p>It is unclear what “Class I bicycle facility on the Bay Trail” is being referenced here, but it is important to note that of the examples that follow on pages 25 and 26, only two of the five propose a barrier, three propose a rumble strip as separation from high-speed traffic, and not a single alternative proposes to accommodate pedestrians.</p>	<p>The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.</p>
80	DAA Public Comment	San Francisco Bay Trail	<p>Bay Trail Project comments to date have repeatedly stated that regardless of what entity ultimately owns and operates this facility, inclusion of Class I, fully separated multi-use pathway along the entire length of the project is of paramount importance and must be and remain a baseline element of the project. The options shown that include a barrier do not illustrate an inviting condition. While understood that these are concept level plans, it is imperative that plans for Highway 37 include the following from the outset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum pathway width of 12’ clear with two 2’ shoulders. Current shown is an 8’ wide two-way bicycle only path with 2’ shoulders. • Positive barrier separating traffic from multi-use path, designed to protect pathway from debris while also allowing visual penetration. • Robust safety analysis—which side for path? Wind, pollution, debris, must be evaluated • Routine maintenance and repair of facility must be incorporated into project • High quality connections to existing and future segments of Bay Trail such as Port Sonoma, Sonoma Baylands, Sears Point, Tubbs/Tolay loop trail, Skaggs Island, White Slough Path, Wilson Avenue, the Vallejo Waterfront and ferry, and the Napa Valley Vine Trail and other important local destinations must be included and well designed. • Scenic viewing/resting areas, including access down to ground level boardwalk platforms with interpretive displays must be baseline elements of the project. • Pathway lighting to allow nighttime use • Tolling—the Bay Trail is and must remain free and accessible to the public at all times. • Design will be of particular importance due to the length of the facility. The East Span Bay Bridge represents good bike/ped design. Yolo Causeway on Highway 80 near Sacramento is poorly conceived and executed. • All aspects of the pathway—planning, designing, permitting, funding, construction—must move forward together. 	<p>The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.</p>
81	DAA Public Comment	San Francisco Bay Trail	<p>The importance of including the most robust version of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the planning phases cannot be overstated. Some have noted over the past few years of discussion that the Bay Trail could be placed on the levees that may remain in place below an elevated structure, should that alternative move forward. While such an approach could provide value for a time, the underlying, fundamental reason for tackling the monumental Highway 37 challenge is that the current levees and roadways are being overtaken by sea level rise.</p> <p>Therefore, any scenario that leaves the Bay Trail below the future roadway structure either leads to a discontinuous trail or requires a massive parallel effort to build an entirely separate continuous trail off of the roadway.</p> <p>As the DAA moves to the next phase of more detailed design consideration, please ensure that bicycles and pedestrians are accommodated with the items listed above incorporated into any and all alternatives. Additionally, any near and mid-term projects to address traffic and/or SLR on Highway 37 should seek opportunities to advance the Bay Trail. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department should be consulted regarding current efforts to connect the Sears Point Bay Trail (currently ending near the Hwy 121/37 intersection) to the Tubbs/Tolay Bay Trail. Several short-term fixes are proposed for the 37/121 and SMART Rail intersection, and opportunities to advance the goals of the Bay Trail, Sonoma County Regional Parks, and the traveling public should not be missed.</p>	<p>The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.</p>
82	DAA Public Comment	The Marin, Sonoma, and Napa County Bicycle Coalitions	<p>Provide a physically separated, continuous multi-use pathway that accommodates people travelling by foot and bike. In order for the corridor’s multi-use pathway to meet its potential as a world-class facility, we urge the agencies to 1) expand access to include those travelling by foot and 2) design it in a manner that is safe and appealing. On the latter, it’s crucial that the pathway is physically separated and protected from vehicular traffic. The use of rumblestrips as a buffer between people bicycling and heavy traffic travelling 50+ MPH is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Any long term solutions will integrate multi-modalism. Bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities will be integrated where feasible in future project phases.</p>
