



CITY of NAPA

www.cityofnapa.org

MEMORANDUM

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

To: Larry Florin, County of Napa

From: Rick Tooker, City of Napa

Date: October 9, 2014

Subject: City of Napa Comments on Napa Pipe Documents

I. The City has completed its review of the following documents:

- Napa Pipe Development Plan (dated 9-5-14, received on 9-11-14)
- Napa Pipe Tentative Map (dated 4-25-14 but signed 9-9-14, received on 9-11-14)
- Development Agreement (Draft – County 9-15-14)
 - Exhibit B – Affordable Housing Plan
 - Exhibit C – Napa Pipe Infrastructure Improvement Plan by Feer & Peers
 - Exhibit D – Phasing Plan
 - Exhibit F – Plan Review Procedures
 - Exhibit G – Existing City Exactions
 - Exhibit I – Subdivision Procedures
 - Exhibit J – Maintenance Standards
 - Exhibit K – Landowner Indemnification
 - Exhibit L – Form of Assignment, Assumption and Release

Our City comments on the above documents are attached. Please note that additional comments/conditions are being prepared on the Development Plan which will be submitted as soon as reasonably possible, however, given the City's focus on the earthquake assessment and recovery our comments have been delayed since receiving the document on September 11th.

II. The following documents were forwarded to the County on September 23, 2014:

- Tax Sharing Agreement (City draft 8-21-14)
- Municipal Services Agreement (City draft 8-21-14)
- RHNA Agreement (City draft 8-21-14)

The City has not yet received responses from the County on these City drafts. With respect to the draft RHNA Agreement, we understand that the County will be proposing language to clarify how the County intends to "prioritize" its use of County Affordable Housing Funds in a manner that corresponds to the City's acceptance of 80% of the County's future RHNA obligations.

III. The following draft documents are undergoing final City revisions and will be sent to the County and NRP the week of October 13 - 17.

- DRAFT Sphere of Influence Agreement (to be sent to County)
- DRAFT Annexation Consent, Protest Waiver and Water Service Agreement (to be sent to NRP)

IV. The following additional documents are not in the City's possession. To the extent these can be provided to the City for review at your earliest convenience it would be much appreciated.

- Design Guidelines/Form Based Code
- Professional Services Agreement

City Comments on County Documents

Development Agreement – See attached draft (City's October 9, 2014) and accompanying red-lined version, showing the City's changes to the County's September 15, 2014.

Exhibits A-1, A-2 and A-3 – Property Descriptions and Graphics – The City has not yet seen these, although we expect that are identical to documents already contained in the record on the same.

Exhibit B - Affordable Housing Plan – The following are City comments that require addressing and/or where applicable revisions in the draft Affordable Housing Plan prior to adoption.

1. Because the DA allows for flexibility in the delivery of phases, the requirement for providing Developable Affordable Parcels should be carefully reviewed. As an example, what if Phase 4 is developed first requiring the "remaining" units (40) instead of what is intended which are 50 Low Income units in each of Phases 1 and 2?
2. The term "Low Income" is combined to include both lower- and low-income households and is described clearly in Section 3.4.4(iii). Why not make this clearer earlier in the document where it is particularly important, such as in Section 3.1?
3. The Phasing Plan should reflect the conveyance of Developable Affordable Parcels as provided in the Affordable Housing Plan.
4. The ability to substitute another parcel in Section 3.2.2 should be with the mutual consent of the Local Agency.
5. Section 3.4.4 is unclear as written partially because of its format. It would be clearer to describe the minimum requirements of the Conveyance Agreement first then describe the Conditions to Conveyance of parcels. The section following the line "At a minimum the Conveyance Agreement shall include the following" is clunky and makes the document difficult to follow with some of these requirements reading clearly like requirements and others reading like statements to be included in the Agreement.
6. 3.4.1 does not appear to be a condition of Conveyance where it reads, "Landowner has designated MidPen Housing Corporation as the Qualified Housing developer to develop the..." The section should be reworded to something like, "When the Local Agency has designated a Qualified Housing developer to develop the Developable Affordable Parcel in a particular phase, or Landowner has designated an alternative Qualified Affordable Developer that has been approved by the Local Agency." Also, this is not the appropriate place to insert MidPen as the selected developer.
7. In Section 3.4.4(i) "design review approval" is referenced as required; however, the Design Guidelines do not require design review approval.
8. Several of the requirements of the Conveyance Agreement that are necessary before the Developer will convey the land are not requirements at all, such as in sub-Section (iv) where it reads the, "...Developer shall be obligated to develop and construct the Affordable Housing Project in accordance with the applicable Project Approvals and Subsequent Approvals and to manage and operate the Low Income Homes consistent with the requirements of this Affordable Housing Plan." It is understandable that the project plans (i), the financing (ii), and the plan for delivery of units should be in place before conveyance (iii), but other requirements should be reworded to read, "The Qualified Housing Developer consents to the obligation to..."
9. There appears to be some inconsistency between sub-Sections (ii) and (v).
10. In sub-Section (ix) the Agreement should the wording be revised to say, "...shall include a waiver and release..."
11. Section 4.1.1 is unclear where it reads, "...no fewer than approximately six percent..." and later the "...required number..." Is the number 6% or not?

