

City of Napa Survey of Community Members and Employees
Napa Public Safety & City Hall Facilities Project
Final Survey Results as of January 10, 2020

Background

The Community Survey was available from December 9, 2019 through January 9, 2020. It was publicized through the Napa Valley Register and other media outlets, through social media, to stakeholder groups and the City website. There were 279 responses.

We asked one demographic question. Respondents could check all that applied to them:

Category	Number	Percent
City of Napa Employee	114	44%
City of Napa Resident	169	66%
Work in the City of Napa	92	36%

The Survey presented three options for a new Public safety and City Facilities campus: The options considered were:

- Option 1 – 1st and Seminary Streets
- Option 2 – First and Second Streets
- Option 3 – School and Second Streets

Survey respondents were asked to vote whether each option was *Very Supportive*, *Somewhat Supports*, *Does Not Support*, *No Impact* or *No Response* for each of the following project features:

- New open space and a public plaza
- Compatible with the surrounding uses
- Safe and pleasant pedestrian experience

Survey Results

Below are the results for the three project features by Option:

1. How well does this alternative support new open space and a public plaza?

Answer	OPTION 1 ALL	OPTION 2 ALL	OPTION 3 ALL	OPTION 1 EMPLOYEES	OPTION 2 EMPLOYEES	OPTION 3 EMPLOYEES
Does Not Support	10%	19%	22%	7%	23%	27%
Somewhat Supports	31%	39%	24%	31	43	24
Very Supportive	30%	17%	29%	42	14	30
No Impact	4%	4%	2%	6	5	3
No answer	23%	22%	23%	15	16	16
Total of Very Supportive + Somewhat Supports	61%	56%	53%	73	57	54

2. How well are the option's building locations compatible with the surrounding uses?

Answer	OPTION 1 ALL	OPTION 2 ALL	OPTION 3 ALL	OPTION 1 EMPLOYEES	OPTION 2 EMPLOYEES	OPTION 3 EMPLOYEES
Does Not Support	13%	20%	23%	8%	27%	28%
Somewhat Supports	28%	34%	28%	33	36	29
Very Supportive	34%	21%	22%	43	20	22
No Impact	3%	2%	4%	4	2	6
No answer	22%	23%	23%	13	15	15
Total of Very Supportive + Somewhat Supports	62%	55%	50%	76	56	51

3. How well does this alternative support a safe and pleasant pedestrian experience?

Answer	OPTION 1 ALL	OPTION 2 ALL	OPTION 3 ALL	OPTION 1 EMPLOYEES	OPTION 2 EMPLOYEES	OPTION 3 EMPLOYEES
Does Not Support	10%	21%	23%	6	24	26
Somewhat Supports	26%	30%	22%	27	33	27
Very Supportive	30%	18%	24%	42	18	22
No Impact	9%	7%	7%	10	7	9
No answer	26%	24%	25%	16	18	
Total of Very Supportive + Somewhat Supports	56%	48%	46%	69	51	49

Summary of Findings

Option 1, 1st and Seminary Streets, has the strongest support overall on all three issues. It led in responses to *Very Supportive* and when *Very Supportive* and *Somewhat Supports* were totaled. Option 3 scored highest in *Does Not Support* for each of the issues.

Verbatim Comments on Each of the Options

Note: Employee comments are highlighted in yellow. The numbers before each comment were used to track commenters and eliminate duplicate comments. The comments in this section are verbatim. Duplicates (where a respondent put the same answer in each comment box) were eliminated and comments in the individual options sections that referred to the project as a whole were moved to the general comments section.)

Option 1 Individual Comments

- 25 Instead have half an employee plaza and half a public plaza. What justifies the diagram as a safe and pleasant pedestrian experience?
- 28 It makes the block on First where the CSB was into a wasteland with the message, This is the very end of Downtown. Maybe that's ok because it's already the very end of Downtown.
- That parking lot could actually activate this far west end of First by being the origin of pedestrian trips if the parking is available for general use."

