

RESOLUTION 2008- 030

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CALISTOGA, COUNTY OF NAPA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE A COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH CALTRANS FOR THE PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION OF A ROUNDABOUT INTERSECTION AT HIGHWAY 29, LAKE STREET, AND SILVERADO TRAIL AND PURSUE FUNDING SOURCES

1 WHEREAS, the City had requested that Caltrans consider a modern roundabout solution in
2 their scoping for this Highway 29 and Silverado Trail intersection project; and

3 WHEREAS, Caltrans made a presentation to Council on February 20, 2007, during which
4 time members of the public expressed concerns for safety if the intersection reverted to a 2-way
5 stop control; and

6 WHEREAS, on April 24, 2007 in response to the City's request for a roundabout solution,
7 Caltrans staff requested that the City submit a roundabout feasibility study before August 20,
8 2007; and

9 WHEREAS, the City conducted a well-attended Roundabout community forum on July 10,
10 2007 to educate the community on roundabout intersection solutions; and

11 WHEREAS, the City prepared a roundabout feasibility study according to Caltrans
12 specifications and submitted the study to Caltrans on July 30, 2007; and

13 WHEREAS, on October 3, 2007, Caltrans staff expressed serious concerns that all
14 Caltrans funding for an intersection safety improvement would be lost if the City continued to
15 pursue a roundabout solution at this intersection; and

16 WHEREAS, on December 5, 2007, Caltrans provided notice to the City that a roundabout
17 solution would need to be funded completely with non-Caltrans funding; and

18 WHEREAS, on December 18, 2007, the City Council expressed its disappointment in the
19 Caltrans response and directed staff to arrange a meeting with high level Caltrans officials; and

20 WHEREAS, Caltrans, City, and County officials, together with local citizens met on
21 February 13, 2008 to discuss the merits of a roundabout solution; and

22 WHEREAS, at the February 13, 2008 meeting, the District 4 Caltrans Assistant Director
23 for Operations committed to apply \$2 million toward a roundabout solution, if a cooperative
24 agreement was established between Caltrans, the County and the City; and

25 WHEREAS, the City retained W-Trans on March 4, 2008 to prepare a more refined cost
26 estimate for a roundabout solution; and

27 WHEREAS, on March 12, 2008, City staff and W-Trans met with key Caltrans staff to
28 align design elements for a roundabout solution; and

29 WHEREAS, W-Trans performed more detailed planning and design to develop a refined
30 cost estimate of \$3,593,425 for a roundabout; and

31 WHEREAS, the Executive Director of the Napa County Transportation and Planning
32 Agency has offered a written commitment to provide additional funding to cover the cost shortfall
33 of a roundabout, from the Caltrans base funding of \$2 million.

34 NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Calistoga
35 hereby chooses to pursue a roundabout intersection solution at Highway 29 (Lincoln Avenue),
36 Lake Street, and Silverado Trail; and

37 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the City Council of the City of Calistoga hereby
38 authorizes the City Manager to negotiate a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for the
39 planning, design, and construction of a roundabout intersection at Highway 29, Lake Street, and
40 Silverado Trail, and pursue funding sources. The City Manager shall insure that said Agreement
41 includes provisions to:

- 42 • insure that funding from Caltrans (approximately \$2 million) is formally dedicated to the
43 roundabout project; and
- 44 • insure that all costs of the roundabout project beyond the funding provided by Caltrans
45 are funded by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA).
46 Formal action by NCTPA to dedicate or assign the necessary funding shall be
47 obtained. No financial expense should be the obligation of the City of Calistoga; and
- 48 • insure that the timing of the project including design and environmental review in
49 addition to construction activities are scheduled such that existing priority Calistoga
50 projects do not suffer significant timing setbacks; and
- 51 • insure that agency cooperation flexibility and collaboration is committed; and

52 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the City Council of the City of Calistoga hereby
53 authorizes the City Manager to direct W-Trans to continue work toward a Caltrans Conceptual
54 Approval Report under the Consultant Services Agreement approved by Council on March 4,
55 2008.

