

Appendix A: Demographic Analysis of Equity Priority Communities

This Appendix includes the datasets used to determine and analyze the nine Equity Priority Communities included in this CBTP.

Equity Priority Communities and Key Demographic Factors

Table 1: Regionally Determined Equity Priority Communities

| EPC Demographic Factor | U.S. Census American Community Survey Data Tables | MTC Bay Area Regional Threshold* | South Downtown Napa – Census Tract 2002.02 | Southeast Napa Neighborhoods - Census Tract 2003.01 | Westwood Neighborhood - Census Tract 2008.04 | East Imola - Census Tract 2009 | Calistoga - Census Tract 2020 |
|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| People of Color | DP05 | 70% | 45% | 61% | 73% | 51% | 43% |
| Low-Income Residents (<200% of Federal Poverty Threshold) | C17002 | 28% | 26% | 31% | 22% | 100% | 18% |
| Limited English Proficiency | B16005 | 12% | 11% | 25% | 32% | 5% | 20% |
| Seniors 75 years and older | DP05 | 8% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 12% |
| Zero-Vehicle Households | B08201 | 15% | 7% | 8% | 1% | 75% | 4% |
| Single Parent Families | B11004 | 18% | 33% | 24% | 26% | 100% | 19% |
| People with a Disability | C18108 | 12% | 11% | 16% | 6% | 59% | 11% |
| Rent-Burdened Households | B25070 | 14% | 18% | 23% | 15% | 82% | 4% |

Sources: MTC Plan Bay Area 2050 Equity Priority Communities, <https://github.com/BayAreaMetro/Spatial-Analysis-Mapping-Projects>; U.S. Census American Community Survey Tables, 5-year data tables, 2018

Table 2: Locally Determined Equity Priority Communities

| EPC Demographic Factor | U.S. Census American Community Survey Data Tables | Napa County Average (2022 Data) | Pueblo Park – Census Tract 2007.04 | American Canyon - Census Tract 2010.04 | Unincorporated Yountville - Census Tract 2012 | South St. Helena - Census Tract 2016.01 |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| People of Color | DP05 | 50% | 53% | 85% | 41% | 39% |
| Low-Income Residents (<200% of Federal Poverty Threshold) | C17002 | 20% | 36% | 16% | 25% | 23% |
| Limited English Proficiency | B16005 | 15% | 28% | 20% | 17% | 12% |
| Seniors 75 years and older | DP05 | 9% | 12% | 6% | 13% | 12% |
| Zero-Vehicle Households | B08201 | 5% | 11% | 1% | 4% | 8% |
| Single Parent Families | B11004 | 22% | 23% | 25% | 15% | 25% |
| People with a Disability | C18108 | 12% | 14% | 12% | 18% | 12% |
| Rent-Burdened Households | B25070 | 24% | 19% | 33% | 18% | 28% |

Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey Tables, 5-year data tables, 2022

Appendix B: Community Engagement Summary



Napa Valley Transportation Authority Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Update Community Engagement Summary

I. Needs Assessment Overview

Between November 2024 and June 2025, consultant staff from MIG and emergent labs partnered with the Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) to gather community input for the Napa County Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP or Plan). The Plan will provide recommendations, including potential projects and programs, for how communities and transit agencies can help to improve access to transportation services and amenities, especially for residents more likely to use or need transit access, or those more likely to walk or bike. The Plan is focused on several key community areas across the county, identified by MTC and NVTA as “Equity Priority Communities,” those with high numbers of potential transit-dependent residents, or key jurisdictions where expanded transportation access and programs would benefit residents with limited means.

The purpose of this engagement was to understand the transportation needs and priorities of residents in nine Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). These areas have a significant concentration of underserved populations, like households with low incomes, people of color, and a combination of additional factors. Feedback was collected through a combination of in-person and virtual methods, including stakeholder interviews, community focus groups, pop-up events, briefing sessions, and a paper survey. These activities enabled the project team to hear directly from community members about their transportation challenges and suggestions for improvements to transportation services in their community. Participants were also asked to identify any unsafe locations and key destinations they travel to in their neighborhoods and community. Themes from the input are described in the summary below.

Much of this input was also geographically located onto a map of Napa County and Equity Priority Communities. This can be accessed at: bit.ly/4m4YPOB

A. Key Stakeholder Interviews

As a foundational step, the team identified and engaged key stakeholders from eight organizations that have direct relationships with residents living in Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). These organizations were selected for their trusted roles within the community and their deep understanding of local needs.

Through a series of one-on-one and small group interviews, stakeholders shared insights that helped the team better understand the broader context of community life as well as the specific transportation challenges faced by EPC residents. These conversations shaped our understanding of both everyday barriers and opportunities for improvement.

- The organizations interviewed included:
- Napa Valley Farmworker Foundation
- Puertas Abiertas (Open Doors)
- UpValley Family Centers
- Rianda House
- Molly's Angels
- Napa County Bike Coalition
- Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition
- Community Action of Napa Valley
- County of Napa Housing and Homelessness Services

The key stakeholder interviews provided a comprehensive view of the transportation challenges faced by Napa County's Equity Priority Communities.

- Stakeholders emphasized the lack of reliable and accessible public transit, especially in rural areas and around affordable housing, which isolates low-income residents, seniors, and farmworkers from essential destinations like medical services, food banks, and workplaces.
- Seniors face compounded barriers due to mobility limitations, technological inexperience, and a lack of door-to-door transportation.
- Farmworkers often depend on informal carpools and face long, fragmented commutes to remote vineyards, with few viable public options.
- Across groups, there were widespread concerns about pedestrian and cyclist safety, poor infrastructure, and limited Spanish-language information.
- Interviewees recommended expanding on-demand services, improving safety infrastructure, completing active transportation networks like the Vine Trail, and tailoring outreach to cultural and community-specific contexts to ensure that solutions are inclusive and effective.

B. Engaging Directly with Community Members

Senior Centers, Mobile Home Communities, Bilingualism

Stakeholders recommended engaging community members through trusted, informal, and culturally responsive approaches. For seniors, they suggested outreach during regular

gatherings like lunches at senior centers or mobile home communities, using word-of-mouth and family referrals rather than digital outreach, and providing bilingual or Spanish-only sessions. Across all groups, stakeholders emphasized offering incentives, hosting activities at familiar community hubs like churches and resource centers, and ensuring materials and events are accessible in both English and Spanish to effectively reach underserved and hard-to-reach populations.

To initiate the engagement process, we developed large-format posters featuring detailed maps of each Equity Priority Community (EPC), accompanied by key questions such as: “*What is most frustrating about transportation in your area?*” and “*What ideas do you have for improving mobility?*” We also created a survey designed to gather more in-depth information about residents’ transit and mobility habits.

With these materials prepared, we reached out to a range of community settings to ensure broad participation. This included outreach to community-based organizations, affordable housing complexes, senior housing developments, and mobile home communities.

- Molly's Angels - Volunteer Drivers (virtual focus group)
- Las Casitas Mobile Home Community – American Canyon
- La Pradera Apartments - Calistoga
- Calistoga Springs Mobile Home Park- Calistoga (survey distribution)
- Silverado Pines Mobile Home Park - Napa
- River Trail Student Housing at Napa Valley Community College - Napa
- Rohlf's Manor - Napa
- Rianda House - Lunch & Learn – St. Helena
- Pop up and Intercepts - Soscol Gateway Transit Center - Napa
- Napa County South Homeless Shelter - Napa
- Stoddard West Apartments (Burbank Housing) - Napa
- Napa Valley College Career Fair – Napa

In addition, comments from outreach conducted for the NVRTA’s Active Transportation Plan that were relevant to the EPCs were integrated into this report in order to help coordinate all transportation planning efforts throughout the EPC areas.

II. Key Findings

Participants provided comments at events, through the survey and across a multitude of transportation needs and issues. The team organized these across Infrastructure categories.

C. Infrastructure and Service Improvements

Community feedback collected between November 2024 and June 2025 revealed a range of infrastructure and service needs across Napa County's Equity Priority Communities. Residents and stakeholders offered targeted recommendations to address longstanding barriers to mobility, emphasizing both physical improvements and service enhancements that would better support everyday travel.

Pedestrian Infrastructure

Sidewalk and Trail Repairs, Traffic Calming, and Visible Street Crossings

Improving conditions for people walking was another prominent theme, with 63 comments focused on sidewalk and trail repairs, crosswalk enhancements, and general pedestrian safety. Many sidewalks were described as incomplete, damaged, or inaccessible, particularly for individuals using mobility devices or strollers. Specific areas such as Main Street, Spring Street, and neighborhoods near schools were identified as needing immediate attention.

Residents also requested more visible and protected crosswalks, better lighting, and traffic calming near high-traffic intersections. The goal of these improvements is to promote safe walking routes to transit stops, schools, and local businesses, especially for seniors, youth, and people with disabilities.

Suggested Locations for Pedestrian Safety Infrastructure Improvements

- Improve Vine Trail access and connectivity with east-west routes into neighborhoods along the trail. Add crosswalk or bridge enhancements at the Vine Trail intersections such as Solano Avenue and just south of Darms Lane (provide separate bike and pedestrian bridges where bike lanes are discontinuous and use only a narrow portion of the bridge); repaving at the segment of the Trail behind the North Napa homeless shelter; and add lighting to the trail bridge segment over Highway 29, also near the shelter.
- Missing sidewalks, crosswalks and bus shelters near bus stops along Hwy 29 in Calistoga, American Canyon, and at Rutherford Road make it unsafe for seniors or individuals with mobility challenges
- Lack of sidewalks on Gasser Drive in Napa is an issue
- Additional safe crosswalks needed along Hwy 29 near schools (American Canyon); in downtown Napa on Seminary across uncontrolled traffic at 1st/2nd/3rd/Oak Street; on Lincoln at its intersection with Brannan Streets, near Fair Way near CalMart; at West Pueblo and Thomas Drive near Pueblo Market; at Linda Vista connecting to Kathleen and

Sutherland Drive; near Soscol and Adobe Lane (widen road as well): and other destinations

- To walk to and from the South Napa Marketplace (with Target, Raley's, Home Depot, etc.), residents must take a longer, circuitous path with long wait times at lights instead of a more direct route with only one crosswalk and light.
- Expand safe routes to school for pedestrians along Hwy 29
- Additional crossing time needed for seniors in crosswalks along 29 (American Canyon)
- Address dangerous street crossings for seniors, such as along Redwood Road, Napa, to reach bus stop; many avoid public transit due to safety concerns
- Address dangerous intersection for pedestrians at Soscol Avenue and Silverado Trail – without a crosswalk, pedestrian access to transit is limited on 121 (Napa)
- Provide infrastructure to slow traffic and/or make crosswalk safer/easier for cars to spot on Third Street between Brown Street and Main Street, and on Hartle Court in Napa
- Foothill Boulevard is identified as a Safe Route to School but vehicles speed 10-15 miles above the speed limit; need traffic calming measures
- Uneven pavement and missing sidewalks in Calistoga and in rural communities; there are many sidewalk gaps (on both the north and south sides) of West Pueblo Ave that require pedestrians to walk into the street. These gaps need to be closed, especially considering this is a busy street with lots of passthrough traffic
- There are sidewalk gaps on Solano Ave between Euclid and the 2755 Solano Ave property address; near the shopping center by Lone Oak Ave and Lincoln Ave; and on Shurtleff between Imola and Wyatt for the safety of children going to school
- Improve and expand sidewalks in St. Helena, especially near schools and parks; many areas lack sidewalks or have uneven or damaged sidewalks, including El Bonita Avenue; provide pedestrian safety improvements along Spring St; and south of Grayson Avenue to the city limits
- Add lighting or indicators to crosswalks to enhance visibility during foggy or dark conditions (Napa); improve lighting on Washington Street which is dark at night
- Fix or add flashing crosswalk beacon on Broadway near Las Casitas (American Canyon)
- Create new pedestrian / bike routes or zones in area formerly occupied by Mount St. Helena golf course; flat, shaded path adjacent to unshaded, hilly Imola Boulevard Bridge near River Park Shopping Center; on Crane and Sulphur Springs where people walk and bike on dirt shoulders; and at Pine Drive/Juniper Circle

Bicycle Infrastructure

Separation from Traffic, Signage, Bike Parking

There were 62 comments focused on the need for safer and more connected bike infrastructure. Residents described key corridors as challenging or unsafe for bicyclists, citing narrow lanes, high-speed traffic, and intersections that lack bike-friendly signaling. In particular, locations like Soscol Avenue, Hudson Avenue, Allyn Avenue, Trancas Street, Jefferson Street, and the S-curve on Pope Street were highlighted for their risks.