4. 49 THIS OPTION DOES NOT ALLOW FOR BOTH SAFE AND SECURE EMPLOYEE PARKING
5. 56 I appreciate the larger parking lot for the city employees.
6. 84 It crams too much into too small a space. This option doesn't allow for growth and expansion.
7. 111 A majority of employees crossing 1st street to get to from parking is a risk.
8. 125 I believe that cost and long-term serviceability to the City that this is the best option. Parking although not ideal is convenient for employees.
9. 142 I think little is gained by building a new fire station in this location. The small park seems too small and the city hall presence on First Street facing north where the facade will almost always be in shadow does not seem as welcoming.
10. 143 Looks to be an efficient use of space.
11. 154 Not much different from existing
12. 159 This option impedes the egress and ingress flow of emergency services.
13. 161 This option meets 100% of the needs.
14. 169 Open Space and Public Plaza = Not sure of the amount of space allocated in the drawing. Safe and Pleasant Pedestrian Experience = The block does not seem to be much different than what it is currently. OTHER: Would prefer not to see the parking facing school street. Perhaps the plaza / open space setting could be used for the entire length of School Street.
15. 172 need to define entrance to city hall and ps buildings, how does design attract people to the plaza, and can it be a functional space for public meetings and employees?"
16. 179 This is the only viable option. In my opinion if any building should be put on the back burner it should be city hall. FS1 and PD are occupied 24/7 365.
17. 212 Other than Fire Station at ground level build a parking structure and go up to 7 stories.
18. 305 Best option
19. 306 If the top priority is a new Police Station building and limit the disruption to all City staff (time disruption, cost and impact to services) then why build a new Fire Station in Phase 1
20. 271 I think the best options are the ones that include new buildings along with renovations to the fire station or other existing buildings.

Option 2 Individual Comments

1. 28 Dividing the parking lot is a weird choice, as is making that weird parallel parking drive aisle between Police Admin and City Hall the very center of the site. Did the architects stop to think what that space would be like?
2. 52 The offset buildings (PD on SW corner of 2nd St, and City Hall on the NE corner of First St.) seem more aesthetically pleasing and seems to provide more pedestrian flow via the sidewalks. Pedestrians cutting through the parking areas near the buildings will be a concern, unless those are fenced/gated.
3. 53 This would be a good option budget wise however I don't feel the way the buildings are laid out is the best use of space. There seems to be more wasted space that could be extra parking.
4. 55 This is the best option, keeps fire station, no temporary moving of anybody for construction. We should be careful as possible, these things can turn into a money nightmare, just look around the bay area for such stories. I would consider cheap ideas like south city business park, sell downtown properties ect.
5. 84 It looks like parking is going to be an issue.

6. 89 "only need to build 2 new buildings (CH and PD FD admin) . Use the existing fire station as is. The 2 buildings could be built in phases to alleviate total relocation of city personnel., Phase 1 - build PD/FD admin and relocate applicable personnel. Phase 2 - Demo PD , Build new City Hall, Phase 3 - relocate personnel , Phase 4 - demo old city hall.
7. 94 Also the trees got removed so it is a little less nice than the previous option.
8. 125 The Public Safety Building is a 24/7 operation and is not conveniently located to parking for those coming and going during odd hours and during bad weather.
9. 142 Again, I do not think City Hall should face First Street. The parking space between the City Hall and the Police and Fire Administration building seems strained and not a good use of space.
10. 143 Hard to tell, but it appears to keep the existing location of fire station? This is a good plan.
11. 159 This option has the LEAST effect on the egress/ingress flow of emergency services. Majority of parking is away from fire station,
12. 162 If I had to choose one it would be this one since the parking is spread out, but if possible the fire station would be made to be 100% of space need."
13. 161 Doesn't meet all the needs.
14. 169 "Parking Layout - Prefer the School street frontage for parking in Option 2 compared to Option 1. Parking in General - Prefer Option 1 for safety purposes keeping all vehicle access in one location away from the main buildings rather than being co-mingled among the buildings. Buildings for Police and Fire - Prefer Option 1 because I like that buildings appear to be connected which in turn means better accessibility for both."
15. 184 The parking seems inefficient and a huge waste of space.
16. 212 "better than opt 1 wastes Property Park now in a Parking structure. Add needed parking now. Sell the other ground level parking. Build enough structures for the next 20 years and lease out the surplus today"
17. 257 This is my preferred option, but again - please do something worthy of our new lovely downtown!
18. 306 Similar concerns with expansion of more surface parking in downtown, but this option seems to highlight the priority of the Police Station building. I would ask whether the new Police Building could be done as a Phase 1 and leave all other buildings to a later date?