12. Per the City-County negotiations, although priority of the fees generated from the project will go to the project, after 2023 the County has agreed that it would define "priority" to City access to County funds for taking on its RHNA obligation into the future.

Exhibit C - NPIIP – The Napa Pipe Intersection Improvement Plan Memorandum dated July 14, 2014 prepared by Fehr and Peers must be revised to incorporate the following comments:

1. Page 2, the Intersection #16 (Kaiser Road/Enterprise Way) Mitigation Description shall specify what type of "peak hour left-turn restriction on the southbound approach" is to be used at this intersection.
2. Page 2, the Intersection #17 (SR 221/Kaiser Road) Mitigation Description shall specify which turn-pocket in what direction is to be extended.
3. Page 2, the Intersection #20 (Napa Valley Corp. Way/SR 221) Mitigation Description shall note that there is already a second left-turn lane existing for the northbound approach.
4. Page 3, Cost Estimates shall include right-of-way acquisition costs for all intersections.
5. Pages 4 & 6, Table 2: Opening Day Impacts, Responsibility & Costs and Table 3: Fair Share Contribution Percentages & Costs, total cost should reflect PS&E, Construction, ROW, Permits, and Environmental. Additionally, ROW costs shall be factored at \$25-\$30 per square foot.
6. Page 4, the Project Solely (100%) Responsible Intersections shall include intersection #16 (Kaiser Rd/Enterprise Way) and #17 (SR 221 Napa-Vallejo Highway/Kaiser Rd). The Napa Pipe Transportation Analysis Sensitivity Test Memorandum dated June 28, 2013 shows that in the cumulative condition the Costco Alternative Project would result in both intersections shifting from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM Peak Hours. This shall be reflected in Table 2: Opening Day Impacts, Responsibilities & Costs on page 4 and in Table 3: Fair Share Contribution Percentages & Costs on page 6.
7. Page 4, Intersection 13 – SR 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway)/Streblov Dr. shall include language stating that "should the improvement not be implemented as an "opening day" mitigation, NRP will pay an amount equivalent to the cost of design, construction, ROW, permits, etc."
8. Page 6, it shall be noted that the two study intersections that have no feasible means of achieving acceptable operations under the Future plus Project scenario (Intersection #31 SR 29/American Canyon Road and Intersection #34 SR 29/SR 37 Westbound Off-Ramp) shall be paying a fair share contribution to improve the Level of Service at those intersections consistent with the Napa Pipe Final EIR and Sensitivity Analysis.
9. Page 7 Table 4: Land Use Program – Costco Alternative, the Costco Alternative Land Use mix identified in the Napa Pipe Impact Comparison – Costco Alternative/ Proposed Project Memorandum dated September 7, 2012 factored in a 282 student Elementary School, not a 500 student Elementary School. Table 4 shall be adjusted accordingly.

These comments are duplicated in City Public Works – Transportation Division's comments in Condition #31 A – I of the Napa Pipe Tentative Tract Map (see below).

Exhibit D - Phasing Plan

1. The following amendments to the Phasing Plan must be made to ensure consistency with the public benefits to be provided by the Developer (e.g., provision of open space,

refurbishment of the cranes, construction of the plaza area, new pedestrian and bicycling trails, etc.):¹

- A. For **Block P9 (Wetlands Restoration)** the schedule shall read, “Prior to issuance of a building permit for the first residential unit in Phase Two.”
 - B. For the **Pedestrian and bicycle connection to Kennedy Park** the schedule shall read, “Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the first residential unit in any phase of development.
 - C. For **Block 14 – Drydock improvements** the schedule shall read, “Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the last residential unit in Phase Two or the 350th residential permit, whichever occurs first.”
 - D. For **Block P5** the schedule shall read, “Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the first residential unit on Block 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 or 22.
 - E. For **Block P7** the schedule shall read, “Concurrent with completion of Block P5 and to include a pedestrian connection across the railroad tracks connecting P5 to P7.”
 - F. For **Block P1** the schedule shall read, “Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the hotel on Block E, but not later than issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the first residential unit in Phase Two or the 350 residential unit, whichever occurs first, or provided P5, P6 and P7 have previously been determined to be Substantially Complete extending the Vine Trail through Kennedy Park to the most southerly portion of the Napa Pipe site.”
 - G. For **Block P2 and Trail** the schedule shall read, “Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the last residential unit on Block 2, 6, 9 or 12 or provided P5, P6 and P7 have previously been determined to be Substantially Complete extending the Vine Trail through Kennedy Park to the most southerly portion of the Napa Pipe site.”
 - H. For **Block P4** the schedule shall read, “Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy of the last residential unit on either Block 1, 4 or 7 or the 350th unit in Phase Three, whichever occurs first.”
2. Page 2, Section 3 **Adjacency and As-Needed** (emphasis added to show new text) – Revise the paragraph to read, “Where it is determined by the County and Developer to be feasible and sufficient to meet the needs of the project or sub-Phase, half-streets may be constructed.”

