



## **RIO VISTA GENERAL PLAN WORKING GROUP**

**WALT STANISH - CHAIRMAN  
LISA HECHTMAN – VICE CHAIR  
EDWIN OKAMURA  
TOM DONNELLY  
EMMETTE KEITH HOLTSLANDER  
JUDITH ADAMSON  
ARTHUR DARDEN**

**RICK DOLK (ALTERNATE)  
LISA DUKE (AT-LARGE ALTERNATE)**

**REGULAR MEETING  
IN PERSON AND TELECONFERENCE**

### **DRAFT MINUTES**

**Thursday, September 7, 2023**

**5:00 P.M. – REGULAR MEETING**

**CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
ONE MAIN STREET  
RIO VISTA, CALIFORNIA 94571**

---

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Walt Stanish, Vice Chair Lisa Hechtman, Edwin Okamura  
Tom Donnelly, Emmette Holtslander, Judith Adamson, Lisa Duke and Rick Dolk

**ABSENT:** Arthur Darden

Chairman Stanish opened the meeting at 5:00 PM

#### **2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public Comment was received.

### 3. ACTION ITEMS

#### 3.1 Approve the Minutes from August 3, 2023

Motion to approve the minutes from August 3, 2023, by committee member Donnelly and second by committee member Okamura, passed by the following roll call vote:

**AYES:** Chairman Walt Stanish, Vice Chair Lisa Hechtman, Edwin Okamura, Tom Donnelly, Emmette Holtslander, Judith Adamson, Lisa Duke, and Rick Dolk

**NOES:** None

**ABSENT:** Arthur Darden

### 4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Before the presentation was given, the General Plan Working Group expressed concern over the future development plan of Forever California/Flannery Group. The City Manager commented that the Flannery Group may circumvent county zoning and CEQA with referendum so will ask legal counsel for more guidance on this. The General Plan Consultant team (Interwest and Fehr & Peers) discussed several items during the meeting.

#### 4.1 SR 12/Rio Vista Discussion

Planning documents that were reviewed: Rio Vista General Plan (2001), Highway 12 Major Investment Study (2001), SR 12 Corridor System Management Plan (2010), SR 12 Realignment/Rio Vista Bridge Preliminary Study (2010), SR 12 Comprehensive Evaluation and Corridor Management Plan (2012)

Short-Term Plan (2015-202)

- SHOPP improvements
- ITS installation
- Finalize Rio Vista Bridge Alignment
- Short-term moveable bridge enhancements

Long-Term Plan (2020-2035)

The long-term plan has capital costs of \$1.44 billion in present day dollars. A significant portion of the cost is attributable to the bridge replacements and associated realignments at Rio Vista and Mokelumne River. When compared to SR-12 today, the long-term CMP reduces delay by as much as 6,000 hours per day and significantly improves end-to-end travel times by 30 minutes.

### Community Concerns

- Economic Activity
- Active Transportation
- Congestion
- Safety
- Bridge Toll

Approximately 20% of trips on SR 12 are local; approximately 80% are pass-through.

Table 1 – SR 12 Pass-Through Trips

Location	Stop Time	% Through Traffic
SR 12 in Rio Vista	No Stop	71
	< 15 Minutes	18
	15-30 Minutes	4
	30-45 Minutes	2
	45-60 Minutes	1
	>60 Minutes	4

Notes: Pass through information is based on Near data collected between August 13, 2022, and November 18, 2022.  
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2023

### **Comments Received:**

- Walt – would a rerouting of Highway 12 have negative impacts on Rio Vista Downtown.
  - Follow up on cell phone traffic data – appears little economic benefit results from Highway 12 traffic.
- Public comment: Land along southern realignment would involve lands protected by conservation easements and residents of Montezuma Hills would oppose.
- Rick – In 2006, his opinion was bypass would be detrimental, now it is less certain the bypass would be negative. In 2006, downtown was more vibrant, and traffic was less impacted.
- Edwin – also has shifted from opposing a bypass to now considering northern bypass as beneficial.
- Tom D. – interested in the dynamics that are leading to increased traffic levels. What is generating the traffic and what trends should we expect?
- Lisa H. – Lack of reliable ferry service limits options. A ferry could be a viable option when the bridge is out.
- Judith – clearly supportive of the northern route over the southern route.
- Would the existing bridge be decommissioned if a new bridge/bypass is constructed?

- If a new bypass is constructed, may consider current bridge having no truck traffic.
- Consensus of GPWG, a bypass is the preferred solution, but location is not known.
- Include programs to continue to study the environmental/economic/social benefits and impacts of each alternative.
- The highway through Montezuma Hills wouldn't be preferred by residents in that area. Properties are also in Solano Land Trust, which is adjacent to corridor alternative to the south. More land is going to be added to Solano Land Trust, so keep this in mind for this area.

### **Goals/ Policies in the Circulation Element**

Ultimate Question – Does the City support realignment of SR 12?