Suggestions included the addition of dedicated bike lanes, improved bike signage, and traffic separation measures. Some participants also requested more secure bike parking at key destinations such as schools, shopping centers, and transit hubs to support multimodal travel. The County was also urged to install showers at offices to further encourage workers to bike to work.

Accessible Bicycle and Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

Community-based organizations working with low-income residents, including the farmworker community, advocated for the introduction of accessible bicycle and electric vehicle infrastructure and programs, including an e-bike share program, EV charging stations at farmworker centers and affordable housing complexes, and prioritization of bike-friendly design in new housing projects and urban developments, as well as retrofits of existing housing bicycle storage for diverse bike types.

Suggested Locations for Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements

- Improve Vine Trail access and connectivity with east-west routes into neighborhoods along the trail. Add crossings (lighted / signalized at busy intersection) or bridge enhancements at the Vine Trail intersections such as Solano Avenue and just south of Darms Lane (provide separate bike and pedestrian bridges where bike lanes are discontinuous and use only a narrow portion of the bridge); remove fence to create an easy bike route through Napa Riverfront Green; and improve the dirt path so bikers don't have to cross and ride streets from Imola along Gasser Drive to Hartle
- Remove obstructions on Vine Trail, including overly thick paint of 25 stripes south of Carrell Lane, steel posts in the middle of trail (at Hoffman Lane and other crossings); and remove or trim trees on east side and immediately north and south of bridges south of Hoffman that block visibility for bikers.
- Remove high spots resulting from tree roots next to Vine Trail just south of Ragatz Lane and then repave
- Complete remaining segments of the Vine Trail

- Repave section of Vine Trail behind the North Napa Homeless Center at 3330 Solano Ave (between Solano and California Boulevard)
- Additional safe crossings needed in downtown Napa on Seminary across uncontrolled traffic at 1st/2nd/3rd/Oak Street; along Lincoln at its intersection with Brannan Streets, near Fair Way near CalMart in Calistoga
- Expand e-bike share program in Calistoga and St. Helena to support mobility among residents without vehicles
- Expand bike parking in St. Helena
- Provide bike routes along Hudson and Allyn Aves, a bike lane connector along Sulphur Springs Road in St. Helena, and bike routes through the former site of Mount St. Helena golf course
- Provide designated bike lanes on Washington St. (in Calistoga) especially for safer biking to school; and at First Street and Highway 29
- Create bike facilities to make backroads near SR 29, such as Valley View Street, safer for young bicyclists during busy school arrival hours; and at Pine Drive / Juniper Circle
- Coombesville Road between Terrace Drive and 121 is too narrow for cyclists, especially during school pickups; need bike lane
- Provide bike path with green bike crosswalks from Police Dept. parking lot north bound through St. Helena to entrance of existing bike path
- Provide a dedicated bike route from Napa to American Canyon without need to ride on highway shoulder
- Improve bike facilities on Pope Street bridge in St. Helena for better sight lines
- Bike safety improvements on Jefferson Street in central Napa; on Silverado Trail; on Soscol Avenue (including smoothing crossing over train tracks at Third Street, widening road, adding crosswalks)
- Green bike crosswalks needed off Yountville Cross Road onto Finnel; T junction at Solano Avenue and Orchard Avenue; at light by R&D Kitchen (Madison Street between Highway 29 and Washington).
- Improve or add paving for bicycle safety on Third Street in Napa; and in Calistoga all along Washington Street, on Fair Way between Lincoln Ave and Lake Street, and on Grant Street
- Many stop signs on Seminary Street make it difficult to cross 1st/2nd/3rd/Oak Street on a bike

Roadway Infrastructure

There were 59 comments focused on general roadway improvements, including pavement maintenance, speed reduction measures, and reconfiguration of unsafe intersections.. These requests were typically paired with safety concerns or service needs, such as poor road conditions making bus travel uncomfortable or dangerous, or lack of sufficient notice being given for road work / construction.

Suggested Locations for Roadway improvements

- Improve lighting along streets and near crosswalks such as Jefferson in Napa which have low visibility at night or during foggy conditions, or on Washington Street which is dark at night
- Low visibility intersection on Pope Street makes it unsafe to turn left (St. Helena)
- Repair potholes on Silverado Trail; on Highway 29; streets around the Geyser; near the high school in St. Helena; and along Sousa Lane (Napa)
- Address speeding traffic, alert drivers to watch for pedestrians near intersection of Soscol and Silverado Trail
- Add traffic calming measures or infrastructure to help eliminate speeding along Foothill Boulevard in Calistoga (identified as a Safe Route to School)
- Traffic signal needed at Wappo Avenue where it meets Lincoln Avenue in Calistoga
- Improve traffic flow on Hwy 29 near airport intersection
- Create solution for S-shaped curve near North Shelter in Napa on Solano Avenue decreases visibility for drivers pulling out of shopping centers / driveways
- Address speeding traffic, make crosswalks safer/easier for cars to see on 3rd Street between Brown and Main Street in Napa, Hartle Street, along Soscol, Imola, and Jefferson
- Disallow left turn across lanes of Soscol Avenue in Southeast Napa at Sousa Lane to cut down on 10-15 minute wait time during afternoon rush
- Increase enforcement or add infrastructure to stop drivers from disobeying “no turn on red” sign at Highway 128 (Foothill Blvd.) and Petrified Forest Road in Calistoga.
- Address gas-station cut-through on southeast corner of Solano and Redwood used to avoid red light restrictions. Increasing vehicle vs. bike/ped conflicts at a high foot-traffic intersection near the Vine Trail, a shopping center, and the Redwood Park & Ride
- Move food cart from the CalMart side of Lincoln at Fair Way where it creates a blind spot for drivers making it difficult to see pedestrian crossings (same 20 foot law should apply as for parked cars)
- Sweep street more often on Highway 221 between Streblow and Kaiser, used by bicyclists to connect to bike trail, to remove gravel and debris

Transit System Improvements

Gaps in Service and Coverage; Infrastructure Improvements

The most frequently cited area of need was transit service enhancements, with 110 comments identifying gaps or barriers in current operations. Residents expressed a strong desire for more frequent and reliable service, particularly during evenings and weekends. Many emphasized the limited hours of service, making it difficult for shift workers, seniors, and students to access jobs, health appointments, and social services outside of typical daytime windows. There were also several requests for improvements to bus stops including more shade and trash containers, shelters at all stops, and better maintenance / improved cleaning. Finally, there were several comments regarding the need to ensure that bus equipment, such as stop request cords, work properly.

Rural and Farmworker Connections, Microtransit

There were repeated requests for expanded service coverage in rural and underserved areas, such as Pope Valley, Calistoga, and farmworker housing centers. Community members also highlighted the need for better connections between towns and their shuttle services and to key destinations such as hospitals, food banks, and shopping centers. Some comments proposed microtransit or shuttle options to address last-mile gaps and improve access for residents without personal vehicles.

Suggested Locations for Transit Service Improvements

- Provide bus shelters and locate stops near intersections with safe crossing points along Hwy 29
- Bus stops located closer together in many locations such as Trancas/Soscol
- Bus stops and benches needed along Redwood Road and Linda Vista (Pueblo Park, Napa)
- Additional bus stops closer to senior housing (such as on Baywood)
- Make bus stop near residence at Napa Valley College usable so residents don't have to walk an extra half-mile to the stop on campus by the parking lot (note: location of unusable stop not clearly defined)
- Wasp's nest at southbound bus stop on the corner of Magnolia Drive at Hwy 221 dissuades Napa Valley College student residents from using it, requiring them to walk an additional half-mile to the stop on campus by the parking lot
- More service to retail destinations (Pueblo Park, Napa), and more routes to Sonoma County destinations including Santa Rosa and Sonoma Plaza

- Provide transit connections / on-demand service to Santa Rosa (destinations including Kaiser medical facilities, Sonoma County Airport)
- Expand on-demand services in City of Napa
- Offer Sunday service on local City of Napa routes (A-G)
- Offer weekend service on Route 21
- Offer service on Route 29 seven days a week
- Reinstate school bus service such as that which used to be offered by the school district
- Develop alternative service options to provide services to seniors who live in residential areas with narrow streets (Napa, Meadows Senior Living)
- Increased bus or shuttle services (including on-demand service) for remote communities like Calistoga, Pope Valley, Angwin, and St. Helena
- Need transit or TNC service (Uber/Lyft) in Angwin (lack of cell reception is a barrier to drivers)
- Provide transit options to get to St. Helena Hospital
- Provide a bus route on Silverado Trail to serve commute needs of winery workers
- Express service from Calistoga and neighboring communities to BART station
- Better connectivity / schedule coordination between NVTA and other regional transit providers like Sonoma County Transit and the Vallejo ferry

These infrastructure and service recommendations reflect a broader community vision for a more equitable and connected transportation system—one that reduces isolation, increases mobility choices, and responds to the diverse needs of Napa County’s priority communities.

D. Community Safety Concerns

Safety emerged as a central concern across many comments collected from Equity Priority Communities during the CBTP outreach process. Residents shared specific challenges they face while walking, biking, or using transit, often linking safety with broader issues of accessibility and infrastructure design. These concerns reflect both physical hazards and broader conditions that impact personal well-being and community mobility. Improvements related to these needs are listed above under infrastructure.

Pedestrian Safety

Sidewalk Gaps, Needed Crosswalk, Difficulty Walking at Night

The most frequently cited safety issue—mentioned in 70 comments—was pedestrian safety. Community members described hazardous walking conditions caused by incomplete sidewalks, poor lighting, and lack of crosswalks at busy or high-speed roads. Intersections near schools, transit stops, and downtown areas near main arterial streets were identified as particularly

dangerous, where vehicles often fail to yield or where crossings are inadequately marked. Residents expressed fear of walking at night or sending children to school due to these risks.

In areas like Spring Street and Main Street, residents called for improved pedestrian visibility, traffic calming measures, and more designated safe crossings. The feedback emphasized that improving pedestrian safety isn't just about infrastructure—it's about ensuring that people feel safe and confident walking in their neighborhoods.

Bicycle Safety

Bike Lanes, Speeding, and Intersection Challenges

Bicyclists also voiced strong safety concerns, with 53 comments highlighting the lack of bike lanes, high vehicle speeds, poorly designed intersections, and debris in bike lanes. Key corridors such as Soscol Avenue, Hudson Avenue, Allyn Avenue, Trancas Street, Jefferson Street, and Pope Street were described as intimidating and unsafe for riders due to narrow lanes, blind curves, and the absence of physical protection from traffic.

Protected Bike Lanes, Signage

Cyclists reported feeling vulnerable on roads that are shared with fast-moving cars, and many suggested the need for dedicated bike lanes, buffered shoulders, and bike-prioritized signage. Several comments noted that improving bike infrastructure would not only increase safety but also support a healthier, more environmentally friendly transportation option for all ages.

Personal and Property Safety

Fear of Walking and Riding Transit

Beyond physical infrastructure, 9 comments raised concerns about personal safety and crime, particularly around transit stops and in areas with poor lighting, or areas with many unhoused individuals. Residents expressed fears about harassment, theft, and general vulnerability while waiting for or walking to transit. This was especially noted by seniors and women, who described feeling unsafe in poorly monitored public spaces.

Emergency Infrastructure

Suggested improvements included better lighting, emergency call boxes, and more visible community presence or patrolling near key transit access points. These changes, according to community feedback, would make public transportation a more viable option for people who currently avoid it due to safety concerns.

Other Safety Concerns

A few comments (8 total) pointed to miscellaneous or location-specific hazards, such as dangerous S-curves, lack of shoulder space, or unsafe driveways or curb cuts. These “other” safety issues often intersected with broader themes of infrastructure maintenance and road design, particularly in rural or hillside areas.

These concerns underscore a clear need for comprehensive safety planning in Napa County’s transportation system. Solutions must proactively address the lived experiences of residents—ensuring safe and comfortable access for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders alike. These insights should inform project prioritization and help guide targeted investments in both infrastructure and community safety initiatives.

E. Affordability and Cost Barriers

While not the most frequently mentioned theme, affordability and the cost of transportation services surfaced as a significant barrier for many residents in Napa County’s Equity Priority Communities. In 12 community comments, participants described how financial constraints limit their mobility and access to essential destinations such as work, school, medical appointments, and social services.

