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Appendix A: Workshop Agenda
AGENDA

Napa Highway 29 Gateway Corridor Improvement Plan
November 13 & 27, 2012

1. Welcome (2 minutes)

2. Workshop Purpose and Outline (3 minutes)

3. Project Background Information (presentation, 15 minutes)
   - Project Purpose and Participating Jurisdictions
   - Process and Timeline
   - Existing Conditions
   - Existing General Plan Land Use Designations
   - Integrating Transportation Improvements and Community Character

4. Small Group Exercises (60 minutes)
   - Activity One: Individual Visions (15 minutes)
   - Activity Two: Sharing and Group Vision; Issues (25 minutes)
   - Report out (20 minutes)

5. Themes and Next Steps (general discussion, 10 minutes)

6. Adjournment

For more information on this project or to communicate with the project team, please go to:
https://sites.google.com/site/sr29corridorstudy/home/about-the-project
Appendix B: Workshop Presentation
WELCOME!

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency
Highway 29 Gateway Corridor Improvement Plan

Visioning Workshops
November 13 & 27, 2012

Planning Area & Participating Jurisdictions

- Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency
- Caltrans (Community Planning Grant Program)
- Cities of Napa, American Canyon, Vallejo
- Counties of Napa & Solano

AGENDA

Project Background
- Planning Area & Participating Jurisdictions
- Project Purpose
- Process & Timeline
- Existing Conditions
- Planning Principles

Small Group Exercise
- Individual Ideas & Concerns
- Group Discussion on Place & Highway Types

Consider Common Themes

Project Purpose (Highway 29 Corridor)
- Transportation performance (all modes)
- Technologies and programs
- Physical improvements
- Implementation tools
- Align with each community's aspirations

Process & Timeline
- Corridor Steering Committee (Jurisdiction Decision Makers)
- Citizens Advisory Committee (for Guidance)
- Community Workshops (for Direct Input)
Transportation Networks

Connecting Roadway Types to Place Types

Planned Highway Improvements

Integrating Transportation & Community Character

Rural Highway

Parkway

Boulevard
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Visioning Exercise

Grade-Separated Highway

Vision for the Corridor
Small Group Exercise

1) Record your general concerns.

2) Consider which transportation improvements, and where.

Planned Land Uses

Adopted General Plans
Consultant Team Members & Roles

- **Dyett & Bhatia:** Project Coordination, Land Use, Urban Design, and Community Outreach
- **Fehr & Peers:** Transportation Performance
- **Bottomley Design & Planning:** Multi-Modal Roadway Design, Urban Design, and Landscape Architecture
- **Economic & Planning Systems:** Infrastructure Financing, Governance, and Market Economics
- **BKF Engineering:** Civil Engineering Due Diligence and Infrastructure Cost Estimating
Appendix C: Table Notes
Visioning Workshop Notes

NOVEMBER 13, 2012

Table 1

- Grade separation, whole way?
- Commute M-F/Wine country Saturday-Sunday 9 AM- 5 PM
- Signage to Jameson Canyon/60 (?)
- Look like a small town destination
- A boulevard to separate through/local would be nice. With bikes!
- More ability to get across
- Like roundabouts, separate safe bike routes
- Separate bikes and walk from road
- Parkway next to growing stuff
- Bay trail
- Car bridge should go above people

Table 2

- Beautify the corridor. It’s ugly!
- Traffic is a problem for whole county
  - Fix Safety
  - High school
- Beautification friendly to business owners
- Families and school kids should be able to walk to shops. Pedestrian friendly
- Expedite the through traffic, fewer stops, less pollution. Frustrated people won’t visit businesses
- Traffic is a nightmare!
- Improve access across corridor
- Boulevard idea makes getting off road to shop easier
  - Would help people get a sense of American Canyon
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- East/west traffic could go under
- Safer feeling/crossing for bicycles
- Access to businesses that don’t have frontage
- “Explosion of green” coming into American Canyon from Vallejo
- Some disagreement: two ideas through heart of American Canyon
  - Boulevard (more business friendly)
  - Grade separated (would move traffic better)
- Remember ADA compliance on all crosswalks
- Beautify highway
- Alleviate traffic
- Safe for pedestrians
- Friendly for business
- Fewer stops

**Table 3**

- Grade separation between American Canyon Road and Napa Junction
  - Need to accept regional commute role
- Bypass routes may have political challenges
- Concerns about widening and consequences for pedestrians

**Table 4**

- Synchronized lights (* just received grant)
- High Speed Lane
- Improve traffic flow
- Volumes too high
- Highway clogged quickly
- Infrastructure –bikes and pedestrian
- Parallel options along roads for residents only, no bypasses
- Bad congestion at peak hours
- Pedestrian amenities
- Multi-modal
- Themes
  - Multimodal traffic flow
– Regional vs. local
– Bike vs. pedestrian

**Table 5**
- Bike lanes important in rural highway areas
- Attractive, really nice
- Context-sensitive character
- Boulevard from 37 to town center
  - Moving traffic
  - Access to businesses, visible
- Cross traffic and through traffic must work
- Recognize parallel routes
- Balance between regional corridor and main street feel/character
- Stop people taking small side streets (especially residential)
- Newell extended to Jameson Canyon
- Parkway where there are no businesses
- Grand view/entrance to the future boulevard
- Increase to three lanes each direction
- Don’t compromise local traffic for commute traffic