56 **PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED** by the City Council of the City of Calistoga at a
57 regular meeting held this 1st day of April, 2008, by the following vote:

58

59

60 **AYES: Mayor Gingles, Vice Mayor Dunsford, Councilmembers Garcia and**
61 **Slusser**

62 **NOES: Councilmember Kraus**

63 **ABSTAIN/ABSENT: None**

64

65

66

67

JACK GINGLES, Mayor

68 **ATTEST:**

69

70

71 _____
RAQUEL CANTILLON, Deputy City Clerk

City of Calistoga

Staff Report

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council
FROM: Dan Takasugi, Public Works Director/City Engineer
DATE: April 1, 2008
SUBJECT: Consideration of a Resolution to Authorizing the City Manager to Negotiate a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for the Planning, Design, and Construction of a Roundabout Intersection at Highway 29, Lake Street, and Silverado Trail and Pursue Funding Sources

APPROVAL FOR FORWARDING:


James C. McCann, City Manager

1
2 **ISSUE:** Consideration of a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Negotiate a
3 Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for the Planning, Design, and Construction of
4 a Roundabout Intersection at Highway 29, Lake Street, and Silverado Trail and
5 Pursue Funding Sources
6

7 **RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt the Resolution.
8

9 **BACKGROUND:**
10

11 The Highway 29/Silverado Trail intersection is a skewed intersection with a long
12 history of collisions and generally difficult circulation. It functions as a circulatory hub
13 in the Upper Valley. It is a principal entry to the community and serves as a major
14 regional circulation conduit for traffic moving from Lake County into Napa County
15 and reverse. The intersection involves the State (Highway 29), the County
16 (Silverado Trail) and the City (Lake Street and Falleri Drive).
17

18 Caltrans staff has indicated a preliminary budget estimate for the realignment project
19 at approximately \$2 million (this amount is derived from a formula based upon an
20 established "safety index" and cost-benefit analysis); modification of the elements of
21 the project must be cognizant of this budget and the safety index/cost benefit
22 requirements. On February 20, 2007, Caltrans project manager, Ahmad Rahimi,
23 addressed Council stating that any type of modification to the project scope must be
24 accomplished in a timely manner, or the City will risk losing State funding
25

26 In a Caltrans letter dated April 24, 2007, Caltrans noted their willingness to
27 cooperate with the City on a roundabout study, but required such a study by August
28 20, 2007. On May 14, 2007, the City responded by letter to Caltrans seeking
29 clarification on the requirements of such a roundabout study and asking for standard
30 unit costs upon which to base our cost assumptions. On May 15, 2007, Zack Matley
31 of W-Trans made an educational presentation to Council on the functionality of
32 roundabout intersections. At that time, Council encouraged more community
33 education on roundabout intersections.

34
35 On June 13, 2007, Caltrans responded with clarification on the requirements of the
36 roundabout feasibility study and cost data assumptions. Staff immediately retained
37 W-Trans to prepare a roundabout feasibility study to Caltrans specifications. A
38 community forum was conducted on July 10, 2007 to educate and receive comment
39 from the community on modern roundabouts. Over 40 community members
40 attended the forum, heard educational presentations, and provided valuable
41 feedback on their concerns with roundabouts. On July 30, 2007, the City sent a
42 roundabout feasibility study to Caltrans.

43
44 On September 19, 2007, Caltrans responded with a letter asking questions about
45 the roundabout feasibility study and asking for a follow-on Concept Approval Report.
46 Thus, on October 3, 2007, City Manager, City Engineer, and Zack Matley held a
47 conference call with 16 Caltrans staff seeking clarity on how to answer the
48 September 19, 2007 letter. In summary, Caltrans staff made it quite clear that the
49 City would very likely lose all project funding if it continued to pursue the roundabout
50 alternative. City staff requested that Caltrans follow-up that conference call with a
51 letter that clearly states the Caltrans position on the roundabout alternative.