Transit Fare Costs

Transit is Disproportionately Burdensome for EPC Communities

One of the most common concerns was the cost of using public transit, particularly for families with multiple riders, low-income individuals, seniors on fixed incomes, the unhoused, and undocumented residents who may lack access to transportation subsidies. Community members noted that even modest fare costs add up quickly, especially for people making multiple trips per day or traveling long distances across the county.

Several participants suggested the need for or better promotion of fare-free or reduced-fare programs, especially for priority populations such as:

- Youth and students
- Seniors
- Farmworkers
- People with disabilities
- Residents in rural or underserved areas
- Unhoused persons

Inter-Agency Fare Confusion

There were also mentions of inconsistencies between transit agencies in fare structures and payment systems, which create confusion and additional financial burden for riders who must transfer between services.

Indirect Transportation Costs

Beyond fares, residents pointed to indirect costs that make accessing transportation unaffordable. For example, when transit service is infrequent or unreliable, individuals are often forced to:

- Pay for taxis or ride-shares, which are expensive and not always available in rural areas.
- Miss work or appointments, resulting in financial penalties or lost income.
- Depend on family or neighbors for rides, placing strain on social networks and reducing independence.

Some residents shared experiences of walking long distances or skipping essential trips altogether due to cost concerns, reinforcing the inequities faced by those without access to a personal vehicle.

Geographic Inequities and Rural Impacts

Isolation, Missing Opportunities

Affordability barriers are especially acute in rural areas such as Pope Valley and outer Calistoga, where transit options are limited or nonexistent. Without reliable and affordable transportation, residents in these communities face greater isolation and fewer opportunities for employment, healthcare, education, and social connection.

Participants called for more equitable investment in rural transit service that accounts for both the geographic and economic isolation of these areas.

Together, these insights highlight the urgent need to address financial barriers to mobility as part of Napa County's transportation planning. Reducing or eliminating transit costs, simplifying fare structures, and improving service reliability would provide meaningful relief for residents struggling with affordability—and ensure that all community members can access the opportunities they need to thrive.

F. Informational, Promotional, and Awareness-Building Needs

Throughout the community engagement process, residents from Napa County's Equity Priority Communities expressed a consistent need for better information, communication, and visibility around existing transportation services. These comments revealed that a lack of awareness—not just a lack of service—can be a significant barrier to mobility, particularly for populations who rely most on public transportation.

Low Awareness of Available Services

Gap in Transit Awareness Impacts Ridership

Many community members reported that they were unaware of current transit routes, schedules, or available programs, even when services existed nearby. This was especially true in rural or linguistically isolated communities, where information often fails to reach residents in clear, accessible, and culturally relevant ways. Some participants mentioned discovering services only through word-of-mouth or by chance, indicating missed opportunities for outreach. Community members also noted that information available on local transit apps such as Ride the Vine is not always accurate.

This gap in awareness creates a disconnect between transit supply and community need—residents may not use transit not because it’s unavailable, but because they simply don’t know how to access it or don’t trust that it will reliably meet their needs.

Need for Multilingual and Culturally Relevant Materials

Spanish Language Promotional Campaign

Several comments emphasized the importance of providing transportation information in multiple languages, particularly Spanish, to better reach immigrant and farmworker communities. Participants called for materials that go beyond translation to incorporate visual aids, plain language, and trusted community messengers who can help explain how to navigate the system.

Outreach strategies should be tailored to audience preferences, including:

- Printed materials at libraries, clinics, churches, community centers, and through employers
- Announcements on local Spanish-language radio and social media platforms
- Direct outreach through schools, senior centers, service organizations, community-based organizations, “promotora” networks, and other trusted messengers
- Connections through children as conduits to parents and caregivers

Simplified and Centralized Information

Mobility Hub, Transit Tutoring

There were also calls for simplifying transit information and offering centralized resources where people can easily find real-time updates, trip planning tools, and eligibility for fare discounts. Some participants suggested a countywide mobility hub or call center that could

provide personalized assistance—particularly helpful for seniors, non-English speakers, and first-time riders.

Residents highlighted the need for information on:

- How to plan trips across multiple services
- Understanding regional connections to the broader Bay Area region
- Fare structures and discount programs
- Where and how to access services such as on-demand shuttles or paratransit
- Changes to routes or schedules

Promotional Campaigns to Build Trust and Familiarity

Innovative Ways to Promote

In addition to informational needs, participants called for proactive promotional campaigns to build confidence in transit and normalize its use across different demographics. Some suggestions included:

- Highlighting success stories of real riders
- Creating videos or social media reels/short videos
- Providing orientation sessions for seniors or students
- Offering “try transit” days or free-ride promotions to attract new users

Promotional efforts should also address misconceptions about who transit is for and reframe public transportation as a safe, reliable, and inclusive option for everyone.

These comments underscore the critical role that communication and outreach play in equitable transportation planning. Even the best-designed systems cannot succeed if people don’t know about them, don’t understand how to use them, or don’t believe they are for them. Addressing these informational gaps is essential for building a transportation system that is both accessible and trusted by the communities it aims to serve.

Awareness of Safe Bicycling Options

In addition to encouraging transit as an inclusive option for all, community events like Ciclovía (open streets), collaboration with promoters and community leaders, and community organizations such as schools, churches, and workplaces can help promote bicycle use within low-income and Latino communities.



Napa Valley Transportation Authority Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Update Community Engagement Summary Appendix A: Summary of Key Stakeholder Interviews

I. Introduction and Methodology

A. Introduction

MIG, Inc. conducted seven interviews with key stakeholders to inform the Napa Valley Transportation Authority's (NVTA) Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) 2025 Update. The CBTP focuses on identifying strategies to improve mobility and transportation access for historically underserved communities with a high percentage of low-income residents, people of color, residents with limited English proficiency, seniors and persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable populations, many of whom are transit-dependent. In order to create a plan to equitably engage those most historically underserved and most impacted by transportation and mobility barriers, MIG interviewed the following representatives from organizations which serve communities in these areas, or who advocate for improved transportation options (listed by their constituent audience):

- **Low-Income, Rural, Homeless and Other Vulnerable Populations**
 - Jennifer Palmer (Director of Housing and Homeless Services), Brandee Freitas (Staff Services Manager), Emma Moyer (Staff Services Manager), and Alex Carrasco (Housing and Homeless Program Analyst), Napa County Housing and Homeless Services
 - Drene Johnson, Executive Director, Community Action of Napa Valley
- **Farmworkers**
 - Sonya DeLuca, CEO/Executive Director, Napa Valley Farmworker Foundation
- **Seniors**
 - Devereaux Smith (Executive Director), Jill Jorgensen (Deputy Director), Terry Lynn (Volunteer Coordinator), Marlen De La Cruz (Spanish Program Manager), Molly's Angels
 - Amanda Cole, Program Director, Rianda House, St. Helena
 - Dora Vega-Leija, Senior Services Case Manager, UpValley Family Centers
- **Active Transportation Users**
 - Chuck McMinn, Founder and Board President, Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition
 - Kara Vernor, Executive Director, and members of the Advocacy Working Group, Napa County Bike Coalition

MIG is pursuing further interviews with several other organizations serving relevant populations, and results from those interviews will be added to this summary as they are completed.

B. Interview Methodology

Interviews were conducted via Zoom and were one half-hour in length. Interview subjects were provided with a brief presentation on the purpose and process for the CBTP update and asked to respond to the following questions:

Tell Us About Yourself and Your Organization

1. Please tell us about yourself and your organization. What is its mission, and who are the communities or individuals you serve?

Key Transportation Needs, Issues and Opportunities

2. What are the key transportation needs of the community members you serve? Where do they need to go?
3. What are the main challenges or barriers that prevent people from reaching where they need to be?
4. What solutions would you propose to have the most impact on improving the mobility of these community members, particularly within Napa County?
5. Are there any specific safety-related concerns related to transportation you can identify? (e.g., bike/pedestrian safety, collision prevention, etc.)
6. What can we do to encourage more active modes of transportation?

Community Outreach

7. MIG has a range of community engagement strategies and methods for engaging the community members you serve. Are there specific events or locations that would work well to attract people and to engage them in a discussion about their transportation needs and priorities? Do you have any suggestions for how we might reach the “hard-to-reach” community groups?
8. Do you have any questions for us?

II. Summary of Community Feedback Organized by Major Themes

Input provided during the interviews is summarized below by theme.

A. Transportation Needs, Issues, and Challenges

A1. Limited public transportation options, especially in rural areas and areas with a large concentration of affordable housing (including mobile home parks), with limited routes directly to essential destinations such as medical appointments, needed service such as food banks or social services appointments, or to major employers and/or remote work sites. Reaching these destinations via transit frequently requires long wait times and complex routes with multiple transfers. New affordable housing is frequently built in areas with limited transit options. The cost of transportation can also be a barrier to the many low-income residents in these areas. Many also have safety concerns (e.g., behavior and environments), or issues with comfortable seating on public transit. These issues affect seniors, workers, low-income and homeless families, and children traveling to school.

A2. Napa’s geography makes transportation a critical issue, especially in rural areas in the County. In those areas, **winding roads and hills, often lacking sufficient lighting**, leads many to avoid driving at night or in poor weather.

A3. Specific Challenges for Seniors and the Disabled

A3.1. Lack of door-to-door transportation caused by limited schedules and scheduling restrictions for on-demand transportation and paratransit such as VineGo. This is especially needed to get from rural areas and places where many seniors live, such as mobile home communities, to major destinations both within and beyond Napa County for medical appointments, shopping, government services, and social or recreational activities. These transportation services can also be unreliable due to volunteer driver shortages. Many users of social services such as food banks rely on volunteers for transportation. Existing services (e.g., Molly’s Angels) would like to expand their offerings but are restricted by these challenges.

- A3.2 Community needs often are not located to be convenient to travel** (e.g., a central Safeway location recently closed), which impacts seniors' and others' access to those needs.
- A3.3. Mobility limitations / use of mobility aids** create difficulty or inability to travel even short distances, creating even greater **need for door-to-door, on-demand transportation and improved infrastructure** such as better sidewalks and improved lighting. Ensuring that **transportation services and surrounding infrastructure are accessible** and safe for those with limited mobility is essential. The fact that many seniors live alone, lacking immediate support for mobility and transportation needs, exacerbates these challenges.
- A3.4.** Many **seniors lack technological comfort or knowledge** in using smart phones, accessing apps, and navigating digital systems, making it difficult for them to get information on transit routes.
- A3.5.** Lack of information translated into Spanish is an additional barrier for seniors who are not proficient in English.

A4. Specific Challenges for Farmworkers

- A4.1. Dependency on Carpools / Shared Vehicles:** The expenses of owning a vehicle (including insurance and licenses) are a barrier to vehicle ownership. Most rely on informal carpools, which are sometimes unreliable as they often consist of a single vehicle driver supporting multiple families or crew members. This is made more difficult by the need to juggle shared vehicles for work, school, and family needs.
- A4.2. Lack of Transit Serving Commuting Needs:** Their commutes to work often involve non-linear travel to remote vineyards which are not served by public transportation. Many travel long distances from places such as Solano County, Fairfield, Vallejo, and even Stockton.
 - A4.2.a.** Transit route information is not always available in Spanish, presenting an additional barrier to using public transit for commuting to work.
- A4.3. Lack of Safe Walking / Biking Access:** Although the Vine Trail provides some safe walking / biking access to town for farmworkers at the Calistoga Farm Workers Housing Center, similar infrastructure is needed near other farmworker housing centers.
- A4.4. Transportation Challenges for Farmworker Employers:** This also presents a challenge also for major employers (vineyard management companies and farm labor contractors), who have difficulty in coordinating crews with limited transport options, but are required by OSHA regulations to provide transportation. Many are experimenting with split shifts and flexible work hours to accommodate working parents, especially as more women enter the vineyard workforce (an estimated 30-40% are women).

A5. Issues Related to Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel

- A5.1.** These are a particular challenge for seniors, children travelling to school, and workers accessing remote employment sites and include:
 - A5.1.a.** Many areas, particularly rural areas, either lack sidewalks or have sidewalks that are uneven or damaged; there are also poor road conditions (e.g., El Bonita and Magnolia neighborhoods in St. Helena).
 - A5.1.b.** There is **insufficient lighting** on many paths (e.g., the Vine Trail and other class 1 paths, town of Calistoga).
 - A5.1.c.** Areas close to the Vine Trail have higher percentages of minority and economically disadvantaged residents, making it important to complete the trail as a safer alternative for bicyclists and pedestrians in these areas. **Lack of safe connectivity**, including recent accidents at unsafe highway crossings, highlight the need for improved safety measures, particularly along Highway 29 (in St. Helena and other communities) and major arterial roads such as Jefferson and Trancas. However, acquiring the necessary easements to complete the trail has been a challenge.