¹ Although not a part of the conditions, the reasoning is described as follows:

- A. The wetlands should not be allowed to hold up opening of the Costco, but may issuance of the first residential permit.
- B. Because the Developer has included in the DA that phases may be interchanged, it is important to note the trigger as any C of O not just the first home in Phase Two.
- C. Also because of the flexibility provided in the DA for mixing and matching phases.
- D. This park is necessary for essentially any development north of the plaza area and should not be based on irrelevant adjacencies as presented. Moreover, there the benefits proposed as part of the development was for a linear park connecting the Vine Trail through the site, not pocket parks built over time that are not required to connect up as build-out approaches.
- E. The relationship of P7 is its connection to P5 and not P6.
- F. The proposed public benefit was to connect the Vine trail through to Kennedy park and P1 being constructed late in the phasing (if at all since it is not a requirement) could restrict that from occurring as proposed, unless P5 and P6 are Substantially Completed with Certificate of Occupancy of the first permit in Phase One or the 350th unit.
- G. Same reason as above.
- H. The reasoning for adjacency does not make sense for the linear design of parks for the larger Napa Pipe neighborhood.

3. Page 4, Section 9 **Membership Warehouse Store and Hotel** – Revise the text to match the County’s zoning relating to the Costco or “other similar type and quality commercial user, as reasonably approved by the Local Agency’s Planning Director” and remove reference to “and adjacent” relating to the “...associated gas station adjacent to said store in Block F as shown in Attachment 1, the illustrative Phasing Plan diagram.”

Also amend reference to include (emphasis added to show new text) “Issuance of a building permit for the construction and commencing construction of the General Wholesale Sales Commercial Activities use shall be a pre-requisite to the issuance of a building permit for any structure in Phase Two” to include

4. Page 4, Section 10 **Floodgates** – Replace “to be” with “shall be” to correct the incomplete sentence and add the reference to “...prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the first residential unit on the site.”
5. Page 5, Section 11.2 **Phase Two** - Revise the paragraph to include “...and P7” to the paragraph beginning with “Phase Two Project Infrastructure including...”
6. Page 5, Section 11.3 **Phase Three** – Correct the paragraph to clearly note that the third railroad crossing and associated fencing and gates for pedestrian and bicycle use shall be constructed in conjunction with the construction of Block P5 “and P7”.
7. There appears to be no timing in the schedule for development of Block 16 and the restoration of the gantry and overhead cranes and other similar elements (e.g., day care facility, community facilities space, transit center kiosk, in the Phasing Plan. This should be addressed in the phasing plan.
8. Page 6, Section 11.4 **Phase Four** – Remove reference to Block 15 at the end of the paragraph which is removed from the area of Blocks C and D.

Exhibit E - MMRP – No comments.

Exhibit F - Plan Review and Approval Procedure – The City proposes removing this exhibit from the DA, consistent with its proposal that plan review and approval procedures applicable to the Project be those of the applicable jurisdiction (i.e., County should apply its procedures to applications submitted for development on County lands, and City should apply its procedures to applications submitted for development on City lands).

Exhibit G – Existing City Fees – See attached version of Exhibit F (Applicable City Exactions).

Exhibit H – Land Use Plan – Land Use Plan must be consistent with approved Development Plan.

Exhibit I - Subdivision Procedures – The City proposes removing this exhibit from the DA, consistent with its proposal that plan review and approval procedures applicable to the Project be those of the applicable jurisdiction (i.e., County should apply its procedures to applications submitted for development on County lands, and City should apply its procedures to applications submitted for development on City lands). However, the City is amenable to working with NRP’s counsel to develop DA language that, subject to consistency with State law requirements, provides for flexibility regarding the Local Agency’s ability to reduce Landowner security.

Exhibit J - Maintenance Standards – Staff has no comments on this document.

Exhibit K - Landowner Indemnification – Staff has no comments on this document, but this exhibit is currently undergoing legal review with comments to be provided the week of October 13 - 17.

Exhibit L - Assignment and Assumption Agreement – Staff has no comments on this document, but this exhibit is currently undergoing legal review with comments to be provided the week of October 13 - 17.

**City Public Works – Transportation Division
Comments on Napa Pipe Tentative Tract Map**

ROADS, CIRCULATION, AND ACCESS

1. Imola Avenue/ Soscol Avenue Intersection (Mitigation Measure TRA-5 revised via Sensitivity Test) - Prior to approval of the first subdivision map for the project, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage toward construction of an additional left-turn lane on the eastbound approach, and an exclusive right-turn lane on the westbound approach. Provide protected phasing for the eastbound and westbound left-turn movements. The project's fair share percentage of the total cost of this intersection improvement is 19.1%.