-Incorporate goals/policies directed at realigning SR 12 in the City's preferred location(s)

-Discourage widening of SR 12 in existing location

-Long-term plan to revitalize existing SR 12 and turn it into a destination

#### Next Steps

- Incorporate goals, policies, and programs consistent with direction provided today.
- Finalize existing conditions report.
- Finalize draft circulation element.

## **4.2 Preliminary Draft Circulation Goals and Policies**

### Draft Mobility and Circulation Goals

**Goal MC-1:** A circulation and mobility system that prioritizes safety and supports and accommodates all modes of transportation.

**Goal MC-2:** A network of roads and trails that balances local mobility needs of community members with the needs of regional circulation/commuters passing through Rio Vista.

**Goal PSF-3:** A citywide circulation system that is well maintained and evolves to meet the needs of the community over time.

## **Draft Mobility and Circulation Policies**

**Policy MC-1.** In the review of development entitlements, ensure all city streets and intersections maintain a level of service (LOS) “D” as the target LOS, except for the following locations where LOS E is acceptable:

- Main Street and Front Street between Main Street and SR 12.
- In the Downtown area, neighborhood commercial areas, and other areas where vitality, pedestrian activity, and transit accessibility are or will be the primary considerations as the community grows.

**Policy MC-2.** Require new development projects to provide primary roadways and connected and continuous pedestrian and bicycle routes as generally depicted in Figure \_\_\_\_.

**Policy MC-3.** New development projects inconsistent with the general plan should not increase cumulative year citywide average VMT per capita, as measured by home-based VMT per resident and home-based VMT per employee or other applicable metric as determined by the City.

## **Road Design Standards**

**Policy MC-4.** Maintain, and update as needed, a street classification system with design standards that are context-sensitive and enable safe, comfortable, and attractive access for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit users of all ages and abilities. Street standards should:

- Address the needs of different modes according to roadway classification.
- Reduce the potential for conflicts and safety risks between modes.
- Support and manage the use of transportation network companies (TNCs, Uber and Lyft) and autonomous vehicles (AVs) and other emerging trends that will become increasingly popular in the future.
- Allow for adjustment by the City Engineer where needed, on a case-by-case basis.

## **Design for Safety**

**Policy MC-5.** Apply complete streets principles in the design and operation of streets to ensure the safety and mobility of all users and prioritize the safety of vulnerable roadway users. This may include deploying design solutions such as roadway reallocations, roundabouts, traffic calming devices, separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and curb extensions at intersections.

**Policy MC-6.** Utilize a data-driven “vision zero” approach to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries by 2035.

## **Regional Transportation Planning**

**Policy MC-7.** Coordinate with Caltrans and STA on regional infrastructure projects to incorporate city projects to reduce planning and construction costs.

**Policy MC-8.** Implement near-term, mid-term and long-term strategies to minimize the impacts of Highway 12 traffic on the Rio Vista community.

### Active Transportation Planning

**Policy MC-9.** Eliminate barriers and gaps, where feasible, in the existing roadway, bikeway, and pedestrian networks, to allow people of all abilities to move freely and efficiently throughout the City.

**Policy MC-10.** Provide a complete sidewalk and bicycle network throughout the city. Use discretionary funding sources and grant funding for the following priority projects:

- Completion of planning and environmental documents for a SR 12 grade separated bicycle/pedestrian crossing.
- Completing gap segments in sidewalks, bike lanes or bikeways, and other bicycle and pedestrian facilities where near-term development is not anticipated.
- Completing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in areas with a high potential for injury.
- Completing gaps in bicycle and pedestrian facilities near important destinations, such as schools, parks, and commercial areas.

**Policy MC-11.** Coordinating with Caltrans to ensure pedestrian and bicycle access and safety is a priority on SR 12 in the City limits.

**Policy MC-X.** Provide mid-block pedestrian crossings and off-street pedestrian paths in areas with high pedestrian traffic to create more direct walking routes.

### **Transit Planning**

**Policy MC-12.** Collaborate with and encourage new transit providers to provide connections for residents to/from key locations both within and outside of the city such as schools, major employment areas, medical facilities, and major transit hubs such as BART stations. Evaluate innovative micro-transit and micro-mobility service options, such as golf cart-shares, bike-shares, e-scooters, mobility scooter rentals, and providers to determine appropriateness for Rio Vista residents.

**Policy MC-13.** Encourage and collaborate with private taxi service providers, AV providers, and TNC's (i.e. Uber) in Rio Vista. Provide designated pick-up and drop-off locations for these services with new developments and redevelopments, as appropriate.

## **Funding**

**Policy MC-14.** Utilize existing local, state, and federal funding sources and actively pursue new and innovative transportation funding and financing sources.

**Policy MC-15.** Prioritize seeking funds for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, in particular funds for planning and construction of an SR 12 bicycle/pedestrian grade-separated crossing.

### **4.3 Draft Introduction Chapter**

- Does the introduction capture the essence of the Rio Vista community and its setting?
- Does the Introduction adequately prepare the reader to understand and apply the General Plan provisions?
- Are there additional key concepts the GPWG would like expressed in the GP Introduction?