A5.2. Barriers to bicycle use include:

A5.2.a. Parents, particularly Latino families and millennial parents, support biking to school but are deterred by **concerns and misconceptions about bicycle safety**. This is especially true for schools in St. Helena and areas requiring crossing highways. **Cultural barriers** such as car culture also lead to underuse of bikes.

A5.2.b. Multifamily Housing Challenges: Existing bike rooms in multifamily housing are poorly designed, with a lack of electrical outlets for e-bike charging, insufficient security features, and inadequate space for larger bikes like trikes and cargo bikes.

A6. General Transportation Infrastructure Issues

B4.1 Potholes cause damage to vehicles, which imposes financial burdens and makes transportation more difficult for low-income families and community members.

B4.2 Many crosswalks without lights have low visibility, especially in foggy or dark conditions (see A7.1.f for specific location identified).

A7. Issues Identified at Specific Locations

A7.1. Interview subjects identified some specific locations with transportation issues. Note that locations specified may not lie within the EPCAs selected for inclusion in the CBTP, but may be nearby and likely affect residents within the EPCAs.

A7.1.a. American Canyon: Identified as an underserved area, particularly in its northern neighborhoods where new affordable housing complexes (e.g., for veterans and seniors) have recently opened. Issues include limited bus service and unsafe pedestrian crossings over Highway 29.

A7.1.b. Highway 29: Acts as a major barrier for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly in American Canyon. Concerns include safety risks for school children crossing the highway and limited infrastructure for safe walking or biking.

A7.1.c. Southeast Neighborhood in Napa: Encompasses an emergency shelter serving individuals experiencing homelessness. Transportation needs include improved bus routes and access to services.

A7.1.d. Food Bank Locations: Mentioned as challenging to access for low-income and elderly populations due to long and complex bus routes requiring multiple transfers.

A7.1.e. Farmworker Centers on Silverado Trail: Includes River Ranch and Mondavi Center, which lack public transit options or safe bike paths such as the provided to the Calistoga Farm Worker Center by the Vine Trail.

A7.1.f. Jefferson Street from Old Sonoma Road to Lincoln Avenue: crosswalks without lights or indicators have low visibility, especially in foggy or dark conditions.

B. Proposed Solutions

B1. Improvements for Paratransit and On-Demand Transportation

B1.1. Extend paratransit hours beyond 6 PM, returning to previous 9 PM operations.

B1.2. Explore on-demand transport as a potential solution to better serve the needs of seniors, the disabled, and low-income residents, particularly for medical appointments and errands, which would allow users to call for transportation without relying solely on fixed bus routes. This could include on-demand shuttle services, pilot programs for subsidized transportation services like Uber or Lyft for essential trips (e.g., to food banks or medical appointments), or lower-cost transportation options that might be more reliable.

B1.2.a. Expand volunteer on-demand transportation networks with paid incentives or stipends. Develop an on-call substitute driver list for these volunteer networks, with advance scheduling options to aid those needing rides for medical appointments or other critical needs. Consider collaborating with retirement communities and other local groups to recruit volunteers willing to provide rides for modest compensation.

B1.3. Establish a **centralized phone number** for assistance with transportation planning and coordination.

B1.4. Improve **awareness and accessibility** of services like VineGo.

B1.5. **Expand bus service hours and routes**, particularly for certain days/hours, to improve access to key destinations, offering a more flexible, cost-effective solution to meet the transportation needs of seniors, low-income residents, and other lacking mobility options. This could involve a part-time or on-demand service to locations like Santa Rosa and Napa.

B1.6. Increase the availability of **Spanish-language informational resources**.

B2. Improve and Promote Active (Pedestrian and Bicycle) and Alternative Transportation Modes

B2.1. **Improve sidewalk walkability and safety**, especially in areas such as Calistoga, where uneven pavement and lack of sidewalks in some areas create hazards for residents, particularly for those with mobility impairments, walking to bus stops or local stores.

B2.2. **Expand safe routes and introduce safe crossings** on highways and busy streets for biking and walking, especially near schools and highways, such as areas like Highway 29 (e.g., American Canyon where schools are located on opposite sides of the highway).

B2.3. **Emphasize continuity and connectivity in trail design**, including connectors for east-west routes to connect neighborhoods to major north-south routes such as the Vine Trail. Funding remains a barrier and substantial investment is needed for expanding routes this trail. Data and demographic metrics demonstrate the need for safe and accessible routes, especially for students traveling to school.

B2.3.a. This includes completing remaining segments of the Vine Trail to better connect underserved communities: South Napa to American Canyon, Calistoga to St. Helena. There are significant gaps in funding for this work.

B2.4 Active Transportation or EV Infrastructure improvements

B2.4.a. Advocate for and introduce **electric vehicle (EV) and bicycle infrastructure**, including accessible EV charging stations at farmworker centers and affordable housing complexes, to help low-income residents transition to electric vehicles. Integrate e-bike infrastructure into long-term plans, especially on major roads.

B2.4.b. Prioritize **bike-friendly design** in new housing projects and urban developments and retrofit existing housing bike rooms to include secure, electrified storage and larger spaces for diverse bike types.

B2.5. Safety Education to improve road safety, including:

B2.5.a. **Vision Zero Initiatives** with a focus on preventing pedestrian and cyclist accidents.

B2.5.b. **Programs (such as Safe Routes to School)** to encourage and educate students and adults to safely walk and/or bike (via regular or e-bike) to destinations, addressing the risks associated with biking along Napa's roads, especially when dark. Provide bike lights and reflectors for low-income workers and nighttime commuters.

B2.5.c. **Pace Car Program** to encourage drivers to observe speed limits to increase safety around trails and roadways.

B2.6 Programs to Promote Walking and Biking, including:

B2.6.a. Expand an **e-bike share program**, particularly in communities like Calistoga and St. Helena. This program would make bikes available at specific locations to increase mobility for residents without personal vehicles. This could include engaging industries such as restaurants and wineries to provide their workers with greater mobility.

B2.6.b. Conduct **community events** like **Ciclovia** (open streets) to promote safe biking. Collaborate with **promotores** and community leaders to increase biking awareness among Latino families. Engage schools, churches, and workplaces as hubs for promoting bike use.

B3. Solutions specific to farmworkers:

B3.1. Transportation solutions must consider the needs of the **entire farmworker community**, addressing **flexibility, scheduling, and affordability** while coordinating with employers and transit agencies.

B3.2. Car Share Programs: Inspired by the "Green Raitero" concept, a car-sharing system with electric vehicles could provide flexible, affordable transport for licensed farmworkers.

B3.3. Mileage Reimbursement: Providing compensation for personal vehicle use was highlighted as a desired solution.

B3.4. Shuttle Systems: Small, flexible circulators to connect workers to central locations across the valley, extending routes beyond the main corridors. Employers could coordinate with transit systems to overcome logistical challenges.

B3.5. E-Bikes: Electric bikes could help farmworkers overcome rural transportation gaps, particularly for short, remote trips.

B4. General Transportation Improvements

B4.1 Fix potholes to prevent damage to vehicles and avoid creating greater financial burdens and transportation challenges for low-income community members.

B4.2 Install more flashing lights at crosswalks to enhance visibility, especially in foggy or dark conditions (Jefferson Street from Old Sonoma Road to Lincoln Avenue was identified as a specific location in need of this).

B4.3. Improve options for reaching remote communities with significant transportation challenges, (e.g., Calistoga, Pope Valley).

C. Community Outreach Recommendations

C1. Seniors

C1.1. Informal sessions during **activities (e.g., "Lunch and Learn"** or weekday gatherings for lunch at senior centers) **hosted by existing senior-serving organizations** such as Molly's Angels, Up Valley Family Center, and Rianda House, as well as other community activities such as the weekly dinner at Grace Church.

C1.2. Many seniors live in **mobile or manufactured home communities**. Some seniors living in these communities, especially those with mobility limitations, can be reluctant to travel, so managers or representatives from these communities can provide information on their behalf.

C1.3. Recommended approaches to engaging seniors include:

C1.3.a. Engage with senior communities directly. Use word-of-mouth and family referrals to outreach to seniors, since many are not internet users. Seniors are more likely to openly share their experiences and concerns during these social gatherings than at a formal meeting.

C1.3.b. Bilingual meetings or separate meetings in English and Spanish as there is large population of Spanish-speaking seniors who are also likelier to be low-income.

C1.3.c. Local healthcare providers (e.g., Kaiser Permanente in Santa Rosa and Napa; Queen of the Valley Medical Center in Napa) can offer data on where senior patients are traveling from and challenges in accessing their facilities.

C2. Farmworkers and the Latino Community

C2.1. Latino community organizations (e.g., Puertas Abiertas Community Resource Center) can host engagement activities or provide insights into cultural or language-specific barriers that might affect transportation needs.

C2.2. Organizations and employers with dedicated farmworker advocates/outreach specialists such as Silverado Farming and the California Home Development Corporation can facilitate engagement with farmworkers or provide insight into farmworker transportation needs.

C2.3. Promotores can also facilitate engagement and provide information to the Latino and farmworker populations.

C2.4. Focus groups hosted and facilitated by organizations such as the Farmworker Foundation. Provide incentives to participate such as gift cards or meals.

C2.5. Surveys during work hours or at community events.

C2.6. Activities during **community events such as Dia de la Familia** (July 20th).

C3. General Community Outreach

C3.1. Activities hosted in partnership with or at regular events held by local community organizations to get input from or help increase engagement with and use of active transportation modes by underserved populations (e.g., focus groups with CBO clients such as school parents and seniors). These include:

C3.1.a. Weekly community dinners at Grace Church in St. Helena attract diverse community members across age groups.

C3.1.b. The **Catholic Church in American Canyon**, which serves a significant Filipino community.

C3.1.c. Family resource centers (e.g., in St. Helena and Calistoga) often work with multi-generational families

C3.1.d. Low-income families can be engaged through **Community Action of Napa Valley's** (CANV) school parent council. Food bank visits are also an opportunity for on-site engagement.

C3.1.e. On the Move: organization with a mission to develop the next generation of community leaders among diverse youth in Napa County

C3.1.f. Organizations offering **affordable housing and/or homeless shelters** such as Abode Services and Catholic Charities

C3.1.g. Napa Valley College for outreach to students, hospitality workers, and healthcare providers

C3.1.h. Local Healthcare Providers such as Kaiser Permanente in Santa Rosa and Napa and Queen of the Valley Medical Center in Napa can offer data on where patients are traveling from and challenges in accessing their facilities.

C3.1.i. Surveys can be distributed through CBO programs (e.g., CANV) and partner organizations to collect feedback from a broader audience.

C3.1.j. Gather insights from **CBO Staff and volunteers** (e.g., CANV), who often interact with constituents and understand their challenges.

C4. Transportation Providers and Government Agencies

C4.1. These organizations can provide information on transportation and transit issues and needs and offer support for improving transportation infrastructure and safety. Examples include:

- C4.1.a.** The Vine Transit (Napa Valley Transportation Authority)
- C4.1.b.** Caltrans
- C4.1.c.** Local Mayors (American Canyon, Calistoga specified) and City Council Members from towns such as Calistoga, St. Helena, and Yountville, and the Napa County Board of Supervisors could offer a local government perspective on transportation and infrastructure needs, priorities, funding opportunities and potential targeted programs.

C5. Overall Outreach Recommendations

- C5.1.** Conduct activities in both English and Spanish.
- C5.2.** Provide incentives such as food, small gifts, stipends, or giveaways to encourage participation.
- C5.3** Engage with extended families of CBO service users to gain a broader perspective on community needs.
- C5.4.** Challenges mentioned in relation to senior communities but that apply to all communities this project seeks to engage include:
 - C5.4.a.** Engaging community members who may have language or technological limitations with accessing information about outreach activities.
 - C5.4.b.** Reducing engagement fatigue by targeting underrepresented groups and avoiding repetitive outreach.
 - C5.4.c.** Communities often feel overlooked due to prior outreach efforts that resulted in limited change.
 - C5.4.d.** The need to connect with less visible or frequently engaged members of the community.