2. State Route 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway)/ Streblow Drive (Mitigation Measure TRA-6 revised via Sensitivity Test) - The Developer is responsible for 100% of mitigation cost for improvements to this intersection. Mitigation is to construct an additional northbound left-turn lane on SR 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) and a receiving lane on Streblow Drive. This intersection improvement is subject to prior monitoring to determine need, and construction of the improvement shall be at the discretion of the City of Napa. Payment to City of Napa prior to issuance of building permits shall constitute meeting of obligation for mitigation under the development agreement.

Napa Valley Corporate Drive/ Anselmo Court - The Developer is responsible for 100% of mitigation cost for improvements to this intersection. Mitigation is to install a single-lane roundabout (preferred mitigation) with a bypass lane installed on the southbound and eastbound approaches of the intersection. The Developer shall construct this improvement and certify it by the engineer prior to a Certificate of Occupancy for the General Wholesale Sales Commercial Activities use.

3. Soscol Ferry Road/ Devlin Road (Mitigation Measure TRA-8 revised via Sensitivity Test) - The Developer is responsible for 100% of mitigation cost for improvements to this intersection. Mitigation is to install traffic signal and median treatment on Soscol Ferry Road that controls all movements except for the westbound through movement on Soscol Ferry Road. The Developer shall complete this improvement and certify it by the engineer prior to Certificate of Occupancy for the General Wholesale Sales Commercial Activities use.

4. State Route 12 - State Route 29/ State Route 221(Napa-Vallejo Highway) (Mitigation Measure TRA-9) - For each project phase, prior to approval of the first final subdivision map, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage towards the construction of a flyover ramp for the traffic traveling from southbound State Route 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) to southbound State Route 12/ State Route 29. The project's fair share percentage to the total cost of this improvement is 10.7%.

5. Airport Boulevard/ State Route 29 – State Route 12 (Mitigation Measure TRA-10) - For each project phase, prior to approval of the first subdivision map, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage toward the construction of a grade-separated interchange as proposed in the Napa County General Plan. The project's fair share percentage to the total cost of this improvement is 7%.

6. State Route 29/ Napa Junction Road (Mitigation Measure TRA-11) - The Napa County General Plan calls for widening of State Route 29 from the State Route 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) interchange to the southern County Line. In order to mitigate the project's significant impact, the additional through lane on State Route 29 in the northbound and southbound directions should be constructed at this intersection, as is currently proposed. For each project phase, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage towards the construction of this improvement. The project's fair share percentage to the total cost of this improvement is 9.8%.

7. State Route 29/ Donaldson Way (Mitigation Measure TRA-12) - The Napa County General Plan calls for widening of State Route 29 from the State Route 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) interchange to the southern County Line. In order to mitigate the project's significant impact, the additional through lane on State Route 29 in the northbound and southbound directions should be constructed at this intersection, as is currently proposed. For each project phase, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage towards the construction of this improvement. The project's fair share percentage to the total cost of this improvement is 14.6%.

8. State Route 29/ American Canyon Road (Mitigation Measure TRA- 13) - The City of American Canyon's general Plan recognizes that this intersection will likely operate at LOS E conditions during peak periods. The Napa County General Plan also calls for widening of SR29 from the SR221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) interchange to the southern County Line. In order to mitigate the project's significant impact, the additional through lane on State Route 29 in the northbound and southbound directions should be constructed at this intersection, as is currently proposed. For each project phase, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage towards the construction of this improvement.

9. Lincoln Avenue/ Soscol Avenue (Sensitivity Test) - For each project phase, prior to approval of the first subdivision map, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage toward construction of an additional left-turn lane on both the northbound and southbound approaches. The project's fair share percentage is 3.9% towards the total cost of this intersection improvement.

10. Kaiser Road/ Enterprise Way - The Developer is responsible for 100% of mitigation cost for improvements to this intersection. The Developer shall restripe the southbound approach to provide dedicated left- and right-turn lanes and include a peak hour left-turn restriction on the southbound approach, forcing motorists to turn right from Enterprise Way onto westbound Kaiser Road and travel 180-degrees around the proposed roundabout at Kaiser Road/Napa Valley Corporate Drive in lieu of the left-turn egress from Enterprise Way.

11. State Route 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway)/ Kaiser Road (Mitigation Measure TRA-7) - The Developer is responsible for 100% of mitigation cost for improvements to this intersection. The Developer shall extend the turn-pocket on northbound State Route 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) to 500 feet from its current length of approximately 280 feet or create a dual left-turn the length of the current turn-lane to adequately store the expected queues. In addition, the Developer shall construct the following improvements:

- Northbound: a third through lane and a second left-turn lane
- Southbound: a third through lane and free right-turn lane
- Eastbound: a second and third left-turn lane and a free right-turn lane

12. Napa Valley Corporate Way/ State Route 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) - For each project phase, prior to approval of the first subdivision map, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage to construct third through lanes in both the northbound and southbound approaches and construct a second left-turn lane on the northbound approach. The project's fair share percentage of the total cost of this improvement is 11.1%.