52
53 On December 5, 2007, Caltrans provided a letter to the City which essentially states
54 that the City may choose to either accept the status quo (misaligned 4-way stop),
55 accept the Caltrans realignment safety project, or plan, design, and construct a
56 roundabout with non-Caltrans funding. The City discussed the Caltrans letter at the
57 December 18, 2007 Council meeting. Council expressed their disappointment with
58 the Caltrans letter and directed staff to conduct a meeting with Caltrans and County
59 officials to discuss the Caltrans letter and seek a reasonable solution.

60
61 The City sent a letter to Caltrans on January 9, 2008 expressing the City's
62 disappointment in the stated Caltrans position of their December 5, 2007 letter, and
63 requested a meeting to discuss the issue. A meeting was scheduled and held on
64 February 13, 2008, with Caltrans and County officials. Of particular note, Sean
65 Nozzari, Deputy Director of Operations at Caltrans District 4, and Jim Leddy,
66 Executive Director of Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA),
67 attended this meeting. At the meeting, Mr. Nozzari offered to maintain the
68 roundabout project option and commit approximately \$2 million in Caltrans safety
69 project funding toward a roundabout project, if the City can make a decision by April

70 1, 2008 to enter into a cooperative agreement with Caltrans and take responsibility
71 for all costs and project planning, design, and management beyond the \$2 million
72 committed by Caltrans. Subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Leddy has conditionally
73 offered to dedicate some NCTPA funding (anticipated savings from another Caltrans
74 project in Napa County) toward this roundabout project, depending upon a more
75 refined cost estimate for a roundabout project.

76
77 On March 4, 2008, Council approved a \$42,500 Consultant Services Agreement with
78 W-Trans. This agreement included \$26,600 to provide a roundabout cost estimate
79 in time for Council to make a decision by April 1, 2008 on whether to pursue a
80 roundabout cooperative agreement with Caltrans. The agreement also includes
81 \$15,900 to complete a Conceptual Approval Report (CAR), which is a more refined
82 level of planning-level design than the earlier feasibility report. Much of the CAR
83 design work was needed to produce the roundabout cost estimate.

84
85 On March 12, 2008, W-Trans engineers and our City Engineer met with many
86 department representatives of Caltrans Headquarters and District 4 to align
87 expectations for the conceptual design refinements of the roundabout intersection
88 and get cost estimate information on further environmental analysis and
89 environmental mitigation. This meeting provided staff with greater assurance that
90 the W-Trans estimate will address all major Caltrans concerns.

91
92 **DISCUSSION:**

93
94 The W-Trans Roundabout Feasibility Study of July 2007 noted an estimated cost of
95 \$2,048,000 for a roundabout at Highway 29 and Silverado Trail. The estimate was
96 based on Caltrans unit cost data and the estimate was escalated to 2009 dollars.
97 However, this estimate did not address several subsequent Caltrans design
98 concerns and did not account for additional environmental analysis and mitigation.

99
100 A "cooperative agreement" with Caltrans will shift a considerable amount of risk from
101 Caltrans onto the City. Under such an agreement, the City will be responsible for
102 project planning, design, construction administration, construction management,
103 construction inspection, scope additions, and budget shortfalls. Caltrans would
104 maintain oversight of the project's design and construction requirements. Further
105 engineering discussion and negotiation are needed to develop a cooperative
106 agreement with Caltrans. If a decision is made to pursue a roundabout solution, a
107 fully developed cooperative agreement would be brought back to Council for
108 approval at a later date.

109
110 In order for the City to make a properly informed decision on whether to embark on a
111 cooperative agreement with Caltrans and NCTPA, a more refined cost estimate is
112 needed. A more refined cost estimate requires a more refined level of design. This
113 refined design level is what Caltrans refers to as a Concept Approval Report. While

114 a full Concept Approval Report for the roundabout was not possible by this date, an
115 engineering cost estimate was achievable, to a level sufficient for decision making.
116

117 The W-Trans cost estimate at preliminary Concept Approval Report stage totals an
118 amount of \$3,593,425. This estimate is significantly higher than the feasibility Stage
119 estimate of \$2,048,000. Some reasons for this significant cost estimate increase are
120 as follows:

- 121
- 122 • Caltrans has provided a cost estimate for Environmental Analysis and
123 Mitigation (beyond that already conducted for the Caltrans realignment
124 project) at \$833,500, versus a \$50,000 value estimated at feasibility stage.
125
- 126 • The current cost estimate includes a 30% contingency versus a 15%
127 contingency at feasibility stage. The 30% contingency factor is more
128 appropriate at this planning level estimate.
129
- 130 • The current cost estimate was based on a more refined engineering design
131 that included more of the contractors constructability cost elements, such as
132 temporary construction easements.
133
- 134 • The current cost estimate is escalated to year 2010, versus the feasibility
135 stage estimate that was escalated to year 2009.
136
- 137 • The current cost estimate addresses several Caltrans design concerns that
138 were not addressed in the feasibility stage estimate.
139
- 140 • The current cost estimate includes consulting services with the Caltrans
141 Cooperative Agreement.
142

143 Subtracting the \$2 million that Caltrans has committed toward the project, this leaves
144 a balance of \$1,593,425 to be funded from non-Caltrans sources. The Executive
145 Director of NCTPA has provided a written commitment to provide additional funding
146 for this roundabout project. More formal funding agreements would need to be
147 established and brought back to Council for approval.
148

149 One of the key roundabout design concerns involves the awkward traffic movements
150 of Falleri Drive off Lake Street, which is undesirably close to the intersection.
151 Likewise, there are traffic movement concerns with the planned Oat Hill Mine Trail
152 parking area to the Northeast corner of the intersection. There was insufficient time
153 and funding to fully develop design solutions to these concerns in the W-Trans
154 consultant agreement between March 4, 2008 and April 1, 2008. For the purpose of
155 this conceptual cost estimate, a right-in, right-out turning movement between Lake
156 Avenue and Falleri Drive was assumed. Further community outreach, planning, and

157 design will be needed to determine the best solution for traffic movements to and
158 from Falleri Drive and the planned Oat Hill Mine Trail parking area.

159
160 Staff recommends that Council discuss and provide direction to staff. If Council
161 chooses to pursue a cooperative agreement with Caltrans for a roundabout
162 intersection, a Resolution is provided for consideration. However, once such a
163 decision is made, it may not be feasible for the City to revert back to the Caltrans
164 realignment safety project solution, and the \$2 million Caltrans safety project funding
165 commitment may be lost.

166
167 **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE:**

168
169 This project is consistent with General Plan Objectives CIR 1.2, CIR 1.4, CI 2.1 and
170 General Plan Goal CIR-3.

171
172 **FISCAL IMPACT:**

173
174 No City funding has been budgeted for a roundabout intersection improvement at
175 this location. The City has verbal assurance from the Caltrans District 4 Assistant
176 Director for Traffic Operations that \$2 million from the safety realignment project will
177 be applied toward a roundabout project through a Caltrans cooperative agreement.
178 The NCTPA Executive Director has provided written assurance that the balance of
179 funding for this roundabout improvement will be provided from expected project
180 savings at another Caltrans project in Napa County.

181
182 Under a Caltrans cooperative agreement, City staff will be required to devote
183 hundreds of hours in planning support, property acquisition, design support,
184 contracting, construction management and inspection. This will come at the
185 expense of other capital projects, maintenance projects, and development
186 engineering management. Staffing needs and project priorities will need to be
187 examined.

188
189 There are inevitable risks of cost over-runs, scope changes, unforeseen site
190 conditions, claims and litigation throughout the project. Under a Caltrans
191 cooperative agreement, those financial risks would normally fall on the City. Some
192 project contingency will be carried through planning, design and construction to
193 mitigate much of the financial risk to the City. Staff continually seeks to mitigate
194 project risk through using best practices in capital project management.

195
196 If Council chooses not to pursue a cooperative agreement with Caltrans for a
197 roundabout solution, then the W-Trans consulting work on a roundabout Conceptual
198 Approval Report will be halted and the City may avoid expenditure of an additional
199 \$15,900 that was assigned for completion of that report.