Napa Valley Transportation Authority Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Update Community Engagement Summary Appendix B: Community Survey – Summary of Results

As part of their community engagement to solicit input on the 2025 Update to their Community-Based Transportation Plan, the Napa Valley Transportation Authority circulated a survey, available both on-line and in hard copy format. Following is an analysis of results and key findings from the survey.

I. Public Transit Usage

More than half of survey respondents (58.4%) noted that they do not use Vine Transit. Asked to identify which out of a number of possible reasons why they do not use transit, a majority of 66% responded that they did so for a reason other than those described. In more than half of those cases, respondents specified that they drive their own car rather than take transit. Results are detailed in Tables 1 and 2 below.

| TABLE 1 | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| Which Vine Transit Route(s) do you currently use? | | |
| (Mark all the routes that apply) | | |
| Vine Transit Route or Service | Percentage | Number |
| None | 58.4% | 94 |
| Route 10 | 26.1% | 42 |
| Calistoga Shuttle | 15.5% | 25 |
| Route C | 20.5% | 33 |
| Route 11 | 11.8% | 19 |
| Route 29 | 6.2% | 10 |
| VineGo (Paratransit) | 5.0% | 8 |
| St. Helena Shuttle | 3.7% | 6 |
| Route 11X | 2.5% | 4 |
| Route F | 2.5% | 4 |
| American Canyon Transit | 2.5% | 4 |
| Yountville Bee | 2.5% | 4 |
| Route A | 1.9% | 3 |
| Route E | 1.9% | 3 |
| Route G | 1.9% | 3 |
| Route B | 1.2% | 2 |
| Route 21 | 1.2% | 2 |
| Route D | 0.6% | 1 |

N=161

Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.

| TABLE 2 If you answered “none” to the previous question, why? (Mark all that apply) | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| Reason Why Not to Take Vine Transit | Percentage | Number |
| Other | 66.0% | 62 |
| The buses don't travel where I need to go | 13.8% | 13 |
| It doesn't fit my schedule | 11.7% | 11 |
| Bus stop is too far | 6.4% | 6 |
| Bus service is too slow | 5.3% | 5 |
| Transit is too confusing / complicated | 5.3% | 5 |
| Bus service is too infrequent | 3.2% | 3 |
| Fares are too expensive | 0.0% | 0 |

N=94

Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.

Please note: There was a difference between the survey as filled out online vs. the hard copy surveys. Online, respondents only received this question if they had answered “none” to the previous question. On the hard copy surveys, no such distinction was made. The majority of surveys were filled out in hard copy; therefore many of the respondents who responded to this question also marked Vine Transit routes that they currently use. Since it is important to understand what issues residents have with using Vine Transit, all responses are included.

Comments from respondents who selected “Other”:

- A total of 40 respondents answered some variation of “drive my own car.”
- Two others noted that they either drive their car or walk.
- Buses not safe with unmaskers.
- Doesn't go to St. Helena Hospital.
- Don't use.
- I don't know about transit.
- I don't know why.
- I live in Angwin.
- No bus from Angwin.
- I take bus, I don't know what bus.
- Just moved to Napa, need ride from someone.
- Lazy.
- New to area.
- No need yet.
- No place to sit.
- Not commuting yet.
- Not needed.
- PTSD
- Used to but cannot get on and off now. Need Sunday service.

II. Transportation Modes Used

Survey respondents were asked to identify which modes of transportation they use to commute to work or school, as well as those they use for non-commuting trips. Slightly over half (53.5%) of respondents indicated that they did not work or go to school; this is probably due to the fact that the majority of those who responded to this question and specified their age range were over 65 (76.09%), with the next largest number aged 55-64 (9.6%). Among those who did identify their modes for commuting to work or school, the majority (67.5%) drive alone.

For non-commuting-related trips, slightly over half of respondents to this question (52%) identified driving alone as one of their modes of transportation. The second most popular modes were walking (19.9%) and transit (18.1%).

Results are detailed in Tables 3 and 4 below.

| Commuting Mode | Percentage | Number |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| I don't work / go to school | 53.5% | 83 |
| Drive alone | 34.2% | 53 |
| Other | 6.5% | 10 |
| Walk | 5.8% | 9 |
| Transit | 5.2% | 8 |
| Carpool / Vanpool | 4.5% | 7 |
| Bicycle | 1.9% | 3 |
| Ride Share (Uber, Lyft, etc.) | 1.3% | 2 |

N=155

Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.

Note: None of the respondents who selected "Other" identified a method.

| Commuting Mode | Percentage | Number |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Drive alone | 52.0% | 89 |
| Walk | 19.9% | 34 |
| Transit | 18.1% | 31 |
| Other | 14.6% | 25 |
| Carpool / Vanpool | 9.4% | 16 |
| Bicycle | 4.7% | 8 |
| Ride Share (Uber, Lyft, etc.) | 4.7% | 8 |

N=171

Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.

Note: only one respondent who selected “Other” identified the mode used, as follows:

- En familia (“with family”)

III. Mobility Programs and Other Transportation Issues

Two final questions were posed to respondents about transportation. The first asked them to identify whether they are currently enrolled in any of the NVTA’s Mobility Programs. The second asked whether they experience difficulties accessing medical facilities, grocery stores, and/or schools, and to further elaborate on those difficulties.

Slightly over half of respondents to the question about enrollment in NVTA’s Mobility Programs (51.9%) were not enrolled and were not familiar with these programs. The majority of those remaining are aware of the programs but are not enrolled (37.7%).

Nearly three-quarters of those who responded to the question regarding difficulties with accessing medical facilities, grocery stores, and/or schools (71.5%) noted that they did not have difficulties accessing these facilities.

Results are detailed in Tables 5 and 6 below.

| Mobility Program | Percentage | Number |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| No, but I am not familiar with these programs | 51.9% | 80 |
| No, but I am aware of them | 37.7% | 58 |
| Taxi Scrip | 5.8% | 9 |
| VineGo | 4.5% | 7 |
| V-Commute | 0.0% | 0 |
| TOTALS | 100.00% | 154 |

| Response Options | Percentage | Number |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| No | 71.5% | 108 |
| Yes | 23.8% | 36 |
| Please elaborate | 4.6% | 7 |
| TOTALS | 100.00% | 151 |

The following comments were made by respondent who responded to “please elaborate”:

- Yes/No. When car is being repaired your service lacks stops in NAPA.
- Sometimes it’s hard to get to school because I have to cross town.
- Not yet.

Respondents were also asked to provide any additional comments for improving their transportation experience around Napa County. Their comments have been included separately in the matrix listing and categorizing comments, and/or on the location-specific map and associated data table.

IV. Survey Respondent Demographics

Respondents were asked a number of demographic questions, including area of residence within the county, age, and race/ethnicity, to clarify who had responded to the survey. Those results are shown in Tables 7 – 11 below.

| Area | Percentage | Number |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Northwest City of Napa | 43.3% | 68 |
| Calistoga | 33.1% | 52 |
| Southwest City of Napa | 5.1% | 8 |
| Other (if your area is not listed) | 3.8% | 6 |
| Northeast City of Napa | 3.2% | 5 |
| Central City of Napa | 3.2% | 5 |
| American Canyon | 2.5% | 4 |
| Southeast City of Napa | 1.9% | 3 |
| Westwood | 1.9% | 3 |
| Angwin/Deer Park/Pope Valley | 1.3% | 2 |
| St. Helena | 0.6% | 1 |
| Yountville | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other Unincorporated Area | 0.0% | 0 |
| TOTALS | 100.00% | 157 |

The following responses were given by respondents who selected “Other”:

- Checked off both Calistoga and St. Helena
- Napa
- Northeast and Southeast City of Napa
- Fairfield
- Solano County

| TABLE 8 | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| Which of the following age categories describe you best? | | |
| Age Categories | Percentage | Number |
| >65 | 75.2% | 118 |
| 55-64 | 10.2% | 16 |
| 25-34 | 5.7% | 9 |
| 35-44 | 3.8% | 6 |
| 45-54 | 3.2% | 5 |
| <18 | 1.3% | 2 |
| 18-24 | 0.6% | 1 |
| TOTALS | 100.00% | 157 |

| TABLE 9 | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| Please describe your race/ethnicity. | | |
| Race / Ethnicity | Percentage | Number |
| White, Caucasian, etc. | 77.9% | 88 |
| Hispanic, Latino or Mexican American | 15.0% | 17 |
| Asian / Chinese | 3.5% | 4 |
| Filipino | 1.8% | 2 |
| German | 0.9% | 1 |
| Mixed Race | 0.9% | 1 |
| TOTALS | 100.00% | 113 |

| TABLE 10 | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| What is your primary language? | | |
| Language | Percentage | Number |
| English | 81.4% | 127 |
| Spanish | 10.3% | 16 |
| Other (please specify) | 8.3% | 13 |
| TOTALS | 100.00% | 156 |

Languages specified by respondents who selected “Other” included:

- English and Spanish (x4)
- French
- German
- Tagalog (x2)
- Naa (could refer to Namla, a nearly extinct language of Indonesia; Na-Dene languages; North American Aboriginal Languages; or “Not applicable.”)

| TABLE 11 | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| How many people live in your household (total number of the people in your home)? / What is your household income (total income of all people in your home?) | | | |
| Total Household Income Ranges | Number of People in Household | Percentage of Overall Total | Number |
| Under \$25,000 | All | 35.3% | 53 |
| | 6 | 0.7% | 1 |
| | 4 | 0.7% | 1 |
| | 3 | 1.3% | 2 |
| | 2 | 2.0% | 3 |
| | 1 | 28.0% | 42 |
| | [no response] | 2.7% | 4 |
| Between \$26,000 and \$45,000 | All | 28.7% | 43 |
| | 6 | 0.7% | 1 |
| | 3 | 2.7% | 4 |
| | 2 | 2.7% | 4 |
| | 1 | 19.3% | 29 |
| | [no response] | 4.0% | 6 |
| Between \$46,000 and \$65,000 | All | 11.3% | 17 |
| | 6 | 0.7% | 1 |
| | 5 | 0.7% | 1 |
| | 4 | 1.3% | 2 |
| | 2 | 2.0% | 3 |
| | 1 | 5.3% | 8 |
| | [no response] | 1.3% | 2 |
| Between \$66,000 and \$85,000 | All | 9.3% | 14 |
| | 4 | 1.3% | 2 |
| | 2 | 3.3% | 5 |
| | 1 | 3.3% | 5 |
| | [no response] | 1.3% | 2 |
| Between \$86,000 and \$110,000 | All | 5.3% | 8 |
| | 6 | 0.7% | 1 |
| | 3 | 0.7% | 1 |
| | 2 | 2.7% | 4 |
| | 1 | 1.3% | 2 |
| Between \$111,000 and \$150,000 | 2 | 0.7% | 1 |
| Over \$150,000 | 2 | 0.7% | 1 |
| I would prefer not to answer | N/A | 8.7% | 13 |
| TOTALS | | 100.00% | 150 |

V. Summary of Responses by Specific Area

Substantial survey replies were received for only two areas: Calistoga, identified as one of the Equity Priority Community areas in the current CBTP; and Northwest City of Napa, identified in the prior CBTP as a Community of Concern. A summary of key findings from each of those two areas is provided below.

A. Calistoga

Fifty-two survey respondents identified themselves as residing in Calistoga.

Demographics

- The majority of survey respondents in the Calistoga area were seniors, with 69.2% of respondents over 65 and an additional 9.6% aged 55 – 64.
- Of the 31 respondents who identified their race or ethnicity, 64.5% were white / Caucasian, and an additional 25.8% identified as Hispanic / Latino (the remaining 9.7% were Asian).
- Nearly three-quarters (72.5%) of respondents speak English as a first language, with only 19.6% speaking Spanish as a first language.
- Household incomes varied, but most were on the lower end of the spectrum, with 65.9% of the 44 respondents who identified their annual household income as \$45,000 or less. This was particularly true among those aged 65 or older – over half, 58.2%, have a total annual household income of \$45,000 or less per year.