13. State Route 12 – State Route 121/ State Route 29 - For each project phase, prior to approval of the first subdivision map, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage to construct third through lanes in both the northbound and southbound approaches and construct the following improvements:

- Eastbound: a second right-turn lane

The project's fair share percentage of the total cost of this improvement is 5.5%.

14. State Route 29/ South Kelly Road - For each project phase, prior to approval of the first subdivision map, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage to construct third through lanes in both the northbound and southbound approaches and construct a second northbound left-turn lane. The project's fair share percentage of the total cost of this improvement is 10.2%.

15. State Route 29/ State Route 37 Westbound Off-Ramp - The Napa County General Plan calls for widening of SR 29 from the SR 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway) interchange to the southern County Line. In order to mitigate the project's significant impact, the additional through lane on SR 29 in the northbound and southbound directions should be constructed at this intersection, as is currently proposed. For each project phase, the Developer shall pay its fair share percentage towards the construction of this improvement.

16. Construction Traffic Management Program (Mitigation Measure TRA-14) – The Developer shall develop and implement a Construction Traffic Management Program (CMP) to minimize impacts of the project and its contribution to cumulative impacts related to both on- and off-site construction and remediation activities and traffic. The program shall provide necessary information to various contractors and agencies as to how to maximize the opportunities for complementing construction management measures and to minimize the possibility of conflicting impacts on the roadway system, while safely accommodating the traveling public in the area. The program shall supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by Napa County departments and agencies.

Preparation of the CMP shall be the responsibility of the Developer, and shall be reviewed and approved by staff from the overseeing jurisdictional agency prior to initiation of construction. The program shall:

- Identify construction traffic management practices in Napa County, as well as other jurisdictions that could provide useful guidance for a project of this size and characteristic.
- Describe procedures required by different departments and/or agencies in the county for implementation of a construction management plan, such as reviewing agencies, approval process, and estimated timelines.

- Identify construction traffic management strategies and other elements for the project, and present a cohesive program of operational and demand management strategies designed to maintain acceptable traffic operations during periods of construction activities in the project area. These could include construction strategies, construction staging areas, construction phasing, construction staging, demand management strategies, alternate route strategies, and public information strategies.
- Coordinate with other projects in construction in the immediate vicinity (i.e. Syar), so that they can take an integrated approach to construction-related traffic impacts.
- Identify barge routes to access the project site and other information as required by Napa County in the event soil import may be serviced by barge via the Napa River.
- Ensure that adequate pedestrian circulation is maintained when then-existing sidewalks must be closed or obstructed for construction purposes.
- Ensure that adequate bicycle facilities are maintained, including detour signs for then-existing bicycle routes.
- Ensure that construction-truck traffic follows established truck routes, where designated.
- Ensure that transit facilities, including stops locations and associated amenities, such as shelters, etc., are maintained, or that acceptable temporary facilities are established.

17. Pavement Condition (Mitigation Measure TRA-15) - Prior to beginning construction on the proposed project, survey road conditions for proposed trucking routes on the following roadways:

- Kaiser Road
- Napa Valley Corporate Drive
- Napa Valley Corporate Way
- Bordeaux Way
- Anselmo Court
- Soscol Ferry Road

This shall include roadway pavement and other surfaces that construction traffic may cross. The project applicant shall return roadway conditions to their preconstruction conditions (or better) following the remediation and grading phase of the project.

For subsequent construction phasing, truck traffic to/from the project shall be monitored on the identified roadways to determine project's construction traffic contribution to overall truck traffic. Project applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to return roadway conditions to their pre-construction conditions following each phase of construction.

18. Pedestrian and Bicycle Conflicts (Mitigation Measure TRA-16) - The design shall minimize these conflicts through means such as channelizing pedestrians to discrete crossing points of the trail, widening the trail through areas where higher pedestrian volumes are expected, and where necessary, separating pedestrian and bicycle travel.

19. Transit Proximity (Mitigation Measure TRA-17) - Reroute the VINE #10 bus route through the project site to serve the proposed transit center as proposed in the project site plan and

ensure that all development proposed would be within a reasonable walking distance to transit (less than 1/3-mile).

The revised bus route through Napa Pipe could either be a loop, in which case existing stops along Napa Valley Corporate Drive would remain, or the route could be relocated. Under the latter option, the existing bus stop at Latour Court would be moved 450 feet to the north to Kaiser Road, the stop at Bordeaux Way would be moved 600 feet to the south to Anselmo Court, and the stop at Napa Valley Corporate Way would be eliminated. Stops at Napa Valley Corporate Drive's intersections with Kaiser Road and Anselmo Court will help maintain current patrons. Current ridership is expected to be maintained or surpassed by routing through the project. However, it should also be noted that the extension into the Napa Pipe site will lengthen the travel time from the City of Napa to the City of American Canyon, which may discourage current commuters.