Option 3 Individual Comments

1. 28 It's oriented toward the parking lot. It might as well be the Whole Foods shopping center. Also, the plaza will be windblown. The orientation of City Hall does not support uses in the former Exertec building.
2. 31 This option reduces parking, requires further considerations for employee pedestrian safety and security.
3. 52 The design/building locations make the lot seem lopsided, as all of the visual heaviness is concentrated on the eastern side of the lot. The public plaza is larger, but I don't think we need another public outdoor gathering space downtown.
4. 53 I like the way this one is laid out. I think you could even shrink the 'plaza' portion down for additional parking and still have a sufficient plaza space. This lay out will also open up the space for better lighting in the parking areas. It will also provide more opportunity to be flexible with the parking for a police secured lot or potential to include secure parking for employees that work graveyard.

5. 64 This is my choice.
6. 84 This option has a nice aesthetic and allows for expansion and growth (with limited parking).
7. 125 This option is too far from parking for employees. It poses a safety hazard.
8. 142 "The City Hall facing east is more welcoming and impressive. The size of the park is large enough to have a real function and does not look like an afterthought. The fire station should be rehabilitated. The Police and Fire Administrative building is close to City Hall but not in it as were previous plans. Best use of space of the three options given.
It would be nice if some of the parking could be public parking and not all city/employee parking. It would be good for the park to have seating so that people can enjoy nature and eat their lunch outside.
9. 143 I like this plan too. Probably the best so far in the slides.
10. 162 If there is going to be this much parking, I prefer the options that have it spread out versus having it all together in one spot. Also, shouldn't fire admin be closer to the fire dept. rather than City Hall?"
11. 161 Doesn't meet all needs.
12. 169 Prefer the Plaza layout along First Street in this example.
Parking - Like how the parking is tucked in the center of the complex.
SUGGESTION: Can Police and Fire stay connected like Option 1 and then move City Hall where Police and Fire Admin is in Option 3. Do something else with the frontage along school street.
13. This is worse for the streetscape activation along First Street with the entire length of the superblock essentially vacant. "
14. 221 Nice to have the plaza on First Street.
15. 225 No one wants large surface parking lots in the downtown core . . . that is a plaza? what would a narrow open space like that be used for? how does this help promote the gateway into downtown?
16. 239 best parking, but need to rebuild not renovate fire station
17. 244 Looking outside, in toward complex, I like that the buildings are seen instead of seeing parking first. Tucking parking inside the space and developing a longer public plaza on First seem like significant benefits for quality of life.
18. 258 like this option because of accessibility from school street
19. 285 Need to include a new fire house #1
20. 306 Again, same concerns with surface parking; however, the Plaza in this option seems better. I would ask the question "Should a public plaza take frontage on First Street or on School Street? I see pros/cons with both, but lean more toward a Plaza on First Street. If this is the direction, could the Police Building be done first and leave City Hall for a later phase or is it absolutely impossible to Phase this? Consider phasing as the real costs of this project begin to take shape.

Importance of Qualities of City Facilities

The choices were Very Important, Important, Not Important, No Opinion

Qualities	<i>Very Important</i>	<i>Sum of Very Important + Important</i>
Functional during and after an emergency	78%	88%
Energy efficient and sustainable	50	81
Welcoming and easy to navigate	44	79
Cutting-edge technology	49	75
Attractive building design	25	70
Provide public meeting and community gathering spaces	35	69
Generates pride in the community	29	65

The chart above shows the total for all responses. Responses from employees very closely mirrored the total responses except for Cutting Edge Technology. 63% of employees ranked this as *Very Important*, and the total responses for *Very Important* and *Important* for employees was 85%.