Transit Issues and Preferred Transportation Modes

- Twenty-four (24) respondents noted reasons why they never use Vine Transit, or use it less frequently. The majority (79.1%) either responded that they prefer to drive or walk, and/or that the buses don't travel where they need to go. There were also a few who noted that bus service is too slow and doesn't fit respondents' schedules. Specific comments included that it takes too long to take a bus to the BART, and that the bus doesn't go to St. Helena Hospital.
- A little less than half of the 52 respondents (45.2%) indicated that they do take Vine Transit. All of those 24 respondents take Route 10; 75% take the Calistoga Shuttle. Only 4 respondents mentioned other routes.
- Fifty-one (51) respondents indicated their preferred modes of transportation for commuting to work or school. A little over half (50.9%) drive alone, with less than a quarter (21.5%) walking, using a carpool or vanpool, or taking transit. It should be noted that 33.3% of respondents also indicated that they don't work or go to school, and this number includes some of those who responded to the question.
- All 52 Calistoga respondents indicated their preferred modes of transportation for non-work or -school related trips. Again, a substantial majority (67.3%) drive alone. Walking is also a preferred mode for 32.7% of these respondents. Only 17.3% of respondents use a carpool or vanpool, and 15.3% take transit, bike, or use a ride share service.

B. Northwest City of Napa

Sixty-eight survey respondents identified themselves as residing in the Northwest City of Napa area.

Demographics

- The majority of survey respondents in the Northwest City of Napa area were seniors, with 88.2% of respondents over 65 and another 8.8% aged 55-64. The remaining 2.9% were aged between 25-34.
- Of the 55 respondents who identified their race or ethnicity, the great majority (90.9%) were white / Caucasian. Out of the remaining respondents, 3.6% identified as Hispanic or Latino, 3.6% as Chinese, and 1.8% as mixed race.
- Just over 92% of respondents speak English as a first language, with 6.3% speaking another language and a remaining 1.6% speaking Spanish as a primary language. The two respondents who identified another language specified “English and Spanish” and “Naa” (meaning not clear).
- Household incomes varied, but most were on the lower end of the spectrum, with 72.7% of the 66 respondents who identified their annual household income making \$45,000 or less.

Transit Issues and Preferred Transportation Modes

- Out of 61 respondents who identified their preferred transportation modes for going to work or school, nearly 3/4 (72.2%) noted that they don't work or go to school, and another 22.9% responded that they drive their own car rather than using any other mode. Thirty-nine (39) respondents noted reasons why they never use Vine Transit, or use it less frequently. Of those, the most common, indicated by 82.1%, was “other,” with the majority indicating that they prefer to drive their own car; 10.4% indicated that the bus stop is too far, followed by it not fitting their schedules (7.7%).
- Only 25 of the respondents indicated that they do take Vine Transit. For those 25 respondents, the route most commonly used by Northwest City of Napa residents is Route C, taken by 72% of respondents; the second most commonly used are Route 11, taken by 36%, and Route 10, taken by 32% of those who responded to the question. A handful of others indicated routes 11X, 29, G, VineGo, and the Calistoga Shuttle.
- Out of the 65 respondents who indicated their preferred modes of transportation for non-work or -school related trips, just over half (50.7%) drive their own car, 27.6% indicated that they use transit, and 18.4% indicated that they use another mode, but did not identify it.

Appendix C: Community Recommendations for CBTP Projects and Programs with Jurisdiction/Agency Comments

This table includes a draft, initial list of recommendations from community members to address transportation challenges and needs in their communities. This list was provided to local jurisdictions in Napa Valley and NVTa to gather feedback about current projects underway and comments about likelihood of future projects and funding related to the recommendations shared here. This table was used to help develop the projects and programs matrix found in the CBTP document.