200

Consideration of a Resolution to Authorizing the City Manager to Negotiate a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for the Planning, Design, and Construction of a Roundabout Intersection at Highway 29, Lake St., and Silverado Trail and Pursue Funding Sources

April 1, 2008

Page 6 of 6

201

202

ATTACHMENTS:

203

204

1. Resolution

205

2. Engineer's Estimate

206

3. NCTPA Commitment Letter for Funding

207

4. Conceptual Layout of a Roundabout Intersection

208

5. Caltrans Realignment Concept

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

RESOLUTION 2008- _____

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CALISTOGA,
COUNTY OF NAPA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE CITY
MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE A COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH
CALTRANS FOR THE PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION OF A
ROUNABOUT INTERSECTION AT HIGHWAY 29, LAKE STREET, AND
SILVERADO TRAIL AND PURSUE FUNDING SOURCES**

WHEREAS, the City had requested that Caltrans consider a modern roundabout solution in their scoping for this Highway 29 and Silverado Trail intersection project; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans made a presentation to Council on February 20, 2007, during which time members of the public expressed concerns for safety if the intersection reverted to a 2-way stop control; and

WHEREAS, on April 24, 2007 in response to the City's request for a roundabout solution, Caltrans staff requested that the City submit a roundabout feasibility study before August 20, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the City conducted a well-attended Roundabout community forum on July 10, 2007 to educate the community on roundabout intersection solutions; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared a roundabout feasibility study according to Caltrans specifications and submitted the study to Caltrans on July 30, 2007; and

WHEREAS, on October 3, 2007, Caltrans staff expressed serious concerns that all Caltrans funding for an intersection safety improvement would be lost if the City continued to pursue a roundabout solution at this intersection; and

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2007, Caltrans provided notice to the City that a roundabout solution would need to be funded completely with non-Caltrans funding; and

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2007, the City Council expressed its disappointment in the Caltrans response and directed staff to arrange a meeting with high level Caltrans officials; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans, City, and County officials, together with local citizens met on February 13, 2008 to discuss the merits of a roundabout solution; and

WHEREAS, at the February 13, 2008 meeting, the District 4 Caltrans Assistant Director for Operations committed to apply \$2 million toward a roundabout solution, if a cooperative agreement was established between Caltrans, the County and the City; and

WHEREAS, the City retained W-Trans on March 4, 2008 to prepare a more refined cost estimate for a roundabout solution; and

WHEREAS, on March 12, 2008, City staff and W-Trans met with key Caltrans staff to align design elements for a roundabout solution; and

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88

WHEREAS, W-Trans performed more detailed planning and design to develop a refined cost estimate of \$3,593,425 for a roundabout; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director of the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency has offered a written commitment to provide additional funding to cover the cost shortfall of a roundabout, from the Caltrans base funding of \$2 million.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Calistoga hereby chooses to pursue a roundabout intersection solution at Highway 29 (Lincoln Avenue), Lake Street, and Silverado Trail; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Calistoga hereby authorizes the City Manager to negotiate a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for the planning, design, and construction of a roundabout intersection at Highway 29, Lake Street, and Silverado Trail, and pursue funding sources; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Calistoga hereby authorizes the City Manager to direct W-Trans to continue work toward a Caltrans Conceptual Approval Report under the Consultant Services Agreement approved by Council on March 4, 2008.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Calistoga at a regular meeting held this 1st day of April, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JACK GINGLES, Mayor

ATTEST:

RAQUEL CANTILLON, Deputy City Clerk



March 25, 2008

707 Randolph Street, Suite 100 • Napa, CA 94559-29
Tel: (707) 259-8638
Fax: (707) 259-8638

Jim McCann
City Manager
City of Calistoga
1232 Washington Street
Calistoga, CA 94515

Dear Mr. McCann:

Thank you for hosting the meeting with representatives of Caltrans, the County of Napa, the City of Calistoga and local community members regarding the proposed State Route 29 and Silverado Trail Roundabout. I truly appreciated being able to attend and participate in working toward a mutually agreeable solution.

