



NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Board Agenda Memo

TO: NVTA Board of Directors
FROM: Danielle Schmitz, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Patrick Band, Senior Planner
(707) 259-8781 / Email: pband@nvta.ca.gov
SUBJECT: Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan Adoption

RECOMMENDATION

That the Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) Board:

- 1) Hold a public hearing to consider adoption of the Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan (Attachment 1), inclusive of minor administrative edits as may be identified, and;
- 2) Determine that the Plan is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) §21080.20.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

At a Special Meeting on February 23rd, the NVTA Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) reviewed the Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan (AT Plan). The ATAC voted unanimously to recommend the Board of Directors adopt the Plan, and request the addition of a buffered Class II proposed facility designation for Silverado Trail from Deer Park Road to the Napa City Limits. NVTA staff reviewed this recommendation and have made this modification to the Plan.

Additionally, informational presentations were made to the NVTA Community Advisory Committee (CAC) on March 4th, and NVTA Paratransit Coordinating Committee (PCC) on March 5th. Committee members were invited to provide comments, but no action was taken.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan serves as a comprehensive update to the prior Countywide Bicycle Plan (2019) and Countywide Pedestrian Plan (2016). New and innovative approaches to active transportation policy and infrastructure, as well as changes in law necessitate periodic updates to ensure that planned improvements align with local and regional goals, and to better compete for limited funding to support the build-out of the active transportation network.

At the February 18, 2026 NVTA Board of Directors meeting, the draft Plan was released for a 28-day public review and comment period. Comments were received from members of the public, community organizations, and local jurisdictions, and are reflected in Attachment 2. Comments were evaluated by NVTA staff and, where appropriate, incorporated into the final plan.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a fiscal impact? No.

CEQA REQUIREMENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: The proposed action is statutorily exempt from the CEQA pursuant to PRC §21080.20, as it is an active transportation plan “that promotes and encourages people to choose walking, bicycling, or rolling through the creation of safe, comfortable, connected, and accessible walking, bicycling, or rolling networks, and encourages alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips.”

Following the public hearing and adoption, notice will be filed with the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation and the County Clerk, as specified under PRC §21125.

BACKGROUND

With extensive input from the community and deep guidance from stakeholder agencies, the Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan establishes a vision for walking, bicycling and other non-automotive transportation options such as e-bikes and e-scooters throughout the county. The Plan documents the existing environment, presents a thoughtful set of recommended projects and other strategies, and includes an achievable implementation plan to make active transportation safer, more accessible, and more convenient for residents and visitors to the region.

Organization

The Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan is structured to include countywide guidance and policies to inform implementation of projects and programs throughout Napa County’s communities, as well as individual chapters specific to each of the six

jurisdictions – the County of Napa, and Cities of Calistoga, St. Helena, Napa, American Canyon, and Town of Yountville. Jurisdiction-specific chapters have been crafted to support countywide goals and are to be adopted by each jurisdiction to guide local planning and investments in projects and programs.

The AT Plan also includes a detailed Treatment Toolkit that identifies nearly 50 project-based improvements to enhance safety, accessibility, and convenience of walking and biking infrastructure.

Public Engagement

Over the course of more than a year, NVTA and local jurisdiction staff have supported extensive community engagement to inform the projects, programs, and policies included in the draft Plan. Nearly 2,000 community members were engaged in the plan development process, with more than 700 comments received through online surveys, interactive maps, and more than 30 separate in-person and virtual events, presentations, and public meetings.

Plan Recommendations

As noted above, the Plan is structured into distinct chapters addressing the specific recommended infrastructure improvements for each of the six jurisdictions in Napa County. While this memo focuses on countywide totals, detailed maps and tables identifying jurisdiction-specific recommended improvements can be found within the Plan (Attachment 1).