83	DAA Public Comment	The Marin, Sonoma, and Napa County Bicycle Coalitions	<p>The multi-use pathway described above should be included as a baseline element of the project. This multi-use pathway should be planned, designed, permitted, funded, and built in lockstep with the rest of the project.</p>	<p>Any long term solutions will integrate multi-modalism. Bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities will be integrated where feasible in future project phases.</p>
84	DAA Public Comment	The Marin, Sonoma, and Napa County Bicycle Coalitions	<p>The multi-use pathway must connect seamlessly with other regional and local bicycle and pedestrian networks. As noted above, a multi-use pathway along the Highway 37 corridor has the potential to connect to a number of existing and planned pathways. These connections should be prioritized as the design process advances.</p>	<p>Any long term solutions will integrate multi-modalism. Bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities will be integrated where feasible in future project phases.</p>
85	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	<p>Page 3, line 6 “... and critical habitat would be lost.” Revise or delete. The relationship between habitat and permanent roadway closure due to sea level rise is complex, and would develop over many years. The environmental effects of inundation events would largely precede any final closure of the highway, and are not described further in the plan document.</p>	<p>Text will be revised to read "...critical habitat could be altered".</p>

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
86	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 4, Traffic Congestion, lines 3-4 “No transit opportunities are available along the study corridor to offset vehicular demand.” Revise this sentence to state that no concerted efforts have yet been taken to encourage car-pools, establish van-pools, or provide bus, ferry, or rail service connecting the Interstate 80 and US 101 Corridors.	Statement is correct and effort is underway. There is a north bay transit operator group that meets quarterly and Transportation Authorities participate in. Additionally, the Transportation Authorities are in discussions regarding an origin/destination study to identify home and work destinations and help determine transit feasibility. TDM strategies, such as vanpools, could also be considered to help alleviate corridor congestion.
87	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 15, lines 3-4 “... rail transit, ferry alternatives ... were evaluated as possible strategies to retreat and it was determined that none of these are feasible standalone strategies” Revise to state that rail, and ferry options may be important within the next three decades and should be studied further. No public transportation system ever stands alone. The region is best served when transit systems and roadways support one another.	Agree text will be revised similar to request, but ferry and rail studies will proceed on parallel tracks to the highway efforts. STA has a Water Transit Study underway (which includes ferry service for the SR 37 Corridor) and SMART is seeking funding to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf Although SMART was not successful in 2017 there are more funding opportunities in 2018. Details regarding the STA's Water Transit Study can be found at: http://www.sta.ca.gov/docManager/1000007094/Water%20Transit%20Plan%20-%20Scope%20of%20Work%20from%20RFP%202017-7a.pdf
88	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Pages 15 - 17, Rail Alternative. Revise to recommend further study. The “Rail Alternative” is described as a potential replacement for SR-37, when in fact it would supplement the roadway, particularly if population along the I-80 corridor continues to grow. To the extent that rail service could provide an option for people who commute from the City of Sonoma and the I-80 corridor to the US-101 corridor, it would reduce traffic on SR-37. These factors merit ongoing evaluation, and should not be dismissed. The estimated costs of various approaches to establishment of passenger rail service should be described in considerably greater detail.	Efforts on SR 37 will not preclude rail. See response #87.
89	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 17, Ferry Alternative. Revise to recommend further study of the costs, benefits, and implementation options for various ferry alternatives that would reduce dependence on the roadway. Knowledge of these factors provides a basis for determining relative value of widening the 2-lane section of highway.	STA has a Water Transit Study underway (which includes ferry service for the SR 37 Corridor). Details regarding the STA's Water Transit Study can be found at: http://www.sta.ca.gov/docManager/1000007094/Water%20Transit%20Plan%20-%20Scope%20of%20Work%20from%20RFP%202017-7a.pdf
90	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 17, Maintain Existing Roadway. Revise to call for improvement of the existing roadway in the next two or three years. In addition to the suggested lane modifications, features such as diamond lanes, lane-metering, and queue-jumping options should be evaluated to encourage use of carpools, van-pools, and to enable establishment of bus routes through the corridor.	These ideas, including TDM strategies, will be evaluated. Request for queue-jumping options will be passed on to Caltrans and evaluated as projects are identified and advanced.