General Comments on the Project

Urban/Building Design/Site Design/Design Process

Design Quality, Consistency with Goals of Prior Plans

1. 242 Please make it match the historical downtown. Not the eye sores that keep getting approved that look like they belong in downtown Disney.
2. 262 It sounds silly, but good landscaping would be nice. It would soften the visual blight of a parking lot
3. 238 Please, please don't make it look ugly!! No more Dentist Type offices!!! No ultra-modern look. This is Napa. Make it look like either craftsman style, or something that looks like the Napa Valley. The ultra-modern look is cold and not friendly. Please no more of that!
4. 244 Downtown Napa is uniquely beautiful, and the complex should add to that within financial reason. I strongly believe the plantings in the plaza should be native plants, water conserving, and support pollination. This complex could establish our city as focused on the future while valuing our shared past.
5. 212 Again yesterday's thinking build a civic center and set an example for the community. 262 It's hard to answer these questions without more context. Can you remind the public what businesses and buildings are around the proposed site?
6. 272 The First Street/Seminary corner is a key gateway to the downtown area. A direction search from San Francisco Airport or Oakland Airport shows that First Street is the primary recommended route into the downtown core. The idea of programming a surface parking lot and a fire station at this key entry intersection entirely misses the wisdom behind the old saying that "you never have a second chance to make a first impression." In addition, the parking density shown misses the new 2019 building code requirement that at least 50% of the site must be shaded by trees as well as the

area that will be required for storm water treatment. Lastly, the parking should be checked against the minimum requirements that are outlined in the Downtown Specific Plan for non parking exempt development areas.

7. 213 First Street is our main downtown core street. I, personally, don't see the goals of the Downtown Specific Plan reflected in these site plans. I refer you to Chapters 3 and 5 specifically for Vision and Design Guidelines. Things like a Primary Gateway, landscaping, core street improvements.... I know these options are not the final designs but those design elements require space planning at this level.
8. 285 What height of buildings are we talking about here. I believe a single or even just 2 story buildings would be wasted space. With the limit of land that we have down town, the solution to incorporate as many city services as possible would be to build vertically.
9. 272 The development of the City facilities should also conform to the planning efforts and guidelines that have been created to make downtown Napa a premiere visitor and community center. The city should set the example in following the new building codes as well as going the extra yard to conform to the Downtown Specific Plan.
10. 281 All the options don't satisfy the goals of the Downtown Specific Plan...vast swaths of surface parking flanking the Western approach to downtown taking up large portions of some of highest density zoned areas of the city. As a city, we have already been there, lets not go backwards, please!
11. (Don Worden via email) But the screening buildings on First st would need to be built with the project and not left for "future use". Hopefully those sold off lots could be developed as housing so we could have more housing downtown....another key request for the downtown specific plan. But this is a disaster. Napa did this kind of thinking in the 70s/80s taking up downtown renovations that were antiquated for the times. Instead of renovating and reusing great old building. they added a bad mall terrible clock tower and tore down some beautiful old buildings in the name of progress. I was hoping that Napa would not make the same kind of foolish mistake again. But these diagrams are showing an extreme lack of vision. It is very disappointing. I unfortunately can't be at the meeting on the 9th as I will be out of the country, But I would hope that some better thought would be brought to the parking before it is too late. Thank you, Dan Worden
12. 225 Please see all the hard work that was put into the downtown specific plan and it might also be worth a second look at all the work that went into the "Napa Consolidated City Hall and Asset Analysis Study" in March of 2009 that was prepared by the City of Napa with assistance by RACESTUDIO and many in the community who participated in that process. Approach 1, 2 or 3 are better and much more thoughtful options that what is being proposed, especially if the city is not considering relocating the police and fire out of the downtown core. Sad to see such an effort of time and expense not being considered in these uninspiring options.
13. 28 Allowing uses of the City Hall other than governance will cause people to see the City Hall as a good building that is part of the community and not a dreadful place where they go to be condescended to by bureaucrats. If people regularly come to the building, they will be aware of public meetings, new campaigns and programs, and other important things that government does that affects their lives. They will feel welcome to participate in a way that getting a postcard inviting them to spend two minutes on the clock talking to a commission at a public hearing does not. Market towns in the Holy Roman Empire had city halls with pubs in the cellar. I recognize that thinking of beer and government in the same sentence marks me either as a clown or a crank, but the point is that the businessmen did their transactions there, guildsmen held meetings there, and

people threw banquets celebrating life's milestones there because it was the public's place with the amenities they wanted. The City Hall should be the public's building, not just the most-hated office building filled with the most-hated class of office workers.* They should be given reasons to come and use it other than paying water bills and permit fees, like a ratskeller, an espresso stand (desperately needed on this end of First), a food truck pod (affordable lunch also desperately needed downtown), using the hearing chambers as a theater for the film festival or concerts with a low rent to encourage interesting acts, or for classes put on by the Parks and Rec department. Yes, it's still the Reagan-Jarvis era: The people hate their public servants."

