STATE ROUTE (SR) 37 POLICY COMMITTEE

9:30 a.m., Friday, July 20, 2018
Foley Cultural Center, Lakeside Conference Room
1499 N. Camino Alto
Vallejo, CA California 94590

MEETING AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS
Chair David Rabbitt
County of Sonoma

2. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the March 1, 2018 SR 37 Policy Committee Meeting
Recommendation:
Approve SR 37 Policy Committee March 1, 2018 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
Pg. 3

Anthony Adams, STA

4. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Summary of Public Outreach – Corridor Plan
Becky Frank, Caltrans

B. Corridor Segments Update:

   Segment B:
   - SR 37 PSR/PDS Progress, Alternatives and Schedule

   Segment C:
   - SR 37 Fairgrounds Interchange & Transit Stops Update

   Segment A:
   - Segment A Ultimate Design Study Update

Kevin Chen, MTC
Janet Adams, STA
Nick Nguyen, TAM

5. PRESENTATIONS

A. Resilience by Design: San Pablo Bay Corridor
Tom Leader, Common Ground
Erik Prince, Common Ground
Thor Andersen, Common Ground
Kushal Lachhwani, Common Ground

SR 37 Policy Committee Members:

Solano Elected Officials
Bob Sampayan, Mayor City of Vallejo
Jim Spering, MTC Commissioner
Erin Hannigan, Solano County Board of Supervisor

Sonoma Elected Officials
David Rabbitt, Sonoma County Board of Supervisor
Jade Mackenzie, MTC Commissioner
Susan Gorin, Sonoma County Board of Supervisor

Marin Elected Officials
Damon Connolly, MTC Commissioner
Judy Arnold, Marin County Board of Supervisor
Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Councilmember, City of Mill Valley

Napa Elected Officials
Alfredo Pedroza, MTC Commissioner
Bella Ramos, Napa County Board of Supervisor
Leon Garcia, Mayor City of American Canyon
6. ACTION ITEMS

A. Future Meeting Schedule

   9:30 a.m., Thursday, November 8, 2018
   9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7, 2019

Daryl Halls, STA

7. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Committee

8. FUTURE TOPICS

November 8, 2018
   • SR 37 PSR/PDS Update Report
   • RM 3 Funding Priorities
   • Update on Transit Corridor Studies

March 7, 2019
   • SR 37 PSR/PDS Progress Final Report
   • Environmental Phase Discussion – Segment B Public Scoping Meeting

9. ADJOURNMENT

Next SR 37 Policy Committee Meeting: November 8, 2018 at Foley Cultural Center in Vallejo.

Future Meeting Schedule (Pending Approval)

9:30 a.m., Thursday, November 8, 2018 in Vallejo
9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7, 2019 in Vallejo
9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 6, 2019, TBD
9:30 a.m., September 5, 2019, TBD
State Route (SR) 37 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 1, 2018
Foley Cultural Center
Vallejo, CA 94592

1. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS
Committee Chairperson, Supervisor David Rabbit, called the SR 37 Policy Committee Meeting to Order at approximately 9:32 a.m.

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Judy Arnold, Marin County Supervisor
Damon Connolly, MTC Commissioner, Marin County Supervisor
Leon Gia, Mayor, City of American Canyon
Susan Gorin, Sonoma County Supervisor
Erin Hannigan, Vice Chair, Solano County Board of Supervisors
Jake Mackenzie, MTC Commissioner, City Council, Rohnert Park
Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Councilmember, City of Mill Valley
Alfredo Pedroza, MTC Commissioner, Napa County Supervisor
David Rabbitt, Chair, MTC Commissioner, Sonoma County Supervisor
Belia Ramos, Napa County Supervisor
Bob Sampayan, Mayor, City of Vallejo
Jim Spering, MTC Commissioner, Solano County Supervisor

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT: None.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS PRESENT: Daryl Halls, STA
Kate Miller, NVTA
Suzanne Smith, SCTA
Dianne Steinhauser, TAM

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS ABSENT: None.

OTHERS PRESENT: Anthony Adams, STA
Melissa Apuya, Assembly Member Marc Levine’s Office
Tom Bartee, Senator Bill Dodd’s Office
James Bezek, Solano County
Steve Birdlebough, SCTLC
Adam Brand, SCTA
Patricia Brown, Resident
John By, ECA
Davis Carlson, ESA
Joan Chaplick, MIGCOM
Rick Coates, EcoRing
Jessica Davenport, State Coastal Conservatory
Mike Davis, ICF
Elizabeth Dippel, Sonoma–Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART)
Bill Emlen, Solano County
Dick Fahey, Caltrans
Rick Fraites, Marin Audubon Society
2. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
No comments were made.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR
   A. Minutes of the January 4, 2018 SR 37 Policy Committee Meeting
   Recommendation:
   Approve SR 37 Policy Committee January 4, 2018 meeting minutes.