91	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 19, Raised Roadway. Revise to describe the current state of knowledge about the depth of bedrock along SR-37. Feasibility of the various options depends greatly on foundation conditions and on forecasts of mud compaction beneath berms. It may not be possible to proceed much further with planning until more geological information is available.	Geotechnical investigation will be part of future studies.
92	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 20, Environmental Mitigations. Revise to address the potential noise, air pollution, and greenhouse gas impacts of an elevated and widened roadway.	These will be addressed in the CEQA/NEPA process when a project is selected and initiated.
93	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 22, Exhibit 20: Study Corridor Segments. Display all of the railroad track locations, including the eastern segment from the bridge over the Napa River to Napa Junction.	See Exhibit 15 for this information
94	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 22, Lane-Drop Merge at SR 121 Intersection. Add a description of queue-jumping options, diamond lane and lane-metering opportunities to encourage car-pools, van-pools, and to make bus service along SR-37 an attractive option. Without such features, it is likely that the Express Bus Transit Service discussed on page 23 would attract fewer riders, and there would be little likelihood of reducing the proportion of single-occupant vehicles in the corridor.	Request for queue-jumping options will be passed on to Caltrans and evaluated as projects are identified and advanced.
95	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Page 23, Paragraph 3: “Improve Merge and Lane Drop at Mare Island WB On-Ramp:” Add a description of diamond lane and lane-metering opportunities to encourage car-pools, van-pools, and to make bus service viable, as described above.	Same as above
96	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Pages 23-24, Express Bus Transit Service. Revise to include van-pool and car-pool improvements. Rather than calling for a separate study of ways to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles, make this a significant part of the Corridor Plan. Coordinate the Corridor Plan with Climate Action Planning by the four counties.	Study will be conducted as part of TDM options.
97	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	As stated above, the Bay Trail currently ends approximately 1,000 feet south of SR 37, and the Draft Corridor Improvement Plan should address the connection to the current endpoint of the trail.	MTC, the north bay CMAs and Caltrans are working with the environmental community, including Bay Trail, to develop design options integrating transportation, ecology, and sea level rise adaptation.
98	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	Near-term options for the SR121-SR37 intersection (pages 22-23) do not address bicycle and pedestrian facilities or connections to the Bay Trail.	Comment noted.
99	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	The "Potential Improvements" on Exhibit 16 (page 1 7) shows a proposal to increase the length of the eastbound right lane. The increased lane length would require widening of SR3 7 and could reduce the amount of land available to develop a proposed trailhead parking lot for the Bay Trail. Regional Parks is evaluating a trailhead parking lot at the southwest intersection of SR37 and railroad tracks.	Comment noted.
100	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	Many of the concepts (pages 25-26) indicate use of a Class IV bikeway along the reconstructed SR37. Class IV bikeway is intended for the exclusive use by bicyclists and no pedestrians. These options would require construction of a separate exclusive facility for pedestrian use that is not currently indicated. Some of the options being considered in the Bay Trail - Sears Point Connector Feasibility Study, such as an elevated boardwalk or floating boardwalk crossing of Tolay Lagoon may be compatible with SR37 vehicle options and would provide a separate pedestrian and bicycle facility. We recommend at a minimum a Class I bicycle path with a physical barrier separating vehicle traffic on the south side of the roadway facing San Pablo Bay. This will allow trail users to enjoy and experience the views of San Pablo Bay and beyond.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
101	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	The existing and planned segments of the Bay Trail will be submerged due to sea level rise and will be inaccessible to pedestrians and bicyclists. Thus, any proposed mid-to long-term improvements to SR37 such as raised roadway or elevated causeway must include bicycle and pedestrian access along the entire length of SR37 as required by Caltrans Deputy Directive 64. The Bay Trail is a regional recreational trail but also serves as a non-motorized transportation route connecting all four counties: Marin, Sonoma, Napa, and Solano.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
102	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	Tables 4 and 5 (pages 29 and 30) should address Active Transportation components of the project, including completion of the Bay Trail.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
103	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	An elevated levee-like buttress fill option for the Bay Trail is also being considered along SR37, and could possibly be accommodated in several of the SR37 options. This may provide some sea level rise protection.	The alternative included in the document are preliminary and include possible options for accommodating bicycles with roadway widening. They are not intended to preclude other alternatives that may be explored during later project development phases.