Concern about the Downtown Location

14. 282 "May not be enough room for PD. NEED to allow more room for parking / future expansion. "
15. 291 We need to rethink this entire project. The use of prime real estate for uses that can be built on the periphery of downtown is a waste of public land and resources.
16. 291 The police building and the needed parking do not need to be downtown. These uses are taking up prime residential real estate in the downtown core."
17. 62 The police station should not be downtown
18. 94 Not sure a Police Station can ever be "Compatible" with surrounding building uses. Where is the secured / cordoned off police parking?
19. 213 Public Safety buildings cannot be located right at the street edge per public safety building requirements so this is not an accurate representation of how the site would work.
20. 173 It is ridiculous to have options for Fire and Police buildings that the Fire and Police Departments do not support. The city voted in 2 new council members who agreed with this principal
21. 243 This is valuable downtown land that could be put to better tax generating use i.e. residential, retail, hotel, etc. Perhaps City Hall stays in the central business district and the fire/police are relocated elsewhere maybe the old Safeway property. I've read that the ground might be contaminated. If that's so how was a Safeway allowed to operate on that land?
22. 306 I see the ability to function during and emergency as extremely critical, but down graded it a notch as I still wonder if we really function best in an emergency with all these buildings in this location? In order to function effectively in an emergency we must have cutting edge technology, safe and secure buildings, and immediate access to necessary support (such as emergency vehicles, volunteer staff, communications services). I still wonder if the best way to ensure that we are functioning at our best in an emergency is to physically put all of these services in the same location. I know it may be too late to re-consider, but this is a critical aspect of the project.
23. 203 Why not consider options outside of the downtown area? Space is so valuable downtown and it is hard to find parking. What about sites like the old Safeway that closed after the earthquake on Jefferson and Clay? Sell the property on School St and First and finance the project.

Project Process

24. 184 It seems like you wasted a lot of time and money leaving all the prior effort behind and developing these less than desirable options.
25. 213 All of these things are very important and possible to attain. As a resident who has followed this project for years I don't understand why the Plenary team was not given the new programming information to generate site layout options. They have a whole team of various design professionals that includes an architect who specializes in public safety facilities, local design professionals

including an architect familiar with the DSP and a landscape architect, a civil engineer who can accurately design the parking, etc.. I understand the desire to move things forward and simplify the process but if the options presented are not really viable where have we gotten?"

26. 225 While the "modern" buildings previously proposed by the City and its developer partner were somewhat controversial, most I have discussed the project with felt the planning concepts were going in the right direction. Please go back to the drawing board . . .

Functionality of Buildings

27. 257 Please consolidate all of the City's services into a single, one-stop-shop campus. It's confusing and inconvenient bouncing around downtown to multiple different outdated building to conduct city business!
28. 299 For the first set of questions, you ask about Plaza's and open space? How about function of the buildings, and parking.
29. 111. Also, how do we know it meets space needs of the departments. We've just seen squares on a map.
30. 139 How many more usable square footage space will each of the buildings gain?
31. 282 "Why aren't you asking, How do these buildings/ designs/ sites meet the needs of their individual users instead of how they fit into the area?"
32. 258 interested to see the construction sequence
33. 31 Employee safety, wellness, work environment, swing space impacts, and parking should all be strongly considered with any option. Employee and citizen buy-in, not just engagement, should be heavily weighed.
34. 275 Where is Community Service building and people going?
35. Need to Accommodate Future Growth and Development
36. 53 I would like to see a space that allows for growth in the future as our community is constantly growing and causing departments to grow to keep up.
37. 95 It's important to consider variances for the future. Planning should include input from the respective departments to ensure allocated space, current costs and future needs align. Eg Fire Station 1 may house numerous more personnel than it currently does. Current plans should capture these future needs.
38. 125 This building will need to service this community for a long time to come. It needs to be functional and allow for growth. The building should be built future forward and great attention to functionality should be maintained in the design process.
39. 143 I would also add that it will meet future growth for the next 25 years. The most effective design should be at the maximum height limits to allow for highest use of site.
40. 169 A new City Hall is very important for residents and employees, and as the City embarks on their General Plan Update, it is very important to provide a building with all of the above features identified in the above survey for future facilities with an eye on what is needed over the next 20 years and more.
41. 195 Is there a plan to transition the additional parking lots to mixed used spaces in the future? Seems like an opportunity for workforce housing on top of parking option.

