

- V. Request for Approval of the Draft “City of Napa Downtown Riverfront Urban Design Plan” for the Downtown Reach.

Cassandra Walker, Director, and Jennifer La Liberté, Project Coordinator, City of Napa Economic and Redevelopment Agency; and Terry Bottomley, Consultant, Bottomley Design and Planning, returned with revisions to the plan, as previously requested by the Panel.

Jennifer noted that there are components of the design that are schematic, such as the Bypass Channel area, that will require additional design detail as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers moves forward with their plans and specs and that the City would be happy to work with the District and the USACOE to set up a procedure for how this would be handled and recommended a subcommittee of the TAP be a part of this process.

Terry walked through the illustrations of Veterans’ Park and the Bypass Channel that were provided to the TAP in response to their previous comments. Questions and comments were entertained from the Panel and the public.

Member Kerr made the following motion, which was also written and passed out to the Panel: Move “finding of consistency,” contingent upon these different items:

1) River Visibility

Further “line of sight” analysis and reconsideration of cross sections of river walls, promenade, lower trail, adjacent buildings and trees to better carry out the Coalition’s Community Plan’s first urban design guideline; i.e., “maximize views of the river from roads, bridges, trails, and surrounding areas”, after clarification by Army Corps of Engineers of current 100-year water surface elevations and corresponding flood wall heights, including those heights presented on Page 39 of the plan. Specific areas of interest include the section between Third and Hatt, Veterans’ Park, Downtown Joe’s. The major elevation reference for viewing the Napa River Channel shall be mean sea level (0.67’ below mean tide elevation). This work shall be completed and found consistent by the TAP before any detailed plans are prepared by Army Corps of Engineers for this ‘plan’ area, or sooner.

A TAP ad hoc committee shall be appointed within a month to work with the appropriate city staff and consultant on these contingent matters, including the urban design category member of the TAP.

The TAP will have “review and comment” privileges on City plans and conditions adjacent to Flood Project rights-of-ways and easements that are directly related to visibility of the river.

This shall be added to the plan documents and this process shall be pointed out at any presentation of the ‘plan’ such as City Council, Flood Board as to such river visibility questions, or other plan contingency items listed below.

2) Napa River Bypass-Oxbow Commons

Before the Army Corps of Engineers proceeds with detailed plans for this item, or sooner, a revised graphic will be presented to the TAP to consider a finding of consistency. One graphic will represent the bypass area in the winter indicating various surfacing including trails and roadways, landscaping, and drainage; color tones. Additional graphic or other

Item V...continued

information shall be supplied as requested by the TAP at their September 25, 2002 and October 30, 2002 meetings.

3) Plan Items for Which There Are Alternatives Given

Various plan components have two or more alternatives or options listed. If one or more of the options are or may be inconsistent with the Community Plan, the option chosen by the City shall be presented to the TAP for consideration of a finding of consistency before detailed plans are prepared by Army Corps of Engineers or sooner.

Some of the components which have alternatives are:

- New railroad bridge over Napa River;
- Rehab of existing bridges over Napa River along Soscol Avenue and First Street;
- Use of sheet piling rather than concrete for river walls;
- Use of stones from existing First Street Bridge over Napa Creek in plan area or marked and stored or ?

4) Materials, Color Tones, Walkway, Recreational Facilities, Themes, and Other “Big Picture” Items

The logical next step to build on the Community Coalition’s Urban Design Guidelines seems to be lacking. Attention also must be given to this for TAP to reflect on a “finding of consistency.” Quote from Guideline No. 2 of the Community Plan: “Such as integrate the Project into the surrounding urban fabric by minimizing physical and visual barriers, limiting the disruption of existing uses and integrating the design with compatible forms and materials; i.e., meld into the fabric of the community.”

5) Relative Heights of Lower Wall and Upper Wall below Promenade down to River (Split-Level Section, e.g., Third to Hatt)

Lower the top of the opaque (solid) portion of the pedestrian barrier along the lower level; i.e., the trail or “lower promenade”, in order to provide a better proportion between the height of the upper and lower walls; e.g., lower such top two or more feet.