104	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	The area immediately east of Tolay Lagoon is the Tubbs Island farmland operated by Vallejo Flood Control and Sanitation District. This area is protected from tidal action by a levee maintained by them. A sea wall and rock slope protection of the road embankment toe as shown on the preliminary sections may not be needed in this area.	Noted. This is a planning level document, example features were included in the corridor plan, more specific designs shall be conducted in future project development phases.
105	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	There could be several miles of SLR resilience if the buttress fill option were constructed together with the levee system maintained by Vallejo Flood Control and Sanitation District.	Noted. This is a planning level document, example features were included in the corridor plan, more specific designs shall be conducted in future project development phases.
106	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	A priority of the US Fish and Wildlife Service San Pablo Bay Wildlife Refuge resilience study is the enlargement of the current Highway 3 7-Tolay Creek culvert, to insure a better hydrologic connection between upper Tolay Creek and Tolay Lagoon. The final Corridor Improvement Plan should include this discussion.	MTC, the north bay CMAs and Caltrans are working with the environmental community, to develop design options integrating transportation, ecology, and sea level rise adaptation, including hydrologic connectivity.
107	DAA Public Comment	Sonoma County Regional Parks	Pedestrian/bicycle on-off ramps to and from the Class I bicycle path (serving as the Bay Trail) should be incorporated into the SR37 improvements. The on-off ramps will enable pedestrians and bicyclists to access existing trailheads, vista points, and future park and ride lots within the SR37 corridor. The future park and ride lots can also serve as trailheads. The Carquinez Bridge Bicycle and Pedestrian Path project is an example of where public access to a vista point and parking lot was provided.	Comment noted.
108	DAA Public Comment	Greenbelt Alliance	As stated in the Corridor Plan, a net-zero wetland loss approach and large-scale on-site restoration should be prioritized throughout the DAA process. Achieving a self-mitigating project should be the ultimate goal, as suggest by Steven Moore of the California State Water Resources Control Board at a recent panel discussion hosted by the Bay Area Resilient by Design Challenge. As stated in the Corridor Plan, The creation and implementation of a Regional Advanced Mitigation Plan (RAMP) is one potential approach. We strongly support examining how participation in a RAMP program could foster robust, coordinated conservation activities along the SR 37 corridor.	A goal of the project is to integrate not mitigate transportation, ecosystem and sea level rise adaptation. A preferred alternative project would incorporate the wetlands. Currently, MTC, four CMAs and Caltrans are working with environmental stakeholders to determine their priorities for a successful project. As stated in the Plan, the implementation of RAMP has been identified as a potential conservation approach.
109	DAA Public Comment	Greenbelt Alliance	The potential for new transportation investments in the SR 37 corridor to influence land use patterns within the corridor and across the North bay must be considered and fully analyzed in the Corridor Plan and DAA. While much of the land along SR 37 between US 101 and Interstate 80 is protected wetlands and open space by public and private entities, there are several privately owned undeveloped areas that could be greater risk of sprawl depending on how the corridor changes, such as Sears Point Raceway and Port Sonoma Marina. These risks could extend into other areas as well if not carefully addressed. These potential impacts should be studied and addressed to ensure that the envisioned improvements to the area's climate resiliency and mobility patterns come to fruition.	Induced growth impacts resulting from the project will be studied as part of the environmental process.
110	DAA Public Comment	Greenbelt Alliance	Greenbelt Alliance urges a comprehensive analysis of public transit options and alternatives to single occupant automobile travel along the corridor as part of the Corridor Plan and DAA. The analysis should include a variety of modes including rail, ferry, express buses, car sharing, car pooling and emerging on-demand transportation models. Now that the SMART line is running, it is more timely than ever to consider improved east-west transit solutions. Trails that provide full accessibility for biking and walking should be an integral part of the SR 37 Corridor Plan. Given that the wetlands are an important part of the Pacific Flyway, the corridor should provide trail connectivity, public access and interpretive stations. Full funding for these components need to be included in the project budget.	The CMAs are actively participating in the North Bay transit operators group that meets quarterly; further, certain transit agencies such as NVTA have studied future east/west connections that coordinate with SMART. The CMAs are in discussions to fund an origin/destination study to look at home and work origins/destination for travelers on the corridor to see if transit would be feasible. STA is currently studying ferry services from Vallejo to Marin; the CMAs are also in support of SMART studying an east/west connection along the corridor. SMART is seeking funding to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf Although SMART was not successful in 2017 there are more funding opportunities in 2018. The preferred project alternative would not prohibit public access to public lands or trails such as the Bay Trail. The preferred project alternative would also accommodate bicyclist along the corridor.