As I mentioned at that February 13th, 2008 meeting, the NCTPA Board has been on record for the support of the construction of three Roundabouts in the northern part of Napa County. These three projects are the Rutherford Roundabout, the Roundabout at Silverado Trail and SR 29 and finally one at the intersection of State Route 128 and Petrified Forest Road. This commitment predates my tenure with the Agency but was reaffirmed most recently last year.

The funding for these three efforts will be coming from a repayment that is due to the agency in regards to surplus properties currently being sold in connection with the Trancas Overpass. At the October 17th, 2007 NCTPA Board meeting, I briefed the Board on the results of my meeting with the California Transportation Commission staff regarding this issue and they reaffirmed the NCTPA commitment to the Roundabouts.

I look forward to being a partner with both the City and the County in making this Roundabout a reality. It is my understanding that the W-Trans report puts the price tag at approximately \$3.6 million. If we are successful in converting the existing \$2.0 million from the current proposed Caltrans safety project to this Roundabout safety project then the shortfall will be \$1.6 million. From the most recent information from the sales of the surplus property the remaining funds should be available to complete the project.

Again, thank you for your effort in moving this project forward.

If I can provide any additional information, please feel free to contact me anytime.

Sincerely,

Jim Leddy
Executive Director

cc: Leon Garcia, NCTPA Chair
Jack Gingles, City of Calistoga

Member Agencies: Calistoga, St. Helena, Yountville, City of Napa, American Canyon, County of Napa
Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency
Napa Valley Transportation Authority

Communication "A" April 1, 2008 Calistoga City Council Meeting

Item # 14: Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans regarding a Roundabout (Highway 29/Lake Street/Silverado Trail)

KRISTIN CASEY & CARL SHERRILL
P.O. BOX 945
CALISTOGA, CA 94515

CITY OF CALISTOGA
City Clerk

MAR 31 2008

March 31, 2008

RECEIVED

To the Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

We understand that you will be reviewing the latest developments regarding the proposed roundabout at Silverado Trail and Lincoln Avenue on Tuesday night. Because it's doubtful that we can be there, we would like to respectfully submit our concerns, based upon our reading of the most recent staff report and the attached letter from the Director of NCTPA.

Our primary concern about the roundabout proposal at this location is the cost to taxpayers. We are taxpayers, and in this time of economic straits, we wonder why the City of Calistoga is so intent upon allowing taxpayer money to be spent in excess of the \$2 Million that Cal Trans has budgeted for "realigning" that intersection. We even wonder why the intersection can't be left as it is, since it has been made safe with a workable four-way stop; this would save \$2 Million in taxpayer funds for use in fixing our roads. But to take the baseline \$2 Million and then seriously consider spending an additional \$1.6 Million (and probably more) of taxpayer money seems very ill advised. There is no "free" money here.

The proposal that relies on a "gift" of taxpayer money from the future sale of "surplus" properties down in Napa appears to be based upon conjecture regarding the amount that would be forthcoming. In addition, the letter from the Director of NCTPA does not indicate a vote or firm commitment on the part of the NCTPA Board to provide Calistoga with \$1.6 Million. And of course, the staff report points out the likelihood of Calistoga incurring additional monetary costs as well as major staff time in dealing with the proposed project.

We would prefer to see our taxpayer money (City, County, State or Federal) be used to provide for infrastructure upkeep that is needed – or maybe even be saved for a rainy day! We would rather see our Planning Department staff time taken up with the necessary work that they have said already overwhelms them. In particular, we would like to see staff time used to finally tackle the job of making all of our Ordinances consistent with our "new" General Plan.

Please consider the greater good when making a decision about this project. It really isn't a necessity.