If the extension of the VINE #10 bus route is not feasible, the applicant shall include peak period shuttle service as included in Mitigation Measure TRA-1b in the Napa Pipe Final EIR.

20. Parking Demand (Mitigation Measure TRA-18) - The project applicant shall collaborate with jurisdictional agency Staff to develop a parking monitoring plan that assesses the utilization of available parking in each phase of the project development. For instance, if a parking shortage is experienced after build out of Phase 1, additional parking shall be allocated into the development of Phase 2. This additional parking shall cover the shortfall of Phase 1 and shall anticipate a commensurate parking shortfall for Phase 2. Alternatively, implementation of a parking management program, a component presented in Mitigation Measure TRA-1b, could be implemented to monitor parking demand and carry out parking reduction strategies when needed.

21. Cumulative Deterioration on Roadway and Intersection Level of Service (Mitigation Measure TRA-19) - In addition to Mitigation Measures TRA-1 through TRA-13 from the Napa Pipe Final EIR, the project applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to other long-term planned roadway improvements in the Regional Transportation Plan (assumed under the Cumulative Planned roadway network) at locations where the proposed project would contribute to cumulatively significant traffic impacts. The following improvements have been identified under this plan:

- Realignment of Silverado Trail at Soscol Avenue to match alignment of proposed Gasser Drive extension
- Widening of State Route 29 to six lanes between Airport Boulevard and southern Napa County line
- Extension of Devlin Road south to Green Island Road

Each of these roadway improvements would improve intersection operations and general roadway circulation in the project study area under Cumulative conditions; however, most intersections would continue to operate unacceptably.

A comprehensive list of roadway improvements that would be required to achieve acceptable intersection level of service under cumulative conditions has been developed and is presented in the Transportation Impact Analysis (Appendix E).

Many of these improvements would require major roadway widening in a fashion that may not be consistent with the stated desires of many communities, through their General Plan documents, to maintain Napa County's rural atmosphere and promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit as successful transportation modes. It should be noted that many cumulative impacts would occur even without the project as discussed later in the Chapter 5 of the Supplement to the 2009 DEIR.

22. Public Streets - All public streets shall be designed to City of Napa standards. The Developer shall submit improvement plans to the City of Napa for review and approval. The public streets shall include the following:

- Kaiser Road from its current terminus as a public road at Syar Road west to the railroad tracks.
- Anselmo Road north of the future Anselmo Road/ Anselmo Court intersection.

23. Site Access - The Development Plan shall provide two viable dry ingress/egress access points.

24. Railroad Crossing Property Rights - The Developer shall demonstrate that sufficient property rights exist for all proposed crossings of the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) line, expressly including those rights to be granted to the City for the installation and maintenance of new public water utilities and any SPRR technical requirements such as the width of proposed easement (twenty feet minimum) and the size and type of proposed pipe(s) with casings, and those rights shall be granted to public for the type of access that is proposed at those crossings.

25. Mitigation and Improvement Property Rights - The Developer shall demonstrate that sufficient property rights exist to construct the proposed roadway connections and any off-site public improvements and/or mitigation measures (including, but not limited to, the Anselmo Court roundabout, etc.).

26. Kaiser Road Improvements - The Developer shall design and construct a landscape median on Kaiser Road between State Route 221 and Syar Road. Median widths, lane widths, and roadway configuration shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Napa.

27. Kaiser Road Roundabout - The Developer shall design and build the Kaiser Road Roundabout to meet the Federal standards for the design of a multilane roundabout per the U.S. Department of Transportation publication *Roundabouts: An informational Guide*. The Developer shall demonstrate that sufficient property rights exist to construct this improvement. If it is decided to not construct a roundabout at this location, a signal shall be installed by the Developer if warranted per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

28. Alleyway Width - All proposed alleyways (shared use driveways) shall be designed and built to meet a minimum 25 foot back up standard as proposed in the Napa Pipe Development Plan dated September 5, 2014.

29. Trails - In general, all trail easements shall be provided with the initial subdivision of a parcel containing a trail. The Developer is responsible for trail construction. All trails shall be

designed to meet Highway Capacity Manual, National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), and local standards.

30. Private Streets - Developer shall design private streets with the following standards in order to provide for functional connectivity and traffic flow:

- **Lane Widths:** Proposed Street I and Street 10 in the Development Plan shall be designed and built with 12 foot lane widths.
- **Street Connectivity:** The Development Plan shall provide an additional street connection from Syar Road to Street S25 in the southeasterly section of the site. This street connection shall be designed and built with 12 foot lane widths.
- **Stop Signs:** Stop signs shall be used only where warranted per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and shall be stamped by a licensed California engineer.