111	DAA Public Comment	Greenbelt Alliance	Greenbelt Alliance urges a comprehensive analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions that will be generated by the SR 37 transportation and sea level rise solutions. In particular, the full scope of Vehicle Miles Traveled with various scenarios needs to be considered. Ultimately, any increases in GHGs and VMTs should be avoided or mitigated to meet state and local greenhouse gas emission reduction mandates and objectives.	With the passage of SB 743 any CEQA analysis on the project would have to evaluate VMT.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
112	DAA Public Comment	Greenbelt Alliance	The Corridor Plan and DAA must consider methods to equitably and sustainably address the social and economic impacts on low-income families that currently use SR 37, particularly if tolls are instituted. The options and costs for addressing this issue needs to be included in the financial analysis and should not be omitted from the Corridor Plan.	The CMAs completed a financial analysis of corridor funding options in November 2017. The preferred funding strategy is yet to be determined. The preferred funding strategy will address the social and economic impacts to low-income users.
113	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 3, line 6 " ... and critical habitat would be lost." Revise or delete. The relationship between habitat and permanent roadway closure due to sea level rise is complex, and would develop over many years. The environmental effects of inundation events would largely precede any final closure of the highway, and are not described further in the plan document.	Text will be revised to read: "...and critical habitat could be altered".
114	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 4, Traffic Congestion, lines 3-4 "No transit opportunities are available along the study corridor to offset vehicular demand." Revise this sentence to state that no concerted efforts have yet been taken to encourage car-pools, establish van-pools, or provide bus, ferry, or rail service connecting the Interstate 80 and US 101 Corridors.	Text will be revised.
115	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 15, lines 3-4 " ... rail transit, ferry alternatives ... were evaluated as possible strategies to retreat and it was determined that none of these are feasible standalone strategies " Revise to state that rail, and ferry options may be important within the next three decades and should be studied further. No public transportation system ever stands alone. The region is best served when transit systems and roadways support one another.	Text will be revised.
116	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Pages 15 - 17, Rail Alternative. Revise to recommend further study. The "Rail Alternative" is described as a potential replacement for SR-37, when in fact it would supplement the roadway, particularly if population along the 1-80 corridor continues to grow. To the extent that rail service could provide an option for people who commute from the City of Sonoma and the 1-80 corridor to the US-101 corridor, it would reduce traffic on SR-37. These factors merit ongoing evaluation, and should not be dismissed. The estimated costs of various approaches to establishment of passenger rail service should be described in considerably greater detail.	Text will be revised.
117	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 17, Ferry Alternative. Revise to recommend further study of the costs, benefits, and implementation options for various ferry alternatives that would reduce dependence on the roadway. Knowledge of these factors provides a basis for determining relative value of widening the 2-lane section of highway.	Text will be revised.
118	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 17, Maintain Existing Roadway. Revise to call for improvement of the existing roadway in the next two or three years. In addition to the suggested lane modifications, features such as diamond lanes, lane-metering, and queue-jumping options should be evaluated to encourage use of carpools, van-pools, and to enable establishment of bus routes through the corridor.	Maintain Existing Roadway strategy is intended identify near-term improvements within the existing footprint without substantial capital improvements.
119	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 19, Raised Roadway. Revise to describe the current state of knowledge about the depth of bedrock along SR-37. Feasibility of the various options depends greatly on foundation conditions and on forecasts of mud compaction beneath berms. It may not be possible to proceed much further with planning until more geological information including fault zones and liquefaction risk is known.	This is a planning level document, further studies will be conducted during later phases of the project development.
120	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 20, Environmental Mitigations. Revise to address the potential noise, air pollution, and greenhouse gas impacts of an elevated and widened roadway.	Comment noted. This is a planning level document, the CEQA process will proceed as a future phase of the project development.