An option could be plant material that would hang down from such top two or three or more feet.

This item also is to return to the TAP for “consideration of a finding of consistency” prior to the Army Corps of Engineers preparing detailed plans, or sooner.

6) Small Boat/Hand Boats

In the “plan” text, the term “small” boats shall be clarified to mean “hand” boats (mouth of Napa River Bypass).

The motion was not seconded.

Item V...continued

Member Stafford motioned to find consistency with the Community Coalition Plan contingent upon further line of sight analysis, bypass design development, other design details, and consideration of alternative design analysis. Member Norris seconded the motion. The motion failed (2-7).

Vice-Chairperson Zlomke proposed to find the conceptual plan presented to be consistent with the Community Coalition Plan. Member Bahr seconded. Member Ohlemutz proposed the Committee, cognizant of the conceptual nature of the Downtown Riverfront design plan, finds the plan consistent with the GDM and the Community Coalition Plan. Committee requests that details of the plan particularly with respect to visibility to river surface treatments and planting details be brought back to the Committee for finding of consistency. Member Zlomke did not accept this amendment as part of his motion. The motion as it was originally stated carried (7-2).

DR	PB	RO	FK	BS	DS	BZ	TN	LB
			N				N	

- VI. Review and Discussion of Elevation of Trail Under Third Street Bridge.
Heather Stanton, Project Manager, distributed a document provided by Mark Andrilla, Civil Engineer, City of Napa. This item was to be continued to the next meeting, but Member Kerr did not feel this was necessary and felt the topic was addressed satisfactorily with Mr. Andrilla's written responses.
- VII. Ad Hoc Subcommittee Report on HTRW/Construction Site.
Chairperson Blake and Member Rinehart reported on their October site visit, also accompanied by Jon Lander, Principal Engineer for the Flood District, and Rick Thomasser, Consultant, Montgomery Watson Harza, to the HTRW construction area. Their overall impressions of the area were positive and commented on the details of the work being performed. Rick Thomasser added a footnote regarding erosion control.
- VIII. Discuss Possibility of Scheduling Study Session.
This item has been deferred to the next meeting. Member Kerr wanted to add a topic, "What actually is the 'GDM' that is being referred to." Chairperson Blake suggested the Panel take a straw vote on the list of topics when this item comes back. Member Kerr's suggested topic will be added to the list of topics to be voted on by the Panel at the special December 4, 2002 meeting.
- IX. Status Report and Update.
This item has been deferred to the next meeting.
- X. Agenda Items for Future Meetings:
- 1. Review Location of Tulocay Pump Station – 35% Design;**
 - 2. Encourage Outside Agencies to Submit Plans for Planting along the Railroad Fencing Area;**
 - 3. Review Final "Final" Plans and Specifications for First Street Bridge and Soscol Bridge (Late 2003);**
 - 4. Review Follow-Up Planting Plans for Contract 1B.**

XI. General Comments from the Panel.

Member Bahr suggested having some of the furniture from the conference room removed and having specific seating arrangements for the TAP, staff, and public. Heather Stanton explained that there were no other options for these meetings.

Member Norris inquired about having the Napa Valley Wine Train proposal for a Napa River Memorial Pavilion made a future agenda item. (Heather Stanton distributed an informational document on this subject at the meeting and indicated that a formal proposal had not been received for the Panel's review.)

XII. Set Next Meeting Date.

The date of the next Special Meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, December 4, 2002.

XIII. Adjourn

Adjourned to the next Special Meeting of the Technical Advisory Panel on Wednesday, December 4, 2002, at 5:30 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Flood Control District Conference Room.

PHILLIP BLAKE, Chair

ATTEST:

HEATHER STANTON
Secretary

By:

GREG MORGAN
Senior Office Assistant

KEY

Vote: DR = Dennis Rinehart; PB = Phil Blake; RO = Rudolf Ohlemutz; FK = Farnum Kerr; BS = Barbara Stafford;
DS = Dennis Scherzinger; BZ = Bob Zlomke; TN = Tony Norris; LB = Larry Bahr

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