Parking/Pedestrian Safety

1. 31 Concerned about employee parking needs, pedestrian safety crossing street, employee security.

2. 25 Plenty of employee parking.
3. 47 There is still a concern about a safe parking environment for night workers. I know there was talk of having such a space, but there is nothing defined, which is cause for concern.
4. 51 Feel like City Hall could remain downtown but the Police Dept and Fire Department could be relocated with a large amount of parking needed. Maybe to the Safeway on Jefferson and Clay area with an actual parking garage for police and fire vehicles as well as a secured lot for the employees who work all hours of the day an night. Better access point already being on Jefferson also
5. 52 Parking is a problem and will continue to be for employees and customers unless the City embraces more telecommuting options for employees and online options for services for customers. The public plaza option isn't really a priority for me, as there are other gathering spaces downtown (Oxbow Commons, Veteran's Park, etc.) and there's no point in creating a public gathering point where no one can park. Vigorous enforcement of employee parking in the City lots will also be required, as we currently don't restrict parking in the front lot of the police department to police business only. We need to make sure OUR customers, not the Andaz's or Tarla's or Norman Rose's customers, have parking.
6. 53 I would like to see a safe parking area for employees that have to work graveyard and are coming and going at all hours of the night. It is not always safe walking alone to and from our vehicles in the middle of the night. Parking is already tough right now and there needs to be sufficient parking to accommodate the employees as well as the public coming to use the facility.
7. 90 I'm curious with any of these options, has any thought been given to temporary parking for employees during construction? I think this will be an issue for whatever option is selected. Is there a lot or parking garage nearby that can be leased for City employees only during the day while construction is in progress?
8. 100 "Crosswalks around Civic Center Area
 - a. Buttons to Activate Flashing Lights at All Crosswalks by Building and Parking
 - b. Speed Humps at All Crosswalks by Building and Parking, Rumble Strips at All Crosswalks by Building and Parking, Public Gather Spot near City Hall, Picnic Bench or Seating, Private/Staff Gather Spot at City Hall, Multiple Picnic Benches and Café Seating, Outdoor Space
9. 111. Having no plan for parking during the multiple project years is concerning. How are we going to afford this?"
10. 139 The map needs more information: Do the northern parking lots serve employees or the public? Who will utilize the parking lot on campus? Are any of the parking lots fenced in?
11. 162 Too much space is wasted with parking. Why not put the parking underground rather than continuing to waste valuable space Downtown with parking????
12. 138 Can a parking structure be in place, perhaps even ones under the new buildings
13. 183 need multistory parking garages!!!
 - a. 213 The parking shown is also not realistic - it does not include shade trees, landscape or any area dedicated to stormwater treatment.
 - b. I don't believe adding large, surface parking lots to our main downtown core (current CSB block) and adjacent streets provides the vibrant pedestrian experience that was intended with the adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan. There is also no gateway experience on First Street.
14. 218 Surface parking is a wasteful use of space and could be minimized to only what is essential.

15. 183 too much parking lots
16. 143 If it will move forward, I think parking should be put underground but otherwise it should be spread out to minimize blight and for easier access to buildings.
17. 100 Shuttle Bus Service for City, County and Downtown Area Hospitality Staff, From Vallejo Park and Ride Lot, Mare Island Area, Curtola Area, from Red Top Park and Ride Lot, Dedicated Employee Parking , More on site, More on streets, People and Vehicle Secured Staff Only Parking Lots – Gates not Arms, Badge Access, Staff Only from 6am-8pm, Patrolled Lots, More Lights at Pedestrian Level on Paths to Parking Lots
18. (Dan Worden via email) I am a bit perplexed by all three schemes. Not for the placement of the buildings but for the lack of foresight and thought on what appears to be large ugly surface parking lots. I was on the downtown specific plan and one of the key components for what we were trying to achieve was to get rid of surface parking lots. Not only are they ugly. They are retro thinking. The age of driverless cars are upon us and ride services are becoming more prevalent. Hopefully better mass transit. It seems very dumb to have a suburban strip mall concept to our new civic center. A better approach if you were going to continue to be car focused is to put a parking structure in the center of the main block and wrap the civic buildings around it. If you sold off the two surface lots to the north that you are proposing then you could probably fund the garage. Scheme 3 seems to be closet to this approach.
19. 225 A huge surface parking in our downtown is a mistake and what is shown will not work in any event . . . the design is not meeting current requirements for storm water, shading, electrical vehicle charging, etc.
20. 281 Again, all I see is a sea of surface parking, certainly not the gracious entry to downtown.
21. 306 For all options, I would prefer to limit new surface parking along one of our most important downtown corridors. Parking certainly drives design so a discussion about parking demand is critical.
22. 282 What does pedestrian experience have to do with needs of law enforcement?"

