

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



Wednesday, November 16, 2011
5:30 p.m.

- I. Call to Order; Roll Call.
The Napa County Technical Advisory Panel met during regular session on Wednesday, November 16, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present: Tony Norris; Dennis Scherzinger; Vice-Chairperson Dennis Rinehart; Chip Bouril; Barbara Stafford; Chris Craiker; Chairperson Bob Zlomke; and Rolf Ohlemutz. Bill Bennett was excused.
- II. Public Comment.
None.
- III. Approve Minutes of the October 26, 2011 Regular Meeting.
Minutes approved.

BB CB CC TN RO DR DS BS BZ
X

- IV. Review of 100% Contract 3 – Bypass Plans and Possible Finding of Consistency.
Julie Lucido, Project Manager, provided a brief history of the plans that were previously brought to the TAP for review and comment at the 35% and 65% design levels. Ms. Lucido mentioned the 100% plans were also provided to the City of Napa, Friends of the Napa River and resource/permitting agencies for their review and comment. The item was turned over to Mort McMillen and Steve Spikelmier, McMillen, Inc. Mr. McMillen noted changes on plan sheet C101, wherein pathways were widened, slopes were re-graded and concrete baffle blocks were modified with architectural treatments. Plan sheet C102 had the most significant design changes. The energy dissipater, which was previously depicted as a straight line, was now curved with its central point turned into an amphitheater. The transition of pathways under the bridge was redone. The roadway that was previously curved was straightened out. The unload/load zone was expanded to allow for kayaks to be taken down to the kayak launch, which was also modified. Depiction of the flood control gates is now completely detailed. McMillen, Inc. worked with the Napa Sanitation District to modify the floodwall foundation to protect the sewer line from additional loading. Electrical panels have been added to provide power for public events. All architectural treatments have been included in the 100% plans. The inlet and outlet cross-sections were modified, flattening out slopes and changing bank stabilization. The only true lawn left is mowed turf upstream from the energy dissipater; native plantings were used elsewhere as much as possible. Ms. Lucido stated that any plan sheets that weren't included in the agenda packet could be made available upon request and further comments would be accepted by or before December 2. The item was opened for discussion. The Panel's comments on the 100% plans (see Attachment "A") will be forwarded to the designer and to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for their review and, as appropriate, possible

Item IV...Continued

incorporation into the final bid set. The 100% “draft” plans were found consistent with the intent of the General Design Memorandum and Community Coalition Plan.

BB CB CC TN RO DR DS BS BZ
X

V. Agenda Items for Future Meetings.

- **Review drafts of proposed interpretive signs (January).**

VI. General Comments from the Panel. (This is an opportunity for Panel members to informally discuss items and ask questions.)

Julie Lucido provided an update on the Farnum W. Kerr memorial bench and read the proposed language for the bench plaque.

Member Stafford inquired how to best acknowledge the first time that water will enter the bypass.

Member Bouril provided an update on former TAP member Phill Blake, who is returning from Afghanistan on December 15 after a one-year work assignment.

Member Norris congratulated staff and the contractor for the initial work on the Napa Creek Project.

Member Craiker inquired about the interpretive signage future agenda item.

VII. Confirm Next Meeting Date of December 7, 2011.
Meeting date confirmed.

VIII. Adjourn.

Adjourned to the next Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Panel on Wednesday, December 7, 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 – November 16, 2011