Table: Jurisdiction Comments on Community-Recommended Potential CBTP Projects

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <p>City of Calistoga</p> | <p>Physical Project: Address uneven sidewalk pavement or lack of sidewalks in Calistoga</p> | <p>The City of Calistoga Municipal Code 12.10.020 follows California State Code that places responsibility of maintaining and repairing all portions of sidewalk adjacent to or fronting on any portion on the property owners. The City of Calistoga does conduct a yearly sidewalk grinding project that addresses vertical tripping hazards between 1/4"-2" along a different section of the City each year. The City of Calistoga also offers a 50/50 cost sharing program that has a limited budget each year for the repair and maintenance of sidewalks. The City of Calistoga is currently working in partnership with NVTA on the Active Transportation Plan updates in order to refine where gap closures should take place in the future.</p> |
| <p>City of American Canyon; City of Napa; County of Napa</p> | <p>Physical Project: Complete Vine Trail from South Napa to American Canyon</p> | <p>City of Napa: Completing the Vine Trail is consistent with the Bicycle Plan; This is subject to Capital Improvement Programing and identification of funding. City of American Canyon: The City is working on segments of the Class I Trail with Green Island Road pending advertisement later this year. Other Vine Trail segments will continue with development improvements of Watson Ranch. What is still a gap is Paoli Loop and how to navigate the connection to the western side of SR29.</p> |
| <p>City of American Canyon</p> | <p>Physical Project: Create safe route/introduce safe crossing in American Canyon where schools are located on opposite sides of the highway</p> | <p>Safer crossing have been on the list for many years and there is still a need whether it happens with the SR29 improvements currently in the PA-ED phase or a separate over/undercrossing project. This is all pending funding and will require a partnership with Caltrans/NVTA.</p> |
| <p>City of American Canyon</p> | <p>Physical Project: Fix or add flashing beacon at the crosswalk on Broadway near Las Casitas Mobile Home Park</p> | <p>The crossing is lighted, but the City will look into upgrades for a future RRFB style device and improved "shark teeth" approach markings. This can be added as a future pedestrian improvement and programmed into a future budget cycle within the next 5 years and potentially leveraged through grant funding.</p> |
| <p>City of American Canyon; NVTA</p> | <p>Physical Project: More bus shelters, replace missing sidewalks and add crosswalks at bus stops on Highway 29 and/or relocate stops near intersections with safe crossing points in American Canyon</p> | <p>Sidewalk gaps are currently being addressed on a project by project basis and mostly through private development. However, it is included in the City's Broadway District Plan and potentially with the SR29 Improvements. There is only one bus stop currently planned near City Hall, but would need to coordinate with NVTA to determine additional locations. In addition, all the improvements are funding dependent as well with coordination needed through Caltrans/NVTA.</p> |
| <p>City of American Canyon; NVTA</p> | <p>Physical Project: Relocate bus stop or add safety infrastructure like an improved pedestrian crossing, sidewalks, and shelter at Highway 29/Napa Junction (near American Canyon City Hall).</p> | <p>This is something the City would like to implement pending funding. It was brought up during the PID phase of the SR29 improvements with the proximity to Napa Junction/SR29. It would need to be a combined effort with support from Caltrans/NVTA.</p> |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| City of Calistoga | Physical Project / Program: Increase enforcement or add infrastructure to stop drivers from disobeying “no turn on red” sign at Highway 128 (Foothill Blvd.) and Petrified Forest Road in Calistoga. | The City of Calistoga is investigating the feasibility of various improvements to address the flow of traffic at the intersection of Hwy. 128 and Petrified Forest Road. |
| City of Calistoga | Physical Project: Add crosswalk (preferably lighted/signalized) at Lincoln and Brannan | The City of Calistoga has an active construction project to install a flashing beacon crosswalk and improve the pedestrian facilities at the intersection of Brannan and Lincoln that will be completed by October 2025. |
| City of Calistoga | Physical Project: Improve lighting on Washington Street which is dark at night | Is this related to a specific section of Washington Street? The City maintains a small number of street lights along Washington St. (Mostly between Lincoln Ave. and 1st St.), but most of the street lighting along Washington St. is maintained by PG&E. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project / Policy: Create a solution for problem of cars traveling northbound on Solano Avenue who will cut through the gas station located in the southeast corner of the intersection to get around the right-turn on red restriction and new red light cameras. Busy intersection with many pedestrians and bicyclists due to Vine Trail crossing, large shopping center and Redwood Park and Ride nearby; increasing car vs. bike/ped conflicts. | City of Napa Municipal Code Section 10.32.120 - Operation prohibited on property to avoid compliance with traffic control: No person shall operate any motor vehicle, including a motorcycle or motor-driven cycle as defined in the California Vehicle Code, on any public or private property in a manner that avoids or evades official traffic control devices as defined in this Title 10, which have been installed on the adjacent public street or streets, or installed for the purpose of controlling any turning movement on the adjacent public streets. |
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project / Program / Policy: Napa transit center feels unsafe | Requires coordination with NVTA. |
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project / Program: Expand turning areas or adjust bus routes to improve access to transit for seniors who live in residential areas with narrow streets (e.g., Meadows Senior Living at 1800 Atrium Parkway, Napa). | Requires Coordination with NVTA. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project / Program: Improvements to intersection of Socol and Silverado trail with no crosswalk. Affects pedestrian access to transit; alert drivers to watch for pedestrians | Requires coordination with Caltrans (State Route 121). |
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project: Add a bench or shelter at the Sutherland Drive / Linda Vista Ave bus stop near Rohlff’s Manor | Requires coordination with NVTA. |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Add a bicycle/pedestrian connector where Sulphur Springs Ave dead-ends about 200 feet away from White Sulphur Spring Road | Project is planned but not funded |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Add a sidewalk and crosswalk at the intersection of Pope and Church Streets | This is not a City sponsored project. |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Add a sidewalk on the south side of South Crane Avenue where it feeds into a school and park | This is not a City sponsored project. Refer to CIP R19-05 for planned improvements to South Crane Avenue and Grayson Avenue. |
| County of Napa | Physical Project: Add a signalized crosswalk at the intersection of the Vine Trail and Solano Avenue so that Trail users traveling toward Solano can turn left to travel southbound on Solano without illegally and unsafely crossing the street. | |
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project: Add bus stops closer to senior housing, such as on Baywood Lane closer to Rohlf's Manor | Requires coordination with NVTA. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Add lighting or indicators to crosswalks to enhance visibility during foggy or dark conditions in Napa | Enhancing crossings is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Add lighting to the Vine Trail bridge segment over Highway 29, near the North Napa homeless shelter | Requires coordination with Caltrans (State Route 29). |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Add sidewalks on Gasser Drive | Closing sidewalk gaps is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to right-of-way evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Add speeding cameras on Imola Avenue | State law does not currently allow for automated speed enforcement cameras, with the exception of a pilot program that does not include the City of Napa. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Add speeding cameras on Jefferson Street from Old Sonoma Road to Lincoln Avenue - crosswalks without lights or indicators have low visibility | State law does not currently allow for automated speed enforcement cameras, with the exception of a pilot program that does not include the City of Napa. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Add speeding cameras on Soscol | State law does not currently allow for automated speed enforcement cameras, with the exception of a pilot program that does not include the City of Napa. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Additional safe crosswalks needed in downtown Napa on Seminary across uncontrolled traffic at 1st/2nd/3rd/Oak Street | Enhancing crossings is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: An additional crosswalk should be added on Linda Vista about 300 feet south of the school so that walkers, bikers, and runners won't be encouraged to jaywalk across Linda Vista to connect to Kathleen Drive and Sutherland Drive. | Enhancing crossings is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Cars speed down Hartle Court, need infrastructure to slow cars down | Potential for vehicle lane narrowing to be evaluated with future street repaving. This is subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Close sidewalk gaps on near the shopping center by Lone Oak Avenue and Lincoln | Closing sidewalk gaps is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to right-of-way evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Close sidewalk gaps on Solano Avenue between Euclid and the 2755 Solano Ave property address | Closing sidewalk gaps is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to right-of-way evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Close the many sidewalk gaps on both the north and south sides of West Pueblo Ave that require pedestrians to walk into the street. | Closing sidewalk gaps is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to right-of-way evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Complete Vine Trail from Calistoga to St. Helena | This project is complete. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Create a sidewalk and crosswalk on the west side of 221 near the Napa Valley College residences so pedestrians can walk straight to the South Napa Marketplace rather than cross illegally to the east side of 221, up to Imola, and back over 221 or take a longer more circuitous path with long wait times at lights. | Requires coordination with Caltrans (State Route 221). |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Create solution for S-shaped curve near North Napa Homeless Shelter on Solano Avenue which decreases visibility for drivers pulling out of shopping centers / driveways (especially with cars tending to speed when traveling northbound on Solano). Many crashes and near-misses caused. | This area is planned to be included in a future corridor study of portions of Redwood Road and Solano Avenue. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Extend Saratoga to Soscol to improve pedestrian connectivity | Subject to future development and not currently listed in the General Plan. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Fix extremely uneven sidewalks (bumping up due to tree root growth) on Dry Creek Road between Redwood Road and Trower, particularly in front of Dry Creek Park; make navigating a stroller impossible, thus requiring people to walk in the street. | Repairing sidewalks is consistent with City programs and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to Capital Improvement Programing and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Fix potholes on Sousa Lane | Completed: Sousa Lane recently repaved. |
| County of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project: Highway 29 and Rutherford Road (Hwy 128): seating and a marked pedestrian crosswalk to improve safety and access to the bus stop. (not in EPC) | |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project: Improve pedestrian crossings at Redwood Road and Linda Vista (near Vintage at Napa Senior Housing) or relocate the stop for better accessibility. | Enhancing crossings is consistent with overarching City programs; Specific locations need to be evaluated for feasibility and funding. Relocating bus stops requires coordination with NVTA. |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Improve sidewalk conditions on Main Street between Hunt Ave and Pope Street | This project is in the planning phase. See St. Helena Downtown Specific Plan. |
| City of Calistoga | Physical Project: Improve signage at Silverado Trail and Lake Street | This intersection requires multi-jurisdiction collaboration. The City of Calistoga is working with Napa County and Caltrans to add signage & striping improvements to this intersection as a part of the active construction project that is occurring on Lake St. and is anticipated to be completed by October 2025. |
| NVTA | Physical Project: Improve the traffic flow on Highway 29 around the Airport Intersection (not in EPC) | NVTA is leading the SR 29/12/Airport Blvd & SR12/Kelly Rd Interchange Project with the goal of advancing safety and congestion relief improvements. The project is currently in the environmental revalidation process which is estimated to be complete in 2027. After studying three viable interchange alternatives and revalidating the Environmental Documentation, NVTA will work on designing the project in 2027-2028, obtain necessary right-of-way approvals in 2028-2029, and begin construction in 2030 (pending funding). |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Increase secure bike parking throughout St Helena | Project is planned but not funded. New VMT Ordinance provides incentive for private development to install secured bike parking as a mitigation measure. |
| City of Calistoga | Physical Project: Install traffic signal at Wappo Street and Lincoln | The City of Calistoga has an active construction project to install a flashing beacon crosswalk and improve the pedestrian facilities at the intersection of Wappo, Brannan, and Lincoln that will be completed by October 2025. |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Low visibility intersection on Pope Street makes it unsafe to turn left (one comment referenced curve over the creek, another not clear, may reference that or s-curve at Pope and Allison Avenue) | The City acknowledges that there are community concerns over this part of Pope Street but this is not an official project. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Make the crosswalk that is located at West Pueblo and Thomas Drive signalized – cars speed down West Pueblo, endangering nearby residents who use it to access Pueblo Market | Enhancing crossings is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programming, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Many cars ignore the flashing light indicating a pedestrian is crossing at the RRFB crosswalk on 3rd Street between Brown and Main Streets. Make this crosswalk safer/easier for cars to spot and stop - perhaps a pedestrian refuge island in the middle or raise the crosswalk. | Enhancing crossings is consistent with City programs/plans and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programming, and identification of funding. |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|--|---|--|
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project: More bus shelters or benches on Redwood Road, including at Redwood Road/Solano Avenue bus stop | Requires coordination with NVTA. |
| City of Calistoga; NVTA | Physical Project: More bus shelters, replace missing sidewalks and add crosswalks at bus stops on Highway 29 and/or relocate stops near intersections with safe crossing points in Calistoga | The City of Calistoga is working with NVTA to add a southbound bus shelter on Lincoln Ave and vetting possible locations for this facility that initially appears to be near Brannan intersection, with future sidewalks added from development project and utilization of flashing beacon crossing. |
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project: Napa Valley College students would like a bus stop closer to the housing complex | Requires coordination with NVTA and Napa Valley College. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Need bicycle safety improvements on Soscol as cars tend to speed down this road | Enhancing the bicycle network is consistent with the Bicycle Plan and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Need bicycle safety improvements on Trancas | Enhancing the bicycle network is consistent with the Bicycle Plan and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. Bicycle facility improvements on Trancas Street between Jefferson Street and Eastern City Limits are included as part of an upcoming paving project. |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Provide bike route improvements along Hudson and Allyn Avenues | Project is planned but not funded |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Provide flat, shaded path adjacent to unshaded, hilly Imola Boulevard Bridge near River Park Shopping Center to encourage more walking/biking on Imola | Requires coordination with Caltrans (State Route 121); The Imola Avenue Corridor Complete Streets Improvement Plan provides recommendations for improving multimodal connectivity and safety on Imola Avenue. |
| City of Napa; NVTA | Physical Project: Remove wasp nest in southbound bus stop at Magnolia Drive and Highway 221; rather than use that stop, Napa Valley College residents walk an extra half-mile to the stop on campus by the parking lot. | (NVTA bus stop located in Caltrans jurisdiction. The Napa County Mosquito Abatement District will remove wasp nests. "Yellowjacket control" is listed as one of their provided services: Services - Napa County Mosquito Abatement District) |
| City of Calistoga; County of Napa | Physical Project: Repair potholes on Silverado Trail and Highway 29, and on the streets around the high school and the Geyser | The City of Calistoga partnered with Napa County and had the city section of the Silverado Trail overlayed in the late summer of 2023. The County completed a pavement repair project on the trail from Larkmead to Hwy. 29. The majority of the Silverado Trail is within the Napa County jurisdictional limits. The City of Calistoga continuously works alongside Napa County in order to address potholes along the Silverado Trail as they are reported. Hwy. 29 is within Caltrans' jurisdiction. The City of Calistoga continuously works alongside Caltrans in order to address potholes along Hwy. 29 as they are reported. |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Repair uneven/damaged sidewalks or add sidewalks where missing in St. Helena, especially near schools and parks, including El Bonita Avenue | These improvements are distributed over multiple CIP projects. Refer to CIP R18-81 (in progress), R19-05 (not funded), R21-02 (complete), and R21-04 (complete) |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Repave the segment of the Vine Trail behind the North Napa homeless shelter | Repaving Class I paths is consistent with City programs and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to Capital Improvement Programing and identification of funding. Requires coordination with Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Some South Napa homeless shelter residents need to connect to Health and Human Services, but cannot afford the bus fare so they bike or walk there. A safe connection is needed between those two locations (Note on this: The Vine Trail will eventually safely link these two locations) | Completing the Vine Trail is consistent with the Bicycle Plan; This is subject to Capital Improvement Programing and identification of funding. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: Soscol and 121/Silverado Trail is a key danger spot given cars "off-ramping" from 121 or exiting liquor store parking lot and not watching for pedestrians, lack of sidewalks and crosswalks, and a long light on Soscol,. Limits pedestrian access to transit on 121 and to other destinations like Raleys. | Requires coordination with Caltrans (State Route 121). |
| City of St. Helena | Physical Project: Spring Street needs pedestrian safety improvements/treatments | Improvements at the intersection of Spring Street and Main Street have been funded are in final design development. Additional phases of the project are planned but not funded. |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: The following streets need bicycle safety improvements: Jefferson, Soscol, Silverado Trail | Enhancing the bicycle network is consistent with the Bicycle Plan and part of long-term needs; Specific locations are subject to feasibility evaluation, Capital Improvement Programing, and identification of funding. Requires coordination with Caltrans for Silverado Trail and portion of Soscol Avenue (State Route 121). |
| City of Napa | Physical Project: The grade crossing at Soscol and Third needs to be improved for bicycles so they can safely and smoothly cross (including smoothing crossing over train tracks at Third Street, widening road, adding crosswalks). A rider reported bike tire damage from the tracks. | Requires coordination with the Wine Train (railroad). |
| City of Napa | Policy: Food trucks parked along Soscol Ave (usually between Lincoln and 1st Street) are blocking the visibility of cars trying to turn right or left onto Soscol | Specific driveway locations can be referred to the City of Napa Service Center (https://www.cityofnapa.org/277/Service-Center) for red curb evaluation. |
| City of Napa | Policy: Reduce the speed limit to 15MPH in downtown Napa since there is a lot of pedestrian and cyclist activity in the area. | AB43 does not allow for reduction in speed of a business improvement district to lower than 20 MPH. |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|--|--|--|
| City of Calistoga; City of St. Helena | Program: Create an e-bike share program in communities such as Calistoga and St. Helena which lack sufficient transportation options, making bikes available at specific locations to increase mobility for residents without personal vehicles. Could include engaging industries such as restaurants and wineries to provide their workers with greater mobility. | The City acknowledges that such a service could have benefit but this is not an official project. |
| NVTA | Program: Expand bus service hours and routes and create better connectivity / schedule coordination between NVTA and other regional transit providers like Sonoma County Transit and the Vallejo ferry to improve access to key destinations such as Sonoma County (Santa Rosa, Sonoma Plaza, Kaiser medical facilities, Sonoma County Airport); and major shopping areas. Offer more flexible cost-effective solutions to meet the transportation needs of seniors, low-income residents, and other lacking mobility options. Could involve a part-time or on-demand service. | NVTA will explore the option of expanding bus service hours if the agency can successfully identify a funding source to expand operations. A majority of funding available to transit agencies are for capital projects (such as purchasing buses, or adding physical infrastructure) as opposed to operating funds (to expand service). If operating funds are available, NVTA will explore the option of transit service to Sonoma County, with a priority on connecting to the Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit (SMART) Train. |
| NVTA | Program: Expand on-demand services in the City of Napa | When the COVID-19 pandemic took effect in March 2020, NVTA decided to shift all of its City of Napa local fixed routes to become exclusively on-demand service that would go to and from any existing bus stop in Napa. That model was successful in serving riders as the ridership levels were low. As ridership recovered over the years, that model became unsustainable and wait times began to increase. Staff then shifted back to fixed route service, which allows the agency to serve more riders efficiently. There are no current plans to shift back to on demand service, but the infrastructure to re-implement it still exists so staff could make that decision again in the future if it were viable |
| NVTA | Program: Improve options for reaching remote communities with significant transportation challenges (e.g., Calistoga, Angwin, Pope Valley). Could be transit or TNC (Uber/Lyft), but note that lack of cell reception is a barrier to TNC drivers. | The physical nature of the roads and landscape present challenges for Vine Transit buses to traverse into and out of Angwin and Pope Valley. NVTA will explore other potential programs that could be offered to reach residents in these more isolated communities. |
| NVTA | Program: Improve the connection between Route F and the Imola Park & Ride (specifically, residents traveling from the South Napa Homeless Shelter that are trying to connect to Route 29) | Route 29 service is currently optimized to meet the Route 10 departures and arrivals at the Redwood Park and Ride and the Red Line BART departures and arrivals at the El Cerrito Del Norte BART Station. In future schedule changes, staff can model out scenarios to assess the feasibility of improving transfer times to and from Route F at the Imola Park & Ride while not compromising the ideal transfer windows at the north and south ends of Route 29. |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|--------------|--|--|
| NVTA | Program: More service to retail destinations such as Pueblo Park, Napa | When making service adjustments or changing routes, we always heavily consider serving locations that are in high demand, including retail destinations. We will continue this practice in the future. |
| NVTA | Program: Offer service on Route 29 seven days a week | In August 2025, Vine Transit began offering Saturday service on Route 29. Riders have nine different round trip options to travel to and from the El Cerrito Del Norte BART station. Depending on funding and the popularity of the route, staff may consider expanding service to Sunday as well. |
| NVTA | Program: Offer Sunday service on local City of Napa routes (A-G) | This are no current plans to offer Sunday service on local City of Napa Routes. However, if NVTA were to obtain additional operating funding, staff could explore Sunday service on the more popular routes (such as Route C) and monitor the ridership and evaluate if Sunday service should expand to all local routes |
| NVTA | Program: Offer weekend service on Route 21 | There are no current plans to extend Route 21 service to Fairfield and Suisun on weekends. If funding became available and there was clear ridership demand, staff would explore this option. |
| NVTA | Program: Provide a bus route on Silverado Trail to reach other parts of town and transport people that work at all the wineries along that corridor | NVTA has no current plans to provide transit service on Silverado Trail given its operational constraints (windy roads with limited to no space for buses to safely pull over to drop off and pick up passengers). A more viable option that could be explored by those commuting to and from locations on the Silverado Trail is utilizing the Enterprise Vanpool Program. |
| NVTA | Program: Provide more frequent or express service from Calistoga and neighboring communities to BART station | In August 2025, Vine Transit began offering Saturday service on Route 29. Riders have nine different round trip options to travel to and from the El Cerrito Del Norte BART station. Depending on funding and the popularity of the route, staff may consider expanding service to Sunday as well. |
| NVTA | Program: Provide more frequent service from Calistoga to City of Napa – have to leave residence really early to make a medical appointment there in time | As part of its long range planning effort, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), who oversees regional planning in the Bay Area, recognizes the importance of Route 10 that connects Calistoga to the City of Napa. The plan recommends increasing the frequency (meaning more trips per day) on Route 10. As funding is available, staff will prioritize increasing frequency on this critical route that connects Napa Valley. |
| NVTA | Program: Provide rides on Solano Avenue. | Route 10 serves the Solano Ave corridor between Yountville and Redwood Ave. While there is no service between Trancas and Lincoln, Route C provides service on a parallel route on Linda Vista Ave between West Pueblo and Redwood Ave |

| Jurisdiction | Project Type / Issue, Recommendation, or Suggestion | Jurisdiction Comments |
|--------------|---|--|
| NVTA | Program: Provide shuttle service between Calistoga and St Helena | Route 10 operates on Highway 29 between Calistoga and St Helena. This provides residents of these communities a direct connection to one another. Operating on-demand shuttles can be costly and inefficient. Instead, staff is prioritizing increasing frequency on Route 10 as funding is available. |
| NVTA | Program: Provide transit options to get to St. Helena Hospital | Given that the location of the St Helena Hospital is on a mountainous windy road, this limits the types of vehicles that can travel to and from the hospital, therefore limiting NVTA's ability to serve the hospital. |
| NVTA | Program: Reinstate school bus service such as that which used to be offered by the school district | |
| NVTA | Program: St Helena shuttles need to either go to Bothe-Napa Valley State Park or meet Calistoga shuttle | There are no current plans to expand the St Helena shuttle outside of its current service area as riders can currently take Route 10 to travel from St Helena to Bothe-Napa Valley State Park and Calistoga. |