### **4.4 Draft Noise Section**

- Draft represents half of the new Safety and Noise Element and first review of noise-related material.
- Provides both the background/context discussion, as well as the goals, policies and programs related to noise.
- Due to the nature of noise, this is a rather technical section.
- The GPWG should consider whether this section correctly identifies and addresses the noise issues of Rio Vista
- Following adoption of the General Plan, the City will update the noise section of the Municipal Code

### **Transportation and Non-Transportation Noise**

- The majority of noise in Rio Vista is transportation related.
  - Cars, trucks, airplanes
  - Day-Night Average Sound Level, or Ldn, is used to describe transportation related noise.
- Non-transportation generally includes all activities and equipment noise (events, construction, etc.)
  - Non-transportation noise is described as maximum decibel, or Lmax, or as Leq, or average /equivalent noise.

## **Draft Noise Goals, Policies, and Programs**

### **GOALS**

**GOAL SN-1.** Ensure that community members and businesses are not adversely impacted by unwanted or excessive noise levels.

### **POLICIES**

**POLICY SN-1.** Ensure that community members and businesses are not adversely impacted by unwanted or excessive noise levels.

**POLICY SN-2.** The new development shall be evaluated for compliance standards provided in Table X-1. Where existing noise levels would exceed acceptable levels, it shall be the obligation of the applicant proposing the project to ensure noise levels are reduced to acceptable levels.

**POLICY SN-3.** Where noise attenuation is required to meet the standards of this element, an emphasis shall be placed on site planning and project design, including, but not limited to, building orientation, setbacks and building construction practices.

**POLICY SN-4.** The use of sound walls will be allowed only if these other measures cannot achieve compliance with the noise standards of this General Plan. Where sound walls are required, the walls shall be designed to ensure the wall is visually attractive and compatible with the design of the proposed project and surrounding development.

**POLICY SN-5.** When noise sensitive development is proposed in proximity to existing gas extraction facilities, the developer of the proposed project shall be responsible for meeting applicable noise standards within the proposed project.

**POLICY SN-6.** Ensure that noise sensitive uses do not encroach into areas needed by noise generating uses.

**POLICY SN-7.** Projects located within the CNEL 55 dB contour of the Rio Vista Municipal Airport, as depicted in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), shall be reviewed for noise sensitivity and consistency with City and ALUCP noise standards.

**POLICY SN-8.** Noise associated with construction activities shall be exempt from the noise standards cited in Table X.2. However, construction related noise impacts shall be minimized as follows:

- The City shall limit construction activities to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. unless an exemption is granted in the City's review of

the project's entitlement or permit.

- The City shall require all internal combustion engines used in conjunction with construction activities to be muffled according to the equipment manufacturer's requirements.

### **Implementation Programs**

**PROGRAM SN-1.** Within any entitlement review, the project applicant shall provide a description of project operations and shall provide information as required, potentially including a noise study, to determine the project's consistency with City noise standards, as established in Tables X-X and X-X.

**PROGRAM SN-2.** Maintain a map of locations of existing and proposed natural gas well sites for reference when reviewing land use entitlements.

**PROGRAM SN-3.** Where noise sensitive land use is proposed near an existing fixed noise source, the applicant shall be responsible for demonstrating that the proposed project will comply with City noise standards.

**PROGRAM SN-4.** All proposed specific plans and PUDs and tentative maps shall be reviewed in terms of present and future noise levels and means of noise attenuation. The City will consider techniques such as site and building design, barriers, and traffic planning. Noise-reducing measures will be incorporated into the proposed specific plan, PUD, or tentative map as necessary to comply with City standards.

**PROGRAM SN-5.** Amend the Chapter 17.52 Noise Standards of the Rio Vista Municipal Code to address noise compatibility standards that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Noise performance standards for gas well operations (i.e., compressors) of 45 dBA (maximum) at the residential property line.
- Limits for mobile or short duration non-mobile noise emissions.
- Noise generated by added equipment that does not require zoning approval or a building permit.
- On-site vehicular operations, such as truck loading and unloading.
- Operation of construction equipment and maintenance equipment.
- Amplified music and outdoor entertainment in Commercial zones.
- Abatement of nuisance noise levels, including standards for nuisance noise and procedures for abatement of nuisance noise levels

#### **4.6 Next Steps**

GPWG meeting – October 5, 2023

- Draft Safety Element Goals and Policies
- Complete First Draft Mobility and Circulation Goals, Policies, and Programs
- Economic Development: Goals, Policies, and Implementation Programs

GPWG meeting – November 2, 2023

- Economic Development: Complete First Draft
- Mobility and Circulation: Complete First Draft
- Environmental Justice: Complete Additions

GPWG meeting – December 7, 2023

- Comprehensive Draft General Plan Review

#### **5. INFORMATION ITEMS**

None

#### **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Stanish adjourned the meeting at 7:00 PM

---

Krystine Ball, General Plan Working Group Clerk