Fire Station

1. 64 I don't see a need to rebuild the fire station when you can build up on that building.
2. 92 no new Fire Station = future liability's Fire station seems small for future needs of larger buildings dense population of a historical downtown district. Also any thoughts of incorporation of Museum space for police and fire
3. 92 An opportunity to expand fire station 1 with new building for future downtown needs of service in its current location vs "improvements" and not meeting current standards for individual rooms vs "Privacy curtains"
4. 95 It should be concerned to have the new fire station built and City Hall renovated as replacement of St 1 has been deemed critical. Moreover, the station is occupied 24/7 while city hall building is used sparingly. Funds should be allocated towards core services facilities prior to niceties.
5. 96 This is the strongest option. I think the new fire station should be built. This is a building that is used more then any other building. People use this building 365 days a year and they live in it like a home. 1/3 of there life's is spent in the fire house. Other buildings can be renovated before the fire house.
6. 111 Replace station 142 I support rehabilitating the fire station in place

7. 148 When addressing a project of this magnitude the perceived savings now by a simple remodel of fire station 1 is merely delaying the inevitable. At some point the station will have to be replaced. When that time comes there will undoubtedly be additional projects, fire stations, and city buildings that will need to be addressed as well. Additionally, when you factor in potentially higher interest rates, continually increasing costs of construction, the cost of planning, consulting, hiring architect etc. a second time, and the cost of the remodel needed to bring the current station up to seismic and building code, i.e. asbestos removal. The combined costs will be significantly greater to the tax payers than what it would cost to do it once and all at the same time.
8. 162 "What is the point of doing all this and not making sure the Fire Station is at 100%?"
9. 173 I fully support the NFD needs and believe they should be prioritized over the City Council and other administrative offices. Fire and Police needs should come first.
10. 187 We need to complete the whole project at once or not do it. Doing everything but the fire station doesn't make sense. Bringing back all the equipment that was already there just for the fire station is expensive and redundant.
11. 187 The fire station is beyond repair. You would be wasting money in a renovation. It was renovated in 2013 and 14.
12. 196 There is a huge need for a new fire station in the downtown area
13. Move Fire Station to the Housing lot."
14. 241 I feel it is very important to have a new fire station built for fire station 1. Our downtown area has been changing & to protect the downtown are we really need to start with a new station1. For this to work we need the fire station upgraded. It is very important for our fire department to be updated & if this is not done then I do not support going forward with this project
15. 296 Fire station 1 has been needing to be replaced for several years. Instead, the city has been putting band-aids on it and telling us it will be replaced. Anything less than replacement or major renovation would be unacceptable. The cities firefighters deserve more.
16. 307 Please prioritize your employees living space. Remodeling Fire Station 1 is a waste of time and money. It's past the point of remodel.

Project Cost

1. 27 All the options are too expensive. Don't put it downtown. Build where the land is cheaper (Soscol south). Maybe have a small office downtown for people to pay bills staffed with 10 or fewer people. Stop it with the over-use of technology. Be more realistic.
2. 44 So what are the cost break downs. A lot of cost estimates grow, and sometimes super grow. I have seen many cities start on a new city hall idea and idea turns into a financial . . . mess. Would Napa rather have a financial mess or have things like they are now. Why not consider thrifty second or third best options, compromise, save, save, save . . . It is hard to convince me the idea is good when I hear something close to " it would actually be cheaper to build a whole new building. I will be checking in on this project. James Cornish Georgia St Napa
3. 152 None of these questions are relevant. The overriding factor is the ridiculous COST. City government's insistence on locating the facility in downtown is ridiculous. Sell the downtown property for useful development and move to south Napa. Land in the industrial park or on Soscol is much cheaper.
4. 162 This survey is flawed in that one of the options is not to leave things as they are and update existing buildings. There is nothing wrong with buildings from the 1960s as long as they are

maintained. Most of us living Downtown live in homes that are much older than that and we love them. In addition, as a City resident I do not feel that customer service has ever been impacted by the fact that City buildings are spread throughout the City as I pay all my bills through the mail or online and rarely do I even need to access City services. Once again, this project entails spending money on a ""want"" versus as need when there should be more basic priorities, such as expanding the police force to deal with increasing violence, paving streets in residential areas and repairing sidewalks, regulating close proximity cell antennas, setting aside money for a legal fund, promoting economic development that benefits working people to address the underlying causes of increasing violence, etc."

