

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

❖  
Wednesday, May 25, 2011  
5:30 p.m.

I. Call to Order; Roll Call.  
**The Napa County Technical Advisory Panel met during regular session on Wednesday, May 25, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present: Chip Bouril; Tony Norris; Rolf Ohlemutz; Bill Bennett; Chris Craiker; Chairperson Bob Zlomke; and Barbara Stafford. Vice-Chairperson Dennis Rinehart and Dennis Scherzinger were excused.**

II. Public Comment.  
**None.**

III. Approve Minutes of the April 27, 2011 Regular Meeting.  
**Minutes approved.**

<b>BB</b>	<b>CB</b>	<b>CC</b>	<b>TN</b>	<b>RO</b>	<b>DR</b>	<b>DS</b>	<b>BS</b>	<b>BZ</b>
					<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		

IV. Review of 65% Contract 3 – Bypass Plans and Possible Finding of Consistency.  
**Julie Lucido, Project Manager, provided a brief introduction of the item, referencing the Panel’s comments to the 35% plans and the designer’s responses contained in the agenda packet. Reference was also made to the proposed energy dissipater’s redesign and relocation that the Panel reviewed as an informational item at the April 27, 2011 meeting, which is contained in the 65% plans. Ms. Lucido turned the item over to George Robeson, McMillen, Inc., via conference phone. Also present at the meeting was Bert Brown, Project Manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Robeson noted that there weren’t many changes from the 35% plans other than the energy dissipater and bank stabilization methods to the outlet/inlet and the area along Napa Creek. The item was opened for discussion. Rick Thomasser, Watershed and Flood Control Operations Manager, stated a group of local plant experts and District staff was going to be convened to tentatively meet on June 23, 2011 to further review the planting palate and wanted to know if the Panel would like a member to attend the meeting as well. Chairperson Zlomke appointed Member Bouril to attend the meeting on the Panel’s behalf. The Panel’s comments on the 65% plans will be forwarded to the designer and to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (See Attachment “A”). Ms. Lucido stated a request would be made to receive the responses to the Panel’s 65% comments one month prior to their review of the 100% plans. The 65% plans were found consistent with the intent of the General Design Memorandum and Community Coalition Plan with the following caveat: Move to proceed to 100% design conditional to modifications/reflected comments that are in the TAP meeting of May 25, 2011.**

<b>BB</b>	<b>CB</b>	<b>CC</b>	<b>TN</b>	<b>RO</b>	<b>DR</b>	<b>DS</b>	<b>BS</b>	<b>BZ</b>
					<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		

- V. Agenda Items for Future Meetings.  
**None were mentioned.**
- VI. General Comments from the Panel. (This is an opportunity for Panel members to informally discuss items and ask questions.)  
**Member Bennett inquired about the resolution of issues affecting the work and construction schedule of the Napa Creek project.**
- VII. Confirm Next Meeting Date of June 29, 2011.  
**Meeting date confirmed.**
- VIII. Adjourn.  
**Adjourned to the next Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Panel on Wednesday, June 29, 2011, at 5:30 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Flood District Conference Room.**

---

BOB ZLOMKE  
Chairperson

ATTEST:

---

JULIE LUCIDO  
Secretary

---

By: GREG MORGAN  
Supervising Office Assistant

KEY

Vote: BB = Bill Bennett; CB = Chip Bouril; CC = Chris Craiker; TN = Tony Norris; RO = Rolf Ohlemutz;  
DR = Dennis Rinehart; DS = Dennis Scherzinger; BS = Barbara Stafford; BZ = Bob Zlomke  
Notations under Vote: N = No; X = Excused; A = Abstained

## ATTACHMENT "A"

### Technical Advisory Panel Comments – May 25, 2011

#### Review of 65% Contract 3 – Bypass Plans

Comment
The dissipater (the vertical component and steps) should be curvilinear in nature.
The dissipater should be curved around into a downstream direction, concentrating the flow more toward the middle and away from the banks.
It would be helpful to know the detail of the steps and how they join the pathway on either side of the toe of slope.
How rough is the roughened concrete and how will it affect public use? The bypass area should be as multi-purpose as much as possible.
Sheet C-321 has a note showing turf reinforcement mat going up the slope. This area should be covered with a group of native grasses or other plants.
Sheet C-102, handed out at the meeting, shows an odd, narrow pathway at the south side of the boat launch that cuts diagonally down toward the river and then suddenly dead ends. What is this pathway?
Sheet C-102 shows the riverside improvement north of the boat launch ending rather abruptly with the improvement sort perpendicular to flood flow. Why is this finished this way, and why isn't it tapered back into the river bank further north? What is the timing of the river improvements further north? There might be a gap in time and that might be vulnerable.
Sheet C-112 shows low-flow channel version one with the pathway beside it, and when the pump station comes in, it is moved downstream. I want to make sure the pathway is moved with it. The trail goes alongside the channel, and if you take out the channel, you don't want the pathway going through the middle.
Would encourage liberal use of zone control valves due to the nature of the project. Optimal results could be achieved with a rather inexpensive ball valve arrangement.
Sheet L-501 – Plant selection is good, but I would want to be sure the soil fertility lab test is taken to make a final determination on plant selection. This would confirm the degree of salt tolerance of plants and possible boron in soil. Notes 1 and 2 under boxes A through D appear to be repetitious rather than seed-specific and should be re-examined to ensure what the real application rate is truly meant to be. Box D – should confirm this is consistent with the expectations of the City. Box C – suggest going with local, native variety of festuca rubra, which is molate fescue. Require contractor to confirm soil fertility lab test after grading of soil since movement of the soil could have changed soil profile. Box E – umbellularia californica is known to be a lead host plant in sudden oak death. This tree should be substituted or permission should be obtained from the Napa County Ag Commissioner to keep this on the list.
Sheet L-103 – There is a lawn area called out on the far north side (east of McKinstry Street). Push pathway to the edge of slope instead of having it in the midsection. Pathway could also act as a mow strip.
Sheet L-102 – There is reference to the City of Napa's pocket park on the corner of First Street and Soscol Avenue. There should be coordination between this and the Bypass project regarding compatible pathway materials and plant selections.