**Table 6**
Concerns:
- Pedestrian crossing east and west American Canyon Road and Eucalyptus Drive
- No alternative north/south route
  - Safety concerns with crossing 29
  - Local alternate route
- Grade separated highway bad for local business
- Safety pedestrian bicycle crossing Highway 29
- Make it convenient for people to get to businesses but still keep traffic moving along main thorough way
- Speed limit on Highway 29 is too fast
- Highway 29 is also Broadway. Confusing
“Vision for future”

- Boulevard for 29 corridor through heart of American canyon
- Pedestrian bike bridge
- Alternative north/south roads “back roads”
- Character of corridor would match character of community roads
- Gateway marker
- Downtown
- Bypass road from north AC off Highway 29 behind high school should connect to Highway 37

**NOVEMBER 27, 2012**

**Table 1**

- Good local circulation not just through
- Access to frontage businesses
- Beautiful! Need to straighten out relationship to community
- Need to address different characters to create identity
- How to link different segments
- Continue parallel routes concept, keep them nice, not through traffic on local streets
- Make SR 29 nice
- PnR should be one at 37/29 too
- RR bridge –maximize its use for other functions
- Traffic engineering/congestion is key issue

**Table 2**

**Concerns**

- Benefits entire county (20) not just American Canyon
  - Bypass through American Canyon
- Cost/alternatives/timing of improvements
  - Incremental (phasing)
  - Overall
  - Options to changing 29
- Safety, easy access, business and family friendly
- Consensus- move forward with a solution
• How the corridor represents the community
• Local traffic vs. through traffic

Vision

• For American Canyon to be an asset that is good for everybody –community and regionally
• Serve community and through traffic

Table 3

Concerns

• Business accessibility from SR 29 visibility
• Restricted flow of traffic/congestion
• Thorough ways congested not just SR 29 side streets
• Restricts business development
• Limited business hours due to traffic

Vision

• Multi-modal overpass at H.S.
• Widen SR 29 to six lanes
  – Boulevard –four middle/ two outside
• Flyover at 12 &29
• Eliminate light at Hwy 29 café
• Rural Highway north of city
• Roundabout without signs at Soscol

Table 4

• Volume vs. design capacity
• Transit is underutilized
• Moving people, not cars
• Congestion mitigation
• Beautification
• Multimodal/bike facilities
• Congestion/consider constraints
• Beautification
• Better bike facilities
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- Alternative modes
- Be careful of quick fix
  - Adding capacity
- Paradigm shift away from SUV
- Transit/pedestrian oriented land use
- Work with employees, tourist industry to shift modes
- If capacity is added hov/hot flex-time

Table 5

- What about an overpass for regional traffic?
- Frontage road access can be confusing
- Country road makes sense for some areas; a boulevard could be more appropriate in town
- Dedicated lands for local vs. through
- Want local traffic to not have to rely on cars. Foot, bike access
- For regional, we should accommodate transit better. Faster! Especially buses
- Incorporate SW into design
- Biking on the main roadway feels dangerous preserve small town crosses in American Canyon
- Community development on 29 is like blood –don’t want to cut businesses off from road
- Multimodal access needs to work well in dense area
- Don’t overbuild! Traffic probably doesn’t exist for 21 hours a day!
- Don’t want regional traffic cutting through neighborhoods unsafe
- Addressing local mobility will solve a lot of problems
- Important to have a class I bike path from ferry to Calistoga
  - Provide alternatives to driving
- Richmond has a good solution for grade separated that also serves other modes
- Create a destination, sense of place, add value
- Commit oaks as the signature statement plant for entrance to Napa Valley

“Minority opinion”

- Transition the majority of the regional traffic to bus
- Move away from car-centered solutions
- Low costs
Appendix D: Mapping Exercise Materials and Results
### Key to Roadway Types and Community Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Pedestrian Environment</th>
<th>Adjacent Development</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Local access lanes with street-facing buildings</td>
<td>• Inner thru-traffic lanes&lt;br&gt;• Outer local access lanes with on-street parking&lt;br&gt;• Active sidewalk&lt;br&gt;• Bicycles accommodated&lt;br&gt;• Parking behind buildings</td>
<td>Any use except open space&lt;br&gt;Where retail is allowed, shops could face roadway</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>Landscaping with sound wall or open space adjacent</td>
<td>• Landscape buffers separate roadway from land uses&lt;br&gt;• Path separated from roadway by landscaping&lt;br&gt;• Bicycles accommodated&lt;br&gt;• Building entrances typically face away from roadway</td>
<td>Any use</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-Separated</td>
<td>Below-grade with or without local access lanes</td>
<td>• Pedestrian/bicycle paths vertically separated from roadway&lt;br&gt;• Bicycles accommodated&lt;br&gt;• No visual connection from thru-traffic to adjacent uses&lt;br&gt;• Access via access lane or other roads</td>
<td>Any use except street-facing retail</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Highway</td>
<td>No landscaping with open space adjacent</td>
<td>• No pedestrian path&lt;br&gt;• Bicycles not accommodated</td>
<td>Open space only&lt;br&gt;No cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Pedestrian and Bike only</th>
<th>Any use, but especially with open space</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Natural in character</td>
<td>• Pedestrian and bike only</td>
<td>Any use, but especially with open space</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossings</td>
<td>At-grade crossing</td>
<td>• Bulb-outs, advance stop bars, signals with countdown times</td>
<td>Any use</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/bike bridge</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any use</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park bridge</td>
<td>Wide with park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban uses only</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Node</td>
<td>Serves VINE bus lines and potential future BRT lane</td>
<td>• Curb extensions/bulb-outs&lt;br&gt;• Transit shelters</td>
<td>Urban uses only</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>