Review of 100% Contract 3 – Bypass Plans

Comment
Suggest coordinating with the City of Napa on aligning the pathways of the proposed pocket park at the corner of First Street and Soscol Avenue with the bypass, plant material selection, and water conservation.
Sheet C-101 – There appears to be a turnaround between the bridge and the start of the zigzag. Due to the sharp narrowing of the pathway on a flat area before it gets to the turn, tires will go off of the paved surface and will create ruts. A wider turnaround area is suggested to accommodate maintenance traffic.
Sheet C-101 – Callout note 22 references Sheet L-401 for landscaping details. Although plantings appear, it is not necessarily a landscaping detail I would expect for slope planting. Be sure when the reader is being referred from one sheet to another that the reference is correct.
Sheet C-102 – On either end of the dissipater stairs, suggest curving the concrete edges of the top stair next to the lawn so there is no tight corner with sod. The concrete of the stairs can be curved like the edges next to McKinstry Street to allow the area to be mowed with one large, wide-deck mower without getting an extra worker/piece of machinery involved.
Sheet C-115 – On note no. 7 regarding the removable bollards, are all those bollards necessary? It seems like a lot of bollards to have to remove just to swing the gate open and closed when two on either side would be sufficient.
Sheet C-506 – On McKinstry Street, a couple of ADA parking spots are called out, but it's not clear how special access is made onto the sidewalk from the parking spots. This ADA accommodation should be reviewed.
Sheet C-102 – At both ends of the dissipater stairs, there is a reference to B/S402. However, this section appears to be in Sheet C-323, but the reference is listed as B/S102. Please check these references.
Sheet C-102 – It appears callouts 8 and 9 on the riprap on the river section were mislabeled. The reference to Sheet C-321, Detail 16 is an incorrect reference, and these two callouts could be tied together.
Sheet C-101 – The bypass stationing is not on this sheet and should be added back in. (Only the low-flow channel.)
Sheet C-101 – I had a previous comment that the 30'-wide bridge should be narrowed for a 10'-wide path. The response was you needed clearance so railing wouldn't be needed. The path is currently diagonal across the bridge. By realigning the path to be perpendicular to the channel, the bridge could be narrowed.
All of the lawn is at the same spot and the rest of the bypass has no lawn. If water use is an issue, scratch some of the mowed lawn at the upstream end and maybe put some in the downstream end (this is a long distance). Providing areas for similar lawn use in multiple locations would be a functional advantage. If it's a water use issue, trade off an acre of lawn here for an acre of lawn there.
Sheet C-506 – At the two crossings where the curb cuts are, there is no striping shown. If this is a heavily used pedestrian area, different texture, a big paver or at least striping should be considered. On the north side, the curb cuts are offset; therefore, the crossing is set diagonally. This should be moved over so the crossing is perpendicular like it is on the south side.

Comment
<p>The plant palette is strictly nativized, which is wonderful. These all look local for the most part. Consider using a little more variety. I don't know what's available in trees. I know we want to eliminate the bay, but maybe add some shrubs, like coffeeberry.</p>
<p>Please add the tide ranges on the details for the two kayak launch ramps.</p>
<p>Plants will grow within 5' of the edge of the bridges. I made a previous comment that the concrete width should be narrowed.</p>
<p>Sheets C-101 and C-102 – is the entire area underneath the bridges to be stamped concrete (note no. 18). There appears to be two different types of stamped concrete here.</p>
<p>Sheet S-501 – These kayak ramps are going to have to have handrails for slopes greater than 5% or less. The kayak launch will also need rails in my interpretation of ADA requirements. It is strongly recommended that you get an ADA expert to review.</p>
<p>The gravel trail at China Point is not ADA compliant.</p>
<p>Sheet C-101 – There is a callout for cross-section 1 across the China Point berm on Sheet C-322 that includes a very steep slope section that needs to be reinforced in some way. The detail on C-322 does not include reinforcing, and I was not able to find a detail for reinforcing elsewhere. Where the low flow channel crosses the area downstream of the pedestrian path, the width of the slope doesn't change and it's unclear if it will be flared out. The access to the downstream kayak ramp needs adjustment. The contours shown within the pathway do not work with the recent grading changes.</p>
<p>Sheet C-127 – Detail no. 1 on the main plan shows no concrete but the callout points to an area with a concrete path adjacent to the turf area. These references need to be checked.</p>
<p>Suggest moving the flood lights. The light on the north should be on the west side of McKinstry and the light on the south side should be moved to the east so they would be a closer to the road.</p>
<p>Sheet C-102 - On the pathways on the river side of the weir for bicycle turning radii, if someone is going down the trail from the crest to the river side on the northern path and makes a right turn, the radius appears too sharp. On the southern path same side of the weir, a left-hand turn has the same issue. Per Chapter 1000 – Bikeway Planning and Design from the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, the recommended radii for turns at different speeds begins on page 8. The lowest speed indicated is 15 mph. However, slow speeds in flat urban areas (less than 10 mph) would require radii of less than 46'.</p>
<p>The oval "stage" area is shown on the plans as a stamped concrete oval to suggest a focus for performance activities. The stamped concrete has a textured uneven surface. If it is intended for performances, I would suggest a very smooth surface would be desirable. It would also seem a more stage-shaped form would be more useful for a range of activities, more suggestive of its function, and better related to its setting.</p>