Kristin Casey
Carl Sherrill

Communication "B" April 1, 2008 Calistoga City Council Meeting

Item #14: Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans regarding a Roundabout (Highway 29/Silverado Trail)

George Caloyannidis
2202 Diamond Mountain Road
Calistoga, CA 94515

CITY OF CALISTOGA

APR 01 2008

CITY MANAGER

March 31, 2008

To: Honorable Mayor and Calistoga City Council

RE: Considerations for the Approval of a Roundabout at the
Lincoln Avenue/Silverado Trail Intersection

The decision before you at the April 1, 2008 public hearing on whether to approve the commitment of additional funds in order to construct a Roundabout vs. a 2-way conventional road realignment as proposed by *Caltrans* at the above referenced intersection needs to take into account the following considerations:

First and foremost, the two designs differ in substantial and varied ways as to their general impact and level of service both in the short and long term.

Staff has on file a 9-page report dated February 11, 2008 "*Traffic Roundabouts, Why They Must Become Local, State and National Policy*" compiled by Dieter Deiss and myself largely based on data from the *Insurance Institute for Highway Safety* in Arlington VA, the *The Federal Highway Administration* in Washington D.C. and other referenced sources. This report shows remarkable advantages of Roundabouts in the areas of Safety (both Vehicular and Pedestrian), Traffic Flow and Capacity, Fuel Consumption and Emissions, Pollution and Long Term Maintenance as compared to conventional and signalized intersections.

In regards to this specific intersection:

Caltrans Design

Due to the early origination of the *Caltrans* study and insufficient input, its proposed design has not taken into consideration:

- The increased development (both past and future) in the immediate area which necessitates increased pedestrian and bicycle safety measures.

Communication "B" April 1, 2008 Calistoga City Council Meeting

Item #14: Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans regarding a Roundabout (Highway 29/Silverado Trail)

- The effects of the increased development and traffic to and from Lake County which will necessitate the installation of traffic lights (current installation cost \$200,000 each, operation cost \$4,000 each annually).
- The development of the *Oat Hill Mine Trail* and its associated parking needs, and pedestrian/ bicycle access and safety.
- The City's long term objective to ease regional commercial and commuter traffic away from Lincoln Avenue.
- The City's objective to convey a sense of arrival to the town at this point as a significant economic factor.

The *Caltrans* design aligns Highway 29 from Lake County through Lincoln Avenue and removes the two stop-signs. Even if these two stop-signs were to remain, the straight line alignment makes this route a naturally preferential one.

Roundabout Design

The Roundabout design addresses the above issues by:

- Demonstrably decreasing approach and intersection speeds to 15-20 miles/hour.
- Providing safe pedestrian/bicycle crossings with splitter islands.
- Eliminating the most dangerous T-type vehicular collisions.
- Diverting unnecessary traffic away from Lincoln Avenue because its geometry has no preferential direction.
- Providing ample parking space for the *Oat Hill Mine Trail* and by providing safe egress/ingress via two right-turn-only accesses to the parking lot.
- Providing a traffic light, maintenance-free enhanced traffic flow many decades into the future.
- Effecting a configuration which through an appropriate design treatment offers the opportunity to convey the sense of arrival.

As per the *Intersection Control Comparison-Year 2030* provided by *w-trans* in January 2006, a Roundabout would have these additional benefits as compared to a *2-Way Stop* conventional design:

- Level of Service **B** vs. **F** (presumably a 4-way stop-sign configuration would offer a level of service **below F**).

Communication "B" April 1, 2008 Calistoga City Council Meeting

Item #14: Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans regarding a Roundabout (Highway 29/Silverado Trail)

- Average Delay per Vehicle **18 seconds** vs. **67 seconds** (presumably this delay would increase to **1 minute 14 seconds** with 4-way stop-signs).
- Fuel Consumption Savings of **14.6 gal/hour** (presumably the savings would increase to **29.2 gal/hour** with 4-way stop-signs).
- Air Emissions **17% lower** (presumably **34% lower** with 4-way stop-signs) and associated pollution and greenhouse gas benefits.
- Injury Collisions **78% fewer**.

It is obvious that the above comparison shows that the Roundabout is a far superior product on long term operational and environmental levels vs. the conventional *Caltrans* design.

The City Council must weigh these benefits to the community and the environment against the additional one time cost.