Countywide Policies & Programs

The Plan includes countywide policies and programs, developed based on an extensive review of prior planning documents, and in close coordination with local jurisdictions. These policies are organized under the national Safe Routes “E’s” framework, addressing Engineering, Education & Engagement, Encouragement, and Evaluation topics. In addition to the countywide baseline policies, the Plan provides space for each jurisdiction to identify and adopt at the local level additional policies or similar language to guide priorities, planning and future investments in active transportation.

Bicycle Facility Recommendations

Building on the recommendations from the 2019 Countywide Bicycle Plan, roadways countywide were analyzed utilizing a range of criteria including existing vehicle speed & volume, existing bike facilities, proximity to key origins & destinations (eg: parks, schools, retail), and historical collision data from the countywide High Injury Network. With engagement and input from local jurisdiction staff, a revised network of proposed facilities was developed, totaling 436 miles of new or improved bike facilities.

Table 5.1: Napa Countywide Proposed Bicycle Network Mileage

Facility Type	2019 Existing Mileage	2025 Existing Mileage*	Change 2019 to 2025	2025 Proposed Mileage	Total Future Mileage
Shared Use Path (Class I)	40.9	47.0	+6.1	66.2	113.3
Bicycle Lanes (Class II)	87.8	87.1	-0.7	79.7	166.8
Buffered Bicycle Lanes (Class II)	-	3.7	+3.7	30.9	34.6
Bicycle Route (Class III)	13.5	6.8	-6.7	-	6.8
Bicycle Boulevard (Class III)	-	0.1	+0.1	52.4	52.4
Rural Bicycle Route (Class III)	-	9.1	+9.1	201.0	210.1
Separated Bikeway (Class IV)	-	1.9	+1.9	5.8	7.7
Unclassified Bike Route	-	17.9	+17.9	0.8	18.7
Total	142.2	173.6	+31.4	436.9	610.4

**2025 Existing mileage totals are derived from a comprehensive review of existing bicycle facilities, which in some cases resulted in removal or re-categorization of facilities.*

Pedestrian Facility Recommendations

Unlike the proposed bicycle network which establishes recommendations for roadways countywide, the pedestrian network focuses more narrowly on closing sidewalk gaps in existing developed areas or in proximity to key origins & destinations such as schools, parks, shopping, and transit stops. Additionally, due to limited roadway width in existing neighborhoods, if sidewalk gaps were found to be present on both sides of the street, the plan prioritizes sidewalk on the side of the street closest to key destinations. The pedestrian network also prioritizes improvements along neighborhood streets with existing or proposed bicycle facilities, reinforcing a preference for multimodal corridors where bicyclists and pedestrians can feel most comfortable.

Table 5.2: Napa Countywide Proposed Pedestrian Network Mileage

Facility Type	Existing Mileage	Proposed Mileage	Total
Shared Use Path (Class I)	47.0	66.2	113.3
Sidewalk	523.1	18.3	541.4
Total	570.1	84.6	654.7

ALTERNATIVES

None.

COUNTYWIDE PLAN GOALS MET BY THIS PROPOSAL

Goal 1 – Serve the transportation needs of the entire community regardless of age, income, or ability.

The project recommendations and policies in the Active Transportation Plan are based on an “All Ages and Abilities” framework.

Goal 2 – Improve system safety in order to support all mode and serve all users.

The Active Transportation Plan incorporates user safety as a key criteria for project recommendations, and includes policies to advance existing goals to reduce or eliminate serious injuries and fatalities on Napa County roadways.

Goal 5 – Minimize the energy and other resources required to move people and goods.

By establishing an aggressive yet achievable active transportation mode share target of 10% of all trips by 2050, implementation of the Active Transportation Plan will reduce energy use for shorter trips (generally 2-3 miles or less).

ATTACHMENTS

- 1 - [Final Countywide Active Transportation Plan](#)
- 2 - Public & Jurisdiction Comments

Napa County Public Works Dept.