Appendix D: Cost and Timeframe Estimates for CBTP project types

| Infrastructure | Cost | | | | | Time | | | Requirements | | | | | | | Notes |
|--|--|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------|------|-----|-------|-------|------|-------|---|
| | Construction | Design | CM | Cost Range for Project Matrix | Cost Range (\$-\$-\$-\$-\$) | Construction | Design | Other | Main. | Env. | ROW | Surv. | Util. | Geo. | Traf. | |
| Traffic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stop Signs | \$800 per sign | N/A | N/A | \$0 to \$25,000 | \$ | < 1 Week | N/A | | | | | | | | X | |
| Pedestrian Warning Signage | \$800 per sign | N/A | N/A | \$0 to \$25,000 | \$ | < 1 Week | Varies (Weeks) | | | | | | | | | |
| Curb Ramps | \$5,000-\$8,000 each | N/A | N/A | \$0 to \$25,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | Varies per #Crews | | | Var | Var | Var | | | Cost for one unidirectional ramp |
| Speed Cushions | \$25,000 each | N/A | N/A | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | Varies per #Crews | | | | | | | | Includes pavement markings and signage. |
| Raised Crosswalk | \$50,000 - \$70,000 | N/A | N/A | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | < 1 Week | N/A | | | | | | | | Var | Includes pavement markings and signage. Does not include drainage |
| EV Charger Level 2 | \$10,000 - \$15,000 per Charger | Varies | Varies | \$0 to \$25,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies | Order Time | X | | | Var | X | | | Price can vary on site requirements |
| Pedestrian Refuge Median Hardscape (15'x10') | \$15,000 - \$40,000 per Median | Varies | \$1,500 - \$4,000 | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | Varies per #Crews | | | | Var | Var | Var | | |
| Update Roadway Striping | \$30,000 - \$100,000 | \$3,000 - \$10,000 | \$3,000 - \$6,000 | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | < 1 Week | Varies (Weeks) | | X | | | | | | | Lead Compliance |
| Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon | \$35,000-\$50,000 Solar, \$80,000-\$120,000 AC | \$4,000 - \$-12,000 | \$4,000 - \$12,000 | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | 2-3 Months to Order | X | | | Var | X | | Var | Higher cost for >=6 lanes |
| Crosswalk Lighting | \$90,000 for 2 street level lights | Varies | Varies | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | Order Time | X | | | | X | X | | |
| EV Charger DC Fast (50kW) | \$90,000 - \$200,000 per Charger | Varies | Varies | \$300,000 to \$1million | \$\$\$\$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies | Order Time | X | | | Var | X | | | Price can vary on site requirements |
| Signalized Intersection (4-Leg) | \$250,000 - \$750,000 per Intersection | \$25,000 - \$75,000 | \$25,000 - \$75,000 | \$300,000 to \$1million | \$\$\$\$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | 6 Months to Order | X | | Var | X | X | X | X | Temp Traffic Control |
| Sidewalk (Concrete Work Only) | Construction Cost | Design | CM | Cost Range for Project Matrix | Cost Range (\$-\$-\$-\$-\$) | Construction | Design | Other | Main. | Env. | ROW | Surv. | Util. | Geo. | Traf. | Notes |
| Repairs/Additions (400',1-Side) | \$150,000 - \$250,000 | \$15,000 - \$25,000 | \$15,000 - \$25,000 | \$100,000 to \$300,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | Varies per #Crews | | | | Var | Var | Var | | |
| Curb Extension/Bulb-out Design | \$100,000 - \$300,000 per intersection | \$10,000 - \$30,000 | \$10,000 - \$30,000 | \$100,000 to \$300,000 | \$ | 2-4 Weeks/ intersection | Varies (Weeks) | Varies per #Crews | | | | Var | X | X | Var | Effects Traffic Control |
| Bike Improvements | Construction Cost | Design | CM | Cost Range for Project Matrix | Cost Range (\$-\$-\$-\$-\$) | Construction | Design | Other | Main. | Env. | ROW | Surv. | Util. | Geo. | Traf. | Notes |
| Bike Storage | \$2,000 - \$4,000 /Bike Locker; \$250-\$300/Bike | N/A | N/A | \$0 to \$25,000 | \$ | < 1 Week | N/A | Order Time | | | | | | | | |
| Class II Bike Path (Bike Lane) (bidirectional) | \$30,000 - \$60,000 | \$3,000 - \$6,000 | \$3,000 - \$6,000 | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | < 1 Week | Varies (Weeks) | | X | | | Var | | | X | |
| Class III Bike Path (Shared Lane) (bidirectional) | <\$50,000 | >\$5,000 | >\$5,000 | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | < 1 Week | Varies (Weeks) | | X | | | | | | X | |
| Class IV Bike Path (Separated Bike Lane) (bidirectional) | \$250,000 - \$750,000 | >\$10,000 | >\$10,000 | \$300,000 to \$1million | \$\$\$\$ | Varies (Months) | Varies (Months) | | | | | Var | X | X | X | Traffic Control |
| Class I Bike Path (Bike Path) - (10'x5280') | \$1,500,000 - \$2,000,000 | >\$40,000 | >\$40,000 | greater than \$1million | \$\$\$\$\$ | Varies (Months) | Varies (Months) | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | Grading cost can Vary |
| Bike/Ped Structures | Construction Cost | Design | CM | Cost Range for Project Matrix | Cost Range (\$-\$-\$-\$-\$) | Construction | Design | Other | Main. | Env. | ROW | Surv. | Util. | Geo. | Traf. | Notes |
| Bridge | Greatly Varies >\$1,000,000 | Varies | 10% | greater than \$1million | \$\$\$\$\$ | Varies (Seasons) | Varies (Seasons) | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | CT Coordination |
| Structure | Greatly Varies >\$1,000,000 | Varies | 10% | greater than \$1million | \$\$\$\$\$ | Varies (Seasons) | Varies (Seasons) | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | CT Coordination |

| Notes |
|--|
| 1. Design based on Napa County Standards |
| 2. Lengths are based on 1 mile |
| 3. Costs based on CT district 4 |
| 4. For Bike Storage information: https://groundcontrolsystems.com |
| 5. For EV Information: https://www.itskrs.its.dot.gov/2020-sc00472 |
| 6. Hourly transit operational cost based on the calculated hourly rate from the most recent TDA audit. |

| Legend and Definitions | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Short Term | Less than six months |
| Medium Term | Less than one year |
| Medium-Long Term | Two to three years |
| Long Term | Longer than 3 years |
| \$ | Approx \$25K or less |
| \$ | Approx \$100K or less |
| \$ | Approx \$100K - \$300K |
| \$ | Approx \$300K - \$1M |
| \$ | Greater than \$1M |

| Abbreviations | | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Main. | Maintenance | Geo. | Geotech |
| Env. | Environmental | Traf. | Traffic Studies |
| ROW | Right of Way | Util. | Utility Coordination |
| Surv. | Survey | CM | Construction Management |

| Infrastructure | Cost | | | | | Time | | | Requirements | | | | | | | Notes |
|---|-------------------------------|--|--------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|-------|--------------|------|-----|-------|-------|------|-------|---|
| | Construction Cost | Design | CM | Cost Range for Project Matrix | Cost Range (\$-\$\$\$\$\$) | Construction | Design | Other | Main. | Env. | ROW | Surv. | Util. | Geo. | Traf. | |
| Pothole | \$800 per CYD | Varies | Varies | \$25,000 to \$100,000 | \$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | | X | | | | X | X | X | Traffic Control |
| Maintenance (Slurry Seal TYPE II) (56' x 5280') | \$100,000 - \$300,000 | \$10,000 - \$30,000 | Varies | \$100,000 to \$300,000 | \$\$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | | X | | | Var | X | X | X | |
| Pavement Rehabilitation (56' x 5280' x 2.5") | \$1.2 mil - \$4 mil | \$120,000 - \$160,000 | Varies | greater than \$1million | \$\$\$\$\$ | Varies (Weeks) | Varies (Months) | | X | | | Var | X | X | X | Requires ADA Work; costs vary based upon repair methods |
| Transit | Construction Cost | Design | CM | Cost Range for Project Matrix | Cost Range (\$-\$\$\$\$\$) | Implementation | Design/Planning | Other | Main. | Env. | ROW | Surv. | Util. | Geo. | Traf. | Notes |
| Expanding hours, expanding routes, adding new service, etc. | 192 (Hourly Operational Cost) | Varies | N/A | | | Varies (Months) | Varies (Months) | | X | | | | | | | Operational cost encapsulates full cost of operation (wages, maintenance costs, fuel, insurance, etc.). Cost to implement difficult to estimate as multiple factors would need to be considered including potential infrastructure costs (adding stops, bus pull outs, etc.), if expansion of paratransit service would be required, would more drivers need to be hired, would more buses need to be purchased, etc. |
| Installing a bus shelter | Approx \$12,000 per shelter | 9' Dome Roof Shelter = \$7,500 13' Dome Roof Shelter = \$8,500 Map Kiosk = \$600 | | \$20,000 - \$25,000 per shelter | \$ | Depending on lead time of shelter, varies (months) | Depending on permits required, varies (months) | | X | | Var | | | | | NVTA does not own ROW. Costs only reflect the purchase of the bus shelters (which vary in size and costs). Does not assume any costs with obtaining permits. |
| Installing a bench at a bus stop | Minimal | Approx \$800 - \$2,000 per bench | N/A | Approx \$800 - \$2,000 per bench | \$ | Depending on lead time of bench, varies (months) If bench already in inventory, (weeks) | Varies (Weeks) | | X | | | | | | | Benches vary in size, build and style. Placement would depend on ROW spacing, complying with ADA access, and obtaining permits |

| Notes |
|--|
| 1. Design based on Napa County Standards |
| 2. Lengths are based on 1 mile |
| 3. Costs based on CT district 4 |
| 4. For Bike Storage information: https://groundcontrolsystems.com |
| 5. For EV Information: https://www.itskrs.its.dot.gov/2020-sc00472 |
| 6. Hourly transit operational cost based on the calculated hourly rate from the most recent TDA audit. |

| Legend and Definitions | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Short Term | Less than six months |
| Medium Term | Less than one year |
| Medium-Long Term | Two to three years |
| Long Term | Longer than 3 years |
| \$ | Approx \$25K or less |
| \$\$ | Approx \$100K or less |
| \$\$\$ | Approx \$100K - \$300K |
| \$\$\$\$ | Approx \$300K - \$1M |
| \$\$\$\$\$ | Greater than \$1M |

| Abbreviations | | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Main. | Maintenance | Geo. | Geotech |
| Env. | Environmental | Traf. | Traffic Studies |
| ROW | Right of Way | Util. | Utility Coordination |
| Surv. | Survey | CM | Construction Management |