<b>Comment</b>
Sheet S-111 – Closure structures on McKinstry Street – Ensure there is good ADA access around the structures on the sidewalks. Might want some sort of detail for gates stop and latching mechanisms where gates swing open to. Have bollard protection for oncoming traffic when gates are opened. The removable bollard between gates as illustrated on Sheet L-102 could be reused as bollard protection.
Sheet C-319 – For base compaction for the flood wall, energy dissipater and other principal concrete structures, it does not show base rock being involved. Is the specification for raw soil good enough? There is a note for compacting backfill. The fabric that goes under the lawn turf is meant to be compacted but it doesn't specify to what degree. A suitable grass species would need to be selected to adequately root to that type of compaction.
Sheet C-401 – In the upper-left corner, there is a note of 12" ± cover between sewer pipe and cap. If this cover cannot be made deeper, the selection of grass that can root suitably here will be critical or there will be a long stripe of weak grass.
Sheet C-113 – A series of switchback pathways are shown coming off the end of West Street on the northwest side and then off the corner of Soscol Avenue and First Street on the southeast side. People are going to cut straight down this area, creating a bald spot in the landscaping. Is there any chance of inserting stairs in this type of situation? The dead end finished at West Street is odd and unusual. Will a City of Napa Public Works street sweeper be able to get into this tight corner? I don't see a provision for a drain or catch face. How would drainage be taken out of that corner of the street (presumably down into the bypass)? What would the provisions be for a catchment filter coming off of the street in that drainage structure and who would be servicing it?
Sheet C-114 – At the river outlet of the low flow channel on either side of the outlet if you look along contour lines, there is kind of like a rectangular empty box. What is this?
Sheet C101 – Looking at the First Street Bridge, it looks like the entire underneath is paved in concrete. We were previously assured that no grass could grow with any shadow. I still disagree and recommend someone who is more of an expert in grass review. Grass would grow to some degree under the bridge where it is still getting half the light. At the approach from Soscol under the First Street Bridge at the bank going down, there are plants that grow in shade and that has been concreted. There is too much concrete. If this area must have concrete, narrow it to 5' from each edge. The Soscol Bridge is two spans with space in between with some light and the possibility of having plants under there. It is not specified if the bank on the First Street side of the Soscol Bridge is concrete or not.
Sheet C-122, drawing 24 – There is a 12'-wide pathway over a 30'-40'-wide bridge structure that crosses the low-flow channel. Why can't we have just a 12'-wide bridge structure?
Sheet C-319 – The lower portion of low-flow channel, which will remain permanent, is rock lined. The upper portion, which is temporary, is plain concrete and is 30' wide with no plants. Is that done because it's easier to pull out than rock?
Sheet C-320 – Upper drawing of boat launch at McKinstry Street – The soil burritos are shown as kind of a stepped pattern and then there is a straight line descending, which I would assume would be this concrete dock, but it is not explained. I would hope there could be more finessing of the concrete dock to make it functional for kayak launching at different tide levels. I don't know if there is room, but part of it should be ADA. The kayak launch might do better with steps so that one can get off land into the boat in 6" of water.
Sheet C-321 – There is a diagonal line at the soil burritos above the root wad. I don't think there is a dock there. What is this line?

<b>Comment</b>
<p>Sheet C-401 – I wonder if there is some other solution other than a flat concrete slab midway between the top of the pipe and the surface. People have commented on the difficulty of getting grass to grow there.</p>
<p>Sheet C-401 – Yajome Street is misspelled under drawing 2.</p>
<p>Sheet L-102- There is an abrupt transition between the salt marsh and other new elevation change across the pedestrian path that crosses the low-flow channel. Why is the area upstream of the pedestrian path listed as TRM with non-mow turf? Where are the places people should access? My predilection is the sense of the whole Living River project is to use natives as much as possible, certainly the inlet to the bypass to the outlet are clear, but even along the outlet if there are natives that would fulfill the functions, I feel they should be used and the actual plants proposed are a mix.</p>
<p>Sheets A-203 &amp; A-204 – There are lights under the bridges. There appears to be lights on the north bank of bypass floodwall and on the south bank, which will help somewhat light the bypass itself, but I look at McKinstry Street which is 400’ and there are no lights. Is that ok – is that what people want, or is there some way to put lights in there that can be removed as necessary? The lights shown in the wall sections appear very decorative side lighting. I wonder if there is more cast oriented down lighting that would do the work without showing off or wasting electricity.</p>
<p>I am curious why there is no lighting on McKinstry Street?</p>
<p>It is important to encourage pedestrian access and activity through this space to make sure it is an active part of the riverscape of Napa. I would encourage adding some kind of steps where the switchback ramps are because not having easy access would discourage people from really using them. Regarding the boat ramp, I suggest something like what’s at the Hennessey boat launch or the ramp at Moore’s Landing. They have good, deeply curved concrete finishes that are slip-free. The worst is Riverside Drive, which is exposed aggregate concrete and very slippery and dangerous. The surface proposed on Sheet A-401 is not good enough. The area of the dissipater could be used to facilitate a stage. I can imagine a temporary stage could be carted in and set on the east side of the overpass approx 240’ from the bridge to McKinstry Street. If the dissipater were arched to surround that, it could be an elevated stage. The boat loading area off McKinstry Street should be adequate for eight to ten vehicles to have short-term parking.</p>