   By consensus, the January 4, 2018 SR 37 Policy Committee meeting minutes were approved.

4. PRESENTATION
   A. Resiliency by Design: San Pablo Bay Region
      Erik Prince and Thor Andersen, both with Common Ground, presented.

      Fraser Schilling, UC Davis, asked how the decision to move the roadway back rather than
      armoring the roadway was made. Erik Prince replied with a discussion on resiliency,
      emphasizing the need to retreat when keeping existing resources is not an option, to minimize
      intensive engineering, and to embrace the natural environment.

      An unidentified speaker asked what the five most significant changes to be made to SR 37
      were. The Common Ground representatives replied by emphasizing the great need to fix SR 37
      due to its negative impact on local communities and the need to plan for the next 100 years,
      considering transportation needs beyond those of cars and drivers.
5. INFORMATION ITEMS:

A. Caltrans SR 37 SHOPP Update
   Dan McElhinney, Caltrans, provided an update on the State Highway Operations Protection and Programming (SHOPP) near term improvement plans. He also supplied the SHOPP PID list and noted that Roundabout at SR37 and SR121, which is scheduled to be constructed in FY 2025/26 would cost an estimated $40M.

Fraser Schilling, UC Davis, asked if there was a timeline for raising SR 37, and how the aforementioned projects work together. Dan McElhinney replied that bridge widening and profile adjustment will be necessary but assured Mr. Schilling that when the long term project occurs it will be integrated. He emphasized that this is a safety project.

Supervisor Susan Gorin commented that SR121 can turn into a one lane road due to heavy rains. She wants to talk about SR121 going north. Mr. McElhinney mentioned that SB1 will provide funding for projects like SR121

B. Transit Update: Origin and Destination Ridership Study
   Kate Miller, NVTA reported that 19% of subjects carpool and asserted that there is a propensity for carpool/vanpool/transit feasibility. She noted that a cost estimate would be available at the next meeting.

Dave Oster asked whether or not the NVTA was coordinating with census date, looking at status quo scores, and examining HOV data. Ms. Miller replied affirmatively.

An unidentified speaker inquired about train integration in the ridership study. Ms. Gorin answered that the NVTA was not prepared to answer train questions at this time, but assured the speaker that they were coordinating with SMART to conduct a feasibility study.

C. Corridor Segments Update:
   1. Daryl Halls, STA, provided an update on Segment C and the SR 37/Fairgrounds Drive Interchange and SolanoExpress bus stop.
   2. Jean Finney, Caltrans, provided an update on Segment B and discussed the SR 37 Project Initiative Document. Finney explained that a PID document is required for all projects on state highways over $3M. Caltrans will use a streamlined PID (PID CPDR-PDS) and STA will reimburse Caltrans.

Daryl Halls thanked Caltrans staff and noted that the PID needs to be completed by the end of the calendar year.

John McKenzie asked when Caltrans would sign off on the PID. Jean Finney replied that Caltrans expects to sign off on schedule, at the end of the year.

Dave Oster critiqued the retreat plan, calling it half-baked and noted that the PID is one alternative, door closed. Jean Finney addressed these concerns and commented that the PID will address numerous alternatives and will be a group effort to address the purpose and needs of the project. Dave Oster asked how alternatives would be identified. Finney responded that alternatives would be identified by counties. Dave Oster expressed his continued reservations and total lack of confidence that comprehensive alternatives will be addressed during the PID.
Steve Bindlebough asked if bedrock was identified during the PID. Jean Finney replied that it had not been identified during this phase. Ashley Nguyen, MTC, added that MTC will perform a limited geo-technical analysis.

An unidentified speaker asked about the scoping process for alternatives. Ms. Finney replied that Caltrans was looking at which alternatives are most feasible.

An unidentified speaker asked if rail is an option. Ashley Nguyen responded that MTC is working with SMART to make SR37 Segment B a multimodal corridor.

Suzanne Smith noted that a similar study was complete for Hwy 101 and asked if the studies could build off one another. David Rabbit replied that the fact that it was not explicitly included in PID did not preclude it from being studied in parallel.

Susan Gorin said that she understood by these comments that rail is needed on this segment and asked if it would be possible to do another PID for rail. Jean Finney responded that this was not possible because rail is not on the Caltrans ROW.

Jake McKenzie asked whether SMART rail is looking at SR37 Segment B as part of the state rail plan. Daryl Halls replied that they are looking at three studies: STA is leading the water ferry, NVTA is leading the bus OD study, and SMART, if they have the funding, is interested in the rail study.