121	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 22, Exhibit 20: Study Corridor Segments. Display all of the railroad track locations, including the eastern segment from the bridge over the Napa River to Napa Junction.	Figure will be revised.
122	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Page 23, Paragraph 3: "Improve Merge and Lane Drop at Mare Island WB On-Ramp:" Add a description of diamond lane and lane-metering opportunities to encourage car-pools, van-pools, and to make bus service viable, as described above.	Near-term operational improvements are intended to restore lost operational efficiencies of the current roadway without substantial capital improvements.
123	DAA Public Comment	Sierra Club	Pages 23-24, Express Bus Transit Service. Revise to include van-pool and car-pool improvements. Rather than calling for a separate study of ways to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles, make this a significant part of the Corridor Plan. Coordinate the Corridor Plan with Climate Action Planning by the four counties. Also, address the equity issues presented by low-income families that would not be able to afford tolls.	Comment noted. Opportunities to improve vanpool/carpool is described on page 23.
124	DAA Public Comment	Friends of SMART	We are concerned that the plan neglects the future mobility in the corridor that will be provided by train service, while focusing on the very slight and temporary improvement offered by an added traffic lane in the "B Segment" of the highway. Caltrans has been expanding roadway capacities for 75 years; and the verdict is in: we can't pave our way out of congestion. Added traffic lanes will attract more traffic, while moving us away from the important goal of reducing vehicle miles traveled. We urge that the Plan incorporate steps to encourage car-pooling, van-pools, and public transportation that will provide better options for those using the highway during rush hours, without encouraging more solo drivers. We are especially concerned about the recommendation to drop consideration of passenger rail service in the corridor. We ask that plans for this corridor explicitly include passenger rail on the existing right-of-way. The benefits of eventual rail service need to be acknowledged, and the conditions under which passenger trains could best serve the corridor should be described.	Comment noted. The corridor plan had identified considerations for HOV/managed lane options, and bus transit services.

SR 37 Corridor Plan
Appendix D - Response to Comments

ID	Comment Origin	Name	Comment	Response
125	DAA Public Comment	Friends of SMART	<p>It is also important to attend to sea level rise impacts on the tracks so that SMART and NCRA are not cut off from the national rail network. Passenger rail services linking Sonoma and Napa county cities with the 1-80 and US-101 corridors are likely to be needed eventually, and SMART should be able to bring in new rolling stock and rail maintenance equipment.</p> <p>Unless transit options such as bus, ferry and rail services are implemented as integral parts of the Plan, it is destined eventually to fail. It is important to consider the needs of the highway and rail service at the same time.</p>	<p>Comment noted. SMART is seeking funding to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf Although SMART was not successful in 2017 there are more funding opportunities in 2018.</p>
126	DAA Public Comment	TRANSDEF	<p>TRANSDEF believes that ongoing traffic congestion is the the motivation to "do something" about Highway 37, despite efforts to characterize the project as sea level rise mitigation. However, considering the Highway 37 problem to be a transportation problem is a misdiagnosis. The current traffic congestion is the direct result of a jobshousing imbalance, caused by a failure of local and regional planning. A transportation "solution" for this problem would only be addressing the symptoms and not the causes of the problem. This is a formula for long-term failure.</p>	<p>The Bay Area is acutely aware that the regional jobs and housing imbalance (affordable housing in particular) is a regional issue that must be addressed, and efforts such as the long-range planning effort through Plan Bay Area 2040 and CASA (the Committee to House the Bay Area) initiative that brings leaders across the regional to focus on housing production are indeed directly addressing the jobs/housing imbalance. So while we agree about the need to address the jobs/housing imbalance, we disagree that the transportation and traffic congestion issues in the corridor should not be addressed.</p>