Comments on the 2/13/26 Draft NVT Active Transportation Plan

The following are comments on AT Plan Chapter 12 “Unincorporated Napa County”:

1. Add a paragraph about the list of projects in Table E-6: “Napa County will continue to evaluate active transportation projects and incorporate safety countermeasures into paving projects; however, due to right of way, utility, environmental, and financial constraints, in general Napa County will only stripe Class II bike lanes and buffered bike lanes when the existing County road is wide enough for the standard widths. When engineers prepare preliminary plans, they will include traffic calming and other design options in the “Toolkit” where appropriate. Napa County is also dedicating resources to construct Class 1 shared use paths to meet the seven percent funding requirement in the Measure U ordinance. For the “Near Term”, Napa County does not plan to apply for funding to widen County roads to construct bike lanes and buffered bike lanes unless such funding compliments an existing planned project and does not detract from other projects. Napa County also emphasizes that the cost estimates in Table E-6 are preliminary and the actual cost could be significantly higher to address environmental studies, right-of-way acquisition, drainage, steep adjacent slopes, etc. For example, a 2024 cost estimate for Project 815 to construct Class II bike lanes on Salvador Avenue was \$1.5 million. Constructing a new bridge over the Napa River with Class II bike lanes could exceed \$10 million.”
2. In Table 12-6, it appears that some of the projects on Caltrans highways are included in the Unincorporated Napa County numbers; however, Caltrans would probably expect Napa County to obtain the funding and apply for an encroachment permit to construct the projects. Napa County only plans to construct Class 1 shared use paths within Caltrans right-of-way; therefore, please create a separate list / table of projects on the State Highway System.
3. Napa County only plans to sign and stripe County roads for Class III bicycle routes when the speed limit is less than 30 MPH per the 9/27/2024 Senate Bill 1216 that changed Sections 891.9, 2382 and 2384 of the Streets and Highways Code.
4. In Table 12-4, I can only think of the three miles of Class 1 between Napa and Yountville and the 0.2-miles on Devlin Road between Airport Blvd and the former Bronco Road. Since 2019, Napa County added five miles of Vine Trail between St. Helena and Calistoga and 0.6 miles between Bronco Road and Tower Road. (3.2 + 5.6 = 8.8) Old Howell Mt. Road is 2.5 miles, Yountville to St. Helena is 7.7 miles, and Vista Carneros is 3.1 miles for a total of 13.3 miles of future Class 1 paths. Are there any more class 1 paths?
5. Table 12-5 is not correct.

6. The Bicycle May Use Full Lane (R4-11) was discontinued with the 11th edition MUTCD and replaced with the “Bicycles Allowed Use of Full Lane” (R9-20) the AT Plan should be updated accordingly.
7. Page 16, Rural Bicycle Routes (Class III) – 95% of County rural bicycle routes do not have shoulder as shown on the image, this image should be replaced with a bicycle sharing the lane with a car for accuracy.

The following are comments on AT Plan Table E-6:

1. Separate projects within the Caltrans State Highway System from projects within Napa County right-of-way, including 821, 826, 866, 885, 894, 935, 1017, 1032, 1058, 1084, 1089, 1090, 1092, 1096, 1220, 1221, and 1229.
2. Remove ID 806, remove the orange highlight for ID 1056, and change “Y” to “N” in the “Near Term Project” column.
3. For ID 807, add “Hillcrest Drive” in the “End” column.
4. For ID 815, remove orange highlight, change the cost to \$1.5 million, and change “Y” to “N” in the “Near Term Project” column.
5. For 852, change beginning to Shady Brook Lane and end to Napa County line.
6. For ID 858, change First Ave. to Second Avenue.
7. Move ID 862 to the City of Am. Can. list.
8. For ID 884, change “Browns Valley” to “650 feet north of Wine Country Avenue”.
9. For ID 917, the applicant developing the property on the south side of Kelly Road is conditioned to construct a Class 1 path on the south side of Kelly Road; therefore, move to the City of Am. Can. list and remove from the Napa County list.
10. For ID 936, there are Class II bike lanes on Monticello Road and Napa County will not close the older Trancas Street Bridge over Milliken Creek that carries eastbound traffic; therefore, remove the Project.
11. For ID 1018, change to Finnell Road from Town Limit to Yountville Cross Road.
12. For ID 1026, change “Oakville Grade Rd” to “Dry Creek Road”.
13. For ID 1033, it appears that this path is complete or in Am. Can.
14. For ID 1036, change “Newell” to “American Canyon City Limit”.
15. For ID 1047, change “4th Avenue” to “Skyline Park”.
16. For ID 1054, change to Class III Bicycle Route.
17. For ID 1055 and 1056, change “Y” to “N” in the “Near Term Project” column.
18. For ID 1085, change “Silverado Trail” to St. Helena City Limit.
19. For ID 1120 and 1228, the speed limit on Petrified Forest Road exceeds 30 MPH. Confirm if Class III would be legal. Delete 1120 since 1228 includes 1120.
20. For ID 1128, 1129, and 1219, move to City of St. Helena list.
21. For ID 1132, 1132, and 1134, move to City of Napa List.
22. Remove ID 1135, which is complete.
23. Change ID 1157 to Class III Bike Route.
24. Add a name and limits to ID 1162 or remove.

25. For ID 1180, highlight with orange and add a “Y” in the “Near Term Project” column.
26. For ID 1186, change limits from Tower Road to South Kelly Road.
27. Remove ID 1211, which is complete.
28. For ID 1223, change “Soscol Ferry Road to “Existing Bay Trail”.

The following are comments on the bike network map and figures at <https://ghdengagement.com/napa-atplan-proposed-bike-network> . Some comments might be a repeat of comments provided on 7/16/25.

1. For the Vine Trail in St. Helena on Oak Avenue, Adams Street, and Fulton Lane, change green Class 1 Shared use path to proposed Bike Blvd. on the bike network map. Remove green dashed line along the railroad between Adams Street and Fulton Lane.
2. In Bothe State Park, remove the dashed green line on the bike network map.
3. For Silverado Trail between Dunaweal Lane and Larkmead Lane, remove the dashed blue line on the bike network map.
4. On Oakville Road, show segments with bike lanes as solid blue and segments without bike lanes and dashed lines on the bike network map.
5. On Atlas Peak Road, there are bike lanes between Hillcrest Drive and McKinley Road, so show as a solid blue line on the bike network map.
6. On Trancas Street between the Napa River and Silverado Trail, remove dashed light blue line and show solid dark blue line for buffered bike lanes.
7. On Monticello Road between Silverado Trail and Highway 121, change dashed light blue line to solid light blue line on the bike network map.
8. Check the appropriate line for the existing bikeway on Second Avenue between Coombsville Road and North Avenue on the bike network map.
9. Check the appropriate line for the existing bikeway on Vichy Avenue between Hagen Road and Monticello Road on the bike network map.
10. Show an existing Class III Bike Route on Old Sonoma Road between Buhman Avenue and Congress Valley Road on the bike network map; however, there are sections of OSR that are wide enough for Class II bike lanes.
11. Show an existing Class II bike lanes and Class III Bike Route on American Canyon Road between the City limits and the Solano County line.
12. Show existing Class II bike lanes on SR 12 between Solano County and SR 29.

Prepared by Graham Wadsworth on 2/17/26 and revised 2/26/26

G:\ENGINEER\DESIGN\2 Staff\Graham\Agencies\NVTA\Active Transportation Plan



March 9, 2026

Public Comment: NVTA Countywide Active Transportation Plan Draft

Dear Mr. Band,

The Napa County Bicycle Coalition (NCBC) represents over 2,000 members and supporters throughout Napa County, advocating to make cycling safe, convenient, and accessible for riders of all ages and abilities. For over 15 years, NCBC has collaborated with local organizations, businesses, elected officials, and the public to align our transportation infrastructure with the needs of cyclists and other active transportation users.