An unidentified speaker questioned the project’s focus on moving more vehicles, noting that climate change is worsening and additional vehicles will exacerbate its effects. Dave Schonberg responded, emphasizing the need for a master document that does not result in each mode fighting each other.

Fraser Schilling commented that previous studies had looked at different alignments, noted that this corridor plan proposed parallel alignment, and asked if the PID could examine other alignment options. Jean Finney replied affirmatively, emphasizing that the PID will look at a variety of alternatives.

Mayor Elizabeth Patterson requested that the guiding principles be provided on the next agenda for adoption. She also commented that the PID focused only on the road, calling this practice archaic, and noted that is a state problem, so looking for a regional solution was taking on too much of a burden to address the issue.

3. Justin Vandever, AECOM, provided an update on the Segment A Levee and Shoreline analysis.

An unidentified speaker asked that the study over the entire corridor, not just Segment A. Diane Steinhausser responded that due to limited funding for this study, expanding it would be overstepping. She noted that TAM plans to resume the study with a recent grant from CTC to attempt to fine-tune this study. TAM will talk about what improvements are needed and when; the next presentation will include a discussion of what to do with the road versus levee management.

John Vasquez asked whether or not AECOM had already identified the owners of the levees. Justin Vandever affirmed that the Levee Ownership Inventory was complete for all levee types.
Jim Spering asked if AECOM was looking into a comprehensive study of all levees, including new or improved ones. Diane Steinhauser responded that TAM is not sure that re-engineering 11 miles of levees is the right path. TAM will look at costs but don’t have an exact budget at this time. Spering questioned why the project requires 11 miles of levees for three miles of road, rather than three miles of levees.

Dianne Steinhauser commented that the new study will look into that and other design alternatives.

Susan Gorin requested that TAM include SR 121 levee in these studies.

David Oster noted the large number of levees and owners and asked whether or not there was a legal right to force the owners to maintain or improve these levees. Justin Vandever responded that this question remained open and unresolved.

Dave Schoenberger emphasized that 100-year storms need to be considered.

An unidentified speaker added that the plan must account for SLR, tides, and storm surge, not just bayside. Vandever cautioned that AECOM did not have the funding to study all factors.

David Babbitt remarked that many levee owners already maintain their levees.

4. Nick Nguyen, TAM discussed the SR Shore Lane Improvement Strategy and provided a Segment A Conceptual Design update.

An unidentified speaker complemented Mr. Nguyen on his “compelling” presentation.

Steve Harcord asked whether or not TAM had located bedrock for Segment A. Nguyen responded that they had not.

Jim Spering asked why a long-term solution is needed now? He asked whether or not the project would be done in parallel, and asked about the timing for the project. Nick Nguyen replied that TAM needed to start something soon and suggested that the group consider the levees or parts of the roadway for improvements. Spering cautioned that the timing was important due to the dearth of resources, asserting that work on Segment A could commence only when improvements to Segment B were completed.

David Rabbitt agreed, noting that phasing is important with limited resources.

Fraser Schilling observed that Segment B is more prone to congestion and less SLR flooding where Segment A is more in danger of immediate flooding due to the proximity of the levees.

D. SR 37 Survey and Focus Group Results

Joan Chaplick, MIG, discussed the survey and focus group results.

Susan Gorin asked if the SR37 improvements would change commute patterns. Ms. Chaplick cautioned that some people cannot take transit due to their job location.
Mayor Elizabeth Patterson noted that RM3 funding helps this project and requested that PowerPoints of these results be provided. Ms. Chaplick responded that PowerPoints were already publically available on the MIG website.

6. ACTION ITEMS
A. SR 37 Corridor Plan
Recommendation: Forward SR 37 Corridor Plan to the Transportation Authorities of Marin, Napa, Solano and Sonoma for review and comment.

B. Response to Comments
Kevin Chen noted that the four workshops had generated a lot of comments. He remarked that TransDef’s comments were included, even though they had received them late.

Daryl Halls proposed that each County Transportation Authority (CTA) bring these comments and responses to each of the four CTA boards.

Jessica Davenport from the Baylands commented that a lot of good work was not included in the document. She argued against barriers and walls and cautioned against short-term improvements that might preclude long-term improvements. She also asserted the need to develop a comprehensive design and to delegate authority to staff to address factual deficiencies.

An unidentified speaker agreed with Ms. Davenport’s remarks and suggestions.

On a motion by Supervisor Spering and a second by Council Member Mackenzie, Policy Committee approved staff recommendation.

7. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS
No comments were offered.

8. FUTURE TOPICS
- SR 37 Project Initiation Document
- STA Water Transit Study
- Origin and Destination Ridership Study

9. ADJOURNMENT
Next SR 37 Policy Committee Meeting: May 3, 2018 at Foley Cultural Center in Vallejo.