127	DAA Public Comment	TRANSDEF	<p>The analysis of a Retreat strategy was half-baked. Whether future traffic could fit on existing alternate roadways (p. 15) was the only consideration given to a Retreat alternative that would avoid spending many billions of dollars to construct a new causeway across the wetlands. This is insulting to the intelligence of readers of the study, and damning proof that no serious effort was made to consider an alternative. Spending far less money to upgrade SR 116 and SR 12 to freeway status connecting Hwy 101 to I-80 is an alternative that must be evaluated.</p> <p>The reasons given for rejecting a rail alternative (p. 15) do not stand up to scrutiny:</p> <p>(a). While a rail route might be longer than the existing roadway, it is untrue that travel times would necessarily be longer. Because rail vehicles do not suffer congestion on their own ROW, travel would be much faster than congested road travel (the appropriate comparison, given that congestion is the driver for this project). Second, a rail vehicle on dry land would provide far more reliable travel than a roadway subject to periodic inundation.</p> <p>(b). The cost projections are grossly out of proportion to recent commuter rail projects. They are closer to BART costs than commuter rail. The final Corridor Plan must provide an appendix documenting the estimates, if they are to be given any credibility. A highway toll should be imposed to fund a rail project and provide a cost differential to induce transit use by drivers. Excerpts of the draft State Rail Plan (See attachment) propose to study and possibly build passenger rail in this corridor. The Corridor Plan should fully support the State Rail Plan proposals.</p> <p>(c). While portions of the rail alignment do have flooding vulnerabilities, it is far less costly to raise tracks than raise a roadway. It is entirely untrue that " Additionally, there is no real advantage of a rail alternative over roadway improvements in this segment in terms of environmental impacts." (p. 16.) First, the rail ROW is largely not in wetlands. Second, a well-used rail line will have the environmental benefit of reducing GHG emissions, while an expanded roadway will significantly increase GHG emissions. The only reason this false statement could have been put into the Plan is the refusal of highway interests to acknowledge the GHG emissions impact of highway widening.</p>	<p>The corridor plan is not intended to preclude other alternatives from being considered and analyzed as part of the project development planning/environmental phases.</p>
128	DAA Public Comment	TRANSDEF	<p>Improved lane drop at SR 121: A major constraint on the flow of traffic in Segment B is the traffic light at SR 121. The roundabout plan, with EB bypass (pp. 23 & 29) would significantly increase the throughput of the intersection, if it can be feasibly constructed while under traffic.</p>	<p>The Bay Area transportation agencies support multimodal transportation solutions. As stated in the corridor plan, rail and ferry options must be considered but on their own they would not accommodate travel demand for SR 37. The transportation agencies will continue to coordinate with SMART, WETA and others on providing a wide range of transportation services that support and complement SR 37. It is worth noting that SMART continues to seek funding in 2018 to conduct an easterly study called the NOVATO - SOLANO HUB see pages 59-61 in the presentation at: http://scta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/State-Rail-Plan_11.01.2017.pdf</p>
129	DAA Public Comment	TRANSDEF	<p>Express bus service between transit hubs would be a desirable near-term addition to the corridor.</p>	<p>Further analysis will be conducted during the project development phase of the intersection improvements at SR 121.</p>
130	DAA Public Comment	TRANSDEF	<p>TRANSDEF would support the following near-term solution, if paired with a statelevel commitment to fund passenger rail service in the corridor: A movable barrier to replace the existing fixed median barrier would allow SR 37 to return to its former 3-lane configuration without requiring any additional ROW. Since the travel demand is highly directional, a movable barrier would provide capacity roughly equivalent to a 4-lane system, at a far lower cost and with fewer environmental impacts. The reversible center lane would be restricted to HOVs. A toll would be charged for all lanes.</p>	<p>The Bay Area transportation agencies support bus service in the SR 37 corridor.</p>
131	DAA Public Comment	TRANSDEF	<p>As stated earlier, it is far too early to commit to a long-range plan, when less costly and less impactful alternatives have not been adequately explored. The Next Steps proposed on page 31 are thus inappropriate, for the reasons discussed above.</p>	<p>The near-term solutions suggested are noted.</p>
132	DAA Public Comment	TRANSDEF		<p>The corridor plan is a high-level assessment of key current and anticipated issues on California State Route 37 (SR 37) and lays out some near-, mid-, and long-term improvements that help to address such issues. As project concepts move into project development, it is expected that potential benefits, impacts, cost-effectiveness and project delivery timelines (to name a few) will be thoroughly vetted.</p>