We welcome the release of the Active Transportation Plan Draft and are encouraged by the progress it represents. Prior to finalization, we respectfully request that the following changes be considered for incorporation into the plan.

Proposed Facilities

Proposed Bike Facilities Map

- **Berry Street** – The proposed bike boulevard removes existing separated bike lanes. We recommend retaining these facilities.
- **SR 29 South of Calistoga** – The plan proposes a Class III designation; however, this segment currently features Class II/IIb bike lanes with rumble strips. Given the speeds and volumes on this corridor, a Class III designation appears inconsistent with recommended facility standards.
- **Calistoga** – A bike facility gap remains on Lake Street and should be addressed.
- **Overlapping Facility Designations** – Conflicting designations throughout the plan should be reconciled. For example, Pratt Avenue in St. Helena shows both Class I and Class II proposals, with the Class I designation rendered nearly illegible.
- **St. Helena – Spring Street** – The City of St. Helena's Streets Master Plan differs in its recommendation from this plan. This discrepancy should be resolved prior to finalization.
- **St. Helena – Network Gaps** – Bike network gaps remain on Madrona/Fulton and Oak Avenue. Additionally, Oak Avenue is still designated for a Class I facility along the Vine Trail alignment, which does not reflect the Vine Trail Coalition's plans, as we understand them.
- **St. Helena – Pope Street** – No improvements are listed for Pope Street, which warrants attention.
- **Napa – Coombsville Road** – Where space exists for Class IIb lanes, we recommend considering Class IV facilities, given the absence of parking and the route's function as a route to school.

- **Napa – Freeway Drive (Laurel to 1st Street)** – We recommend upgrading existing buffered segments to Class IV facilities.
- **Trower Avenue Extension to Big Ranch Road** – As a newly constructed roadway, this corridor presents an opportunity to designate a facility type beyond Class II.
- **Solano Avenue (South of Vine Trail)** – No improvements are proposed for this segment, despite substandard bike lane conditions along much of the stretch between the Vine Trail and Lincoln Avenue. At minimum, we recommend updating these lanes to standard Class II bike lanes.
- **Silverado Trail (City of Napa to Deer Park Road)** – We recommend upgrading this segment to Class IIb.
- **American Canyon – West Donaldson Way** – A bike network gap exists on this corridor and should be addressed.
- **American Canyon Road** – Consider upgrading the segment that crosses Highway 29, and studying it so deep intersection improvements can be implemented.

Proposed Pedestrian Network

- **County Pocket Sidewalks** – While acknowledging these may fall outside the scope of this plan, NCBC intends to continue encouraging the Board of Supervisors to identify solutions for sidewalk gaps in county pocket areas.
- **Calistoga – Silverado Trail (Lincoln Avenue to Brannan Street)** – The sidewalk gap along this segment should be closed in its entirety.
- **El Centro Avenue & Jefferson Street near Willow** – Sidewalk gaps in this area remain unaddressed.
- **West Park Avenue (West of WPES)** – No sidewalk facilities are present.
- **Marin Street (Lincoln to Central)** – Sidewalk coverage is absent along this segment.
- **West Imola (SR 29 to Minahen)** – A sidewalk gap closure is needed on this segment.
- **American Canyon – SR 29 Class I to Paoli Loop Road** – No connection between these facilities appears to be planned.
- **East Napa Junction Road** – No sidewalk gap closure is shown for this area.
- **Howell Mountain Road** – The existing sidewalk should be extended to College Avenue to maximize network connectivity.

Priority Projects

Calistoga Priority Bike Projects

- **Stephenson Street** – This street is not listed for improvement. We recommend designating it as a Class III facility.

St. Helena Priority Bike Projects

- We question the prioritization of the Class I river trail along the Napa River above all in-town projects, and request that the rationale for this decision be clarified.