5. 139 What are the cost differences between the options?
6. 31 "Of most importance is the financial impact and fiscal responsibility considerations with major debt service. Upon final location decision, should consider sale of City assets/properties to offset expense.
7. 111 "Can we afford it? Who is going to maintain the cutting edge tech? We can't cover what we have now
8. 55 Save save save [money]
9. 152 We do not need a landmark building. Stop trying to make one. Build something cheap and functional outside of downtown.
10. 162 Again, I do not think this project should be a priority at this time. I think other basic needs should be addressed first.
11. 218 Cutting edge technology is a broad and undefined term that could be a cost element associated with ongoing upkeep and dysfunction.
12. 261 The fire station and police department should be top priority. If moneys are short, trim city hall....city offices can rent alternative space that already exists.

Plaza

1. 139 How much of the space for City Hall is allocated for the "plaza" space?
2. 213 And, again, this plaza is less appealing with a parking lot on one edge and an exposed street
3. 172 consideration needs to be given to creating linkages to the downtown and community and use of the plaza for functional uses as well as public art and gathering space corner.
4. 184 All three options, the plaza and open space seems like an afterthought.
5. 213 I don't believe the plaza will be well-used unless there is a good reason to go there – food Without activated commercial surrounding it I'm not sure why anyone would populate it.
6. 221 What will the plaza be like? Will Napa residents be able to eat a bag lunch there?213 entertainment, family-friendly features (i.e. a working fountain).
7. 299 We're talking about City Hall, Police Department, and Fire Department. Why on earth does open space take a priority to function? Does a certain planning Department member have a stake in the ""artwork"" that will be required for all of this open space?

Sustainability

1. 161 Needs to meet needs and serve as example of sustainability. Should be net zero buildings with light (reflective surfaces).
2. 192 The most critical aspect for any public project is to have the buildings Zero net energy, minimize carbon in the building materials, solar PV that has storage and is island- able so it can be a operating

microgrid during emergencies. It is essential to have all public projects minimize the carbon and GHG impacts on our community. Also add more EV charging stations for the parking area.

3. 198 We need an environmentally sustainable the building which is all electric, solar and has options for micro grids.
4. 213 Regarding stormwater/ bioretention areas and CalGreen shade requirements - I would hope that the City is planning on adhering to, or exceeding, the BASMAA guidelines and green building/ sustainability standards that the rest of the design community is held to during any project approval process. This project is an opportunity to set an example for sustainability. In light of the climate change news, and given that our main industry in the Valley is dependent on climate, is this project being designed for zero energy buildings and carbon neutral?"

Community Spaces

1. 52 I don't think we need to emphasize public meeting space and community gathering spaces, other than Council Chambers and perhaps one community gathering room. The City has or can foster partnerships with other venues such as Napa Valley College where large public gatherings could take place. Training rooms in each building to accommodate groups of 30-50 people and multiple small conference rooms for staff meetings are a higher priority for me. We can use technology to provide info to the public while needing fewer face to face public meeting spaces.
2. 100 100% Non-Smoking Campus, More Restrooms than OSHA Requirements – especially for Women, In Public Area – Badge Access Required – Staff Use Only, Behind Badged Area – Staff Use Only
3. 142 Please consider the level of comfort for those attending City Hall meetings. If you have portable, stackable chairs will they be comfortable enough for many hours long hearings? You have more older people sitting in hearings than young ones. Please take this into account as you design the Council Chambers.
4. 162 I think providing a public space that groups can use for small group and large group meetings would be make this project a project that actually benefits the community and not just City employees.

Other

1. 246 I have been asking this for years- when will residents be able to pay their water bills online? Please modernize this and have payment options online. Every other bill that I receive can be paid online- please let residents pay online. Thank you
2. 264 Que los carteles y la información también este en español (That the posters and information are also in Spanish)