31. Napa Pipe Intersection Improvement Plan Memorandum - The Napa Pipe Intersection Improvement Plan Memorandum dated July 14, 2014 prepared by Fehr and Peers shall incorporate the following comments:

- A. Page 2, the Intersection #16 (Kaiser Road/Enterprise Way) Mitigation Description shall specify what type of “peak hour left-turn restriction on the southbound approach” is to be used at this intersection.
- B. Page 2, the Intersection #17 (SR 221/Kaiser Road) Mitigation Description shall specify which turn-pocket in what direction is to be extended.
- C. Page 2, the Intersection #20 (Napa Valley Corp. Way/SR 221) Mitigation Description shall note that there is already a second left-turn lane existing for the northbound approach.
- D. Page 3, Cost Estimates shall include right-of-way acquisition costs for all intersections.
- E. Pages 4 & 6, Table 2: Opening Day Impacts, Responsibility & Costs and Table 3: Fair Share Contribution Percentages & Costs, total cost should reflect PS&E, Construction, ROW, Permits, and Environmental. Additionally, ROW costs shall be factored at \$25-\$30 per square foot.
- F. Page 4, the Project Solely (100%) Responsible Intersections shall include intersection #16 (Kaiser Rd/Enterprise Way) and #17 (SR 221 Napa-Vallejo Highway/Kaiser Rd). The Napa Pipe Transportation Analysis Sensitivity Test Memorandum dated June 28, 2013 shows that in the cumulative condition the Costco Alternative Project would result in both intersections shifting from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM Peak Hours. This shall be reflected in Table 2: Opening Day Impacts, Responsibilities & Costs on page 4 and in Table 3: Fair Share Contribution Percentages & Costs on page 6.
- G. Page 4, Intersection 13 – SR 221 (Napa-Vallejo Highway)/Streblov Dr. shall include language stating that “should the improvement not be implemented as an “opening day” mitigation, NRP will pay an amount equivalent to the cost of design, construction, ROW, permits, etc.”
- H. Page 6, it shall be noted that the two study intersections that have no feasible means of achieving acceptable operations under the Future plus Project scenario (Intersection #31 SR 29/American Canyon Road and Intersection

#34 SR 29/SR 37 Westbound Off-Ramp) shall be paying a fair share contribution to improve the Level of Service at those intersections consistent with the Napa Pipe Final EIR and Sensitivity Analysis.

- I. Page 7 Table 4: Land Use Program – Costco Alternative, the Costco Alternative Land Use mix identified in the Napa Pipe Impact Comparison – Costco Alternative/ Proposed Project Memorandum dated September 7, 2012 factored in a 282 student Elementary School, not a 500 student Elementary School. Table 4 shall be adjusted accordingly.

**City Public Works – Water & Solid Waste Division
Comments on Napa Pipe Tentative Tract Map**

The subject project has been reviewed by the Water Division, Solid Waste Division and Development Engineering Division must comply with the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and the special conditions listed below.

WATER

2. Prior to approval of the improvement plans, Developer shall submit the following:

A. Payments for water infrastructure improvements which are outlined as follows:

- One-time payment for Water Supply: \$900,000 based on recent purchase of State Water Project entitlements from Town of Yountville.
- Infrastructure payment: The City requires reimbursement for specific treatment, transmission and storage infrastructure that directly benefit the Project. Costs shown below are the proportional share of design and construction costs (not including City staff time) of the facility based on the Project's demands. Reimbursement can be a one-time payment or a surcharge distributed equitably as development occurs.
 - Treatment: \$747,000 for Barwick Jamieson Treatment Plant.
 - Transmission: \$112,000 for 24-inch pipeline on Hwy 221 and \$137,000 for Dwyer Road Pump Station.
 - Storage: \$900,000 for Imola Tank and Pipeline.
- Connection Fee: contribute 50% of a water connection fee study to update fees and calculate a fee specific to the project which takes into account the payments made in item i and ii above.

B. A soil corrosivity report which at a minimum shall include the following corrosivity tests: Chlorides (ASTM D4327), pH (ASTM D4972), resistivity at 100% saturation (ASTM G57), Sulfate (ASTM D4327), and REDOX Potential (ASTM D1498).

Note: corrosive soils may dictate the use of alternate materials such as polyvinylchloride C900 (PVC C900) water mains and the installation of additional corrosion protection measures on all public water infrastructure as approved by the City.

C. A civil improvement plan outlining water infrastructure improvements sufficient to meet City water quality, operational and fire flow standards, more specifically described as follows:

- i. Abandonment of any existing unused water service(s).
- ii. Construct approximately 5,000-feet of 12-inch water line on Devlin Road and Soscol Ferry Road to provide a looped system and second feed to the project area.
- iii. Railroad crossings and all points of connection required to supply all water infrastructure required for the project.
- iv. Elimination of public water mains within the parking lanes (i.e. place in lanes of travel).
- v. Elimination of all public water infrastructure within any privately-owned alleys, streets, et al.

