

**MINUTES OF THE
NAPA COUNTY TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL
REGULAR MEETING**

❖
Wednesday, March 25, 2009
5:30 p.m.

- I. Roll Call; Call to Order.
The Napa County Technical Advisory Panel met during regular session on Wednesday, March 25, 2009 at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present: Dennis Scherzinger; Barbara Stafford; Vice-Chairperson Chip Bouril; Chris Craiker; Bob Zlomke; Dennis Rinehart; and Chairperson Rolf Ohlemutz. Bill Bennett arrived during Item III, and Phill Blake was excused.
- II. Public Comment.
None.
- III. Approve Minutes of the February 25, 2009 Regular Meeting.
District staff was directed to attach to future minutes a list of Panel comments generated from the review of plans provided by an outside agency in which the comments are forwarded to the agency for their responses (see Attachment "A"). Minutes approved.
- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| BB | PB | CB | CC | RO | DR | DS | BS | BZ |
| | X | | N | | | | | |
- IV. Review of Value Engineering Concept for the Bypass Rail Bridge Relocation Project.
Julie Lucido, Project Manager, went over the plans contained in the agenda packet and via projector as well as additional concept designs via projector. The item was opened for discussion. The Panel's comments will be forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and their contractor (see Attachment "B").
- V. Agenda Items for Future Meetings.
- **Conclusion of Value Engineering Concept;**
 - **Further design review of Napa Creek (May).**
- VI. General Comments from the Panel. (This is an opportunity for Panel members to informally discuss items and ask questions.)
None.
- VII. Confirm Next Meeting Date of April 29, 2009.
Meeting date confirmed.
- VIII. Adjourn.
Adjourned to the next Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Panel on Wednesday, April 29, 2009, at 5:30 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Flood Control District Conference Room.

ROLF OHLEMUTZ

Chairperson

ATTEST:

JULIE LUCIDO

Secretary

By: GREG MORGAN

Supervising Office Assistant

KEY

Vote: BB = Bill Bennett; PB = Phill Blake; CB = Chip Bouril; CC = Chris Craiker RO = Rolf Ohlemutz;

DR = Dennis Rinehart; DS = Dennis Scherzinger; BS = Barbara Stafford; BZ = Bob Zlomke

Notations under Vote: N = No; X = Excused; A = Abstained

Technical Advisory Panel Comments – February 25-2009**65% Design Level Plans for the Napa Creek Box Culverts and Roadway Modifications**

Comment
Consider installation of debris diversion structure at the DS Bypass Inlet.
Consider installation of landscaping in the small area between south abutment of Coombs Street Pedestrian Bridge, top of bank (right) and new Coombs Street sidewalk (east side).
Clarify if landscape areas immediately east and west of Coombs Street Pedestrian Bridge north abutment will be part of the terrace or part of the parking lot landscaping.
Consider aesthetic improvements to fencing that is visible to the public.
Consider aesthetic improvements to concrete at bypass inlets and outlets.
Revise trash rack so that vertical members are parallel to each other to avoid wedging debris as water surface rises.

Technical Advisory Panel Comments – March 25-2009

Value Engineering Concept Plans – Bypass Rail Bridge Relocation Project

Comment
A steel bridge is preferred over a concrete bridge – it fits better culturally for a railroad, overall less of an environmental impact (less piles, less invasive to wildlife), the current bridge is steel, and a steel bridge would make a nice contrast to concrete bridges.
Will a metal bridge be noisier?
Soil report needs to be looked at as well as calculations.
How will safety requirements be handled for handrails, guardrails, and ADA within the bridge area for train access?
Decorative arches on a square bridge beam are unflattering and structurally unnecessary.
Current design underneath has i-beams exposed with concrete deck over them – will provide nesting for birds over river but would have bird droppings over dry bypass – need different treatment for bypass area.
Additional six-inch freeboard is a good thing.
No gold or maroon colors.
Having the bridge appearance relate to form structure than matching other bridges would be a good thing, but there is reluctance to interfere with the City's design guidelines for the downtown area.
Any cost reductions should expedite other facets of the Flood Project.
If the steel bridge had a rust finish, would graffiti removal be more difficult?