- vi. Elimination of dead-ends in any part of the public water system (i.e. all potable water pipelines shall be looped and connected to a grid).
 - vii. Installation of twelve-inch or eight-inch water mains in all proposed public streets along City-approved alignments.
 - viii. Installation of a sufficient number of hydrants on all public water facilities at City-approved locations.
 - ix. Installation of a sufficient number of water main valves at City-approved locations.
 - x. Installation of a sufficient number of water quality monitoring/sampling stations at City-approved locations.
 - xi. Installation of appropriately-sized potable water services (fire, commercial, residential, irrigation, etc.).
 - xii. Installation of an approved backflow device for each water service connection.
 - xiii. Installation of all required corrosion protection measures on all public water facilities which at a minimum, shall consist of cathodic protection (CP) test stations, anodes, bond wiring, plastic sleeves, insulating flange gaskets, grounding components, et al. with electrical conductivity that is confirmed, tested and accepted by the City of Napa.
- D. A letter of intent from the current railway owner outlining the commitment to establish a public water utility easement for multiple water utility crossings which at a minimum, shall include but not be limited to the following:
- i. Width of proposed easement (twenty feet minimum);
 - ii. Size and type of proposed pipes with casings;
 - iii. Technical requirements for pipeline crossings in conformance with railway owner specifications.

3. Prior to activation of water mains Developer shall:

- A. Construct all public and private water improvements as shown on the approved civil plans, the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and the special conditions listed above.

Note: all pipeline construction involving the use of directional drilling installation methods shall be constructed by City-approved directional drilling contractors.

- B. Ensure all cathodic protection measures are installed, tested, approved and accepted by a City-approved corrosion specialist to ensure electrical conductivity and to confirm all anodes meet the minimum electric potential requirements. All cathodic protection system(s) that fail inspection shall be removed and replaced at the Applicant's expense.

Note: cathodic protection testing shall only occur after successful completion of the water main pressure tests. Prior to acceptance, the City of Napa shall review the corrosion specialist's inspection report prior to determine whether the system has passed. Prior to final paving, the Contractor must receive City confirmation that all cathodic protection systems have passed inspection.

- C. Demonstrate substantial progress toward submittal of a record drawing outlining as-built conditions of the completed water system improvements (City requires electronic and bond copy formats).

- D. Negotiate and acquire all applicable rights (as approved by the City) to establish an appropriately sized water utility easement(s) across the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) which at a minimum, shall account for construction and continuous water system operation and maintenance.
- 4. Prior to approval of the building permit(s) Developer shall:
 - A. Provide the Water Division with written documentation identifying building connections and points of service. The documentation shall include APN of the parcel, street addresses associated with the parcel and the new water service account numbers specific to the addresses and/or parcels being served.
 - B. Submit all required connection fees to the City's Development Engineering Division at 1600 First Street, Napa, 94559.
 - 5. Prior to final building permit(s) sign-off Developer shall:
 - A. Submit any remaining meter set and/or hot-tap fees to the Water Division office, 1340 Clay Street, Napa.
 - B. Identify all water meter boxes with the appropriate street address.
 - C. Submit certification that all backflow devices have been installed and tested by an AWWA certified tester (a list of testers is provided by the City of Napa) to the City of Napa Water Division.
 - D. Record all "Private Water Easements" necessary to extend private services behind the public water meter to the properties of which they serve, as approved by the City.
 - E. Complete the water demand mitigation requirements of this project as specified by the City of Napa Water Division. The Applicant will be contacted by the City of Napa after obtaining a building permit specifying the requirements for the proposed project.

SOLID WASTE HANDLING

- 6. Submit a comprehensive solid waste handling program consistent with adopted solid waste and recycling enclosure standards as more fully described at www.cityofnapa.org/recycle. The program shall identify the various types services desired and pick-up locations.

STORMWATER QUALITY

- 7. A Post-Construction Stormwater BMP Maintenance Agreement will need to be signed, notarized, and recorded prior to Final Plan approvals. Current and future applicant will need to demonstrate how proposed Post-Construction stormwater quality bmp's will be maintained. Provide notes on the Tentative Map and Development Plans illustrating who will maintain these bmp's within private and future public dedicated areas.
- 8. Note that future Post-Construction development standards will be in effect January 1, 2015. These standards will require current and future phases of development to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) requirements with specific bio-retention design measures for treatment.

9. The New BASMAA Post-Construction Manual shall be used for this project to meet State and local stormwater quality requirements. A copy of the manual may be downloaded at <http://www.basmaa.org/BoardandCommittees/Phasell.aspx>(scroll down to “Projects and Programs).
10. The submitted SRMP report will need to be revised to incorporate the stormwater quality requirements as described in the BASMAA Post-Construction Manua, latest edition, as stated above.
11. Proposed Vegetated swales will need to be redesigned according to the BASMAA Post-Construction Manual, latest edition.
12. All new impervious runoff associated with future street improvements along Kaiser Road and “Street A” will need to be treated for stormwater quality.
13. In the event this project is phased, all stormdrain facilities along with stormwater quality post bmp’s will need to be installed for each phase and work independently of one another.