Napa Priority Bike Projects

- SR 221 South of Imola has both Class I and Class II facilities listed as priorities. Given the stated policy of excluding redundant facilities, we recommend prioritizing only the Class I designation and redirecting remaining prioritization resources elsewhere.
- Jefferson Street does not appear in the priority list, despite its inclusion in the City's Five-Year Measure T Plan. We recommend its prioritization be revisited.

County Priority Bike Projects

- If Class II facilities on North Kelly Road and SR 221 are to be prioritized, the Class IV facilities on SR 29 between them must also be prioritized to avoid cyclists being directed onto a high-risk stretch without adequate infrastructure. The intersection in this area warrants additional attention.

Partnership

NCBC respectfully requests acknowledgment of our organization and the volunteers who conducted the countywide bike parking audit, much of which was completed on a voluntary basis.

Additional Comments

- The plan does not appear to include language committing to "implement this plan or better." We request that this language be incorporated.

Possible Errors and Typographical Issues

- **Page 5, "Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction," Third Bullet** – The current language reads "increase work trips made by bicycling or walking by 10%." We believe the intent is to increase mode share *to* 10%, rather than *by* 10% from an already small baseline. This should be updated to align with Objective 4.2.
- **American Canyon Existing Conditions Map** – The existing Class I facility in front of NJES on Eucalyptus Drive is not shown.
- **American Canyon Road (James to Silver Oak Trail)** – The Existing Conditions map lists this segment as buffered; please confirm whether this is accurate.
- **Donaldson Way East** – Existing Class II bike lanes on this segment are not reflected in the Existing Conditions map.
- **Grayson Avenue, St. Helena** – The existing Class II/Class III combination on this street is not shown in the Existing Conditions map.
- **Existing Pedestrian Network** – An error message appears in the first paragraph of this section.
- **Napa Junction** – The Class III connection between existing Class I facilities has not been updated.

- **County of Napa – Community Input Section** – This section does not appear to be included. A summary of community meeting discussions should be incorporated for completeness.

Should you have any questions about our comment, please do not hesitate to reach out to us at the phone number below, at kvernor@napabike.org, or at csianato@napabike.org.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kara Vernor, Executive Director
Napa County Bicycle Coalition



Napa Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors
625 Burnell Street
Napa, CA 94559

March 16, 2026

Subject: Comments on the Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan

Dear NVTA Board of Directors,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Napa Countywide Active Transportation Plan. I'm writing on behalf of Save The Bay. We're a regional organization whose mission is to protect the San Francisco Bay for people and wildlife, and this include advocating for shoreline access for all. Our vision for the Bay includes a complete, accessible, and climate-resilient Bay Trail around the entire Bay.

The San Francisco Bay Trail is a planned 500-mile pathway around the entire San Francisco Bay running through all nine Bay Area counties and 47 cities. Approximately 350 miles are complete and in use today. Save The Bay has recently taken on a regional advocacy role to improve and complete the Bay Trail. Connecting communities to the Bay will increase the number of people able to benefit from the beauty, open space, wildlife, active transportation, and recreational opportunities that the Bay has to offer, and will help develop the next generation of Bay stewards.

In Napa County, there are approximately 11 miles of [incomplete Bay Trail](#). Approximately 1 mile of incomplete Bay Trail is in the City of American Canyon, approximately 2 miles in the City of Napa, and approximately 8 miles in unincorporated Napa County. Additionally, there are approximately 10 miles of incomplete Vine Trail running through American Canyon and Napa which, if completed, would serve as an important connector in the Bay Trail network.

We are pleased to see that the Bicycle and Pedestrian networks in the Active Transportation Plan include proposed shared-use paths along these incomplete Bay Trail and Vine Trail segments.

Completing these segments as dedicated paths for both pedestrians and cyclists is a priority for Save The Bay. We look forward to engaging with the County and cities as the bicycle and pedestrian networks are implemented.

Sincerely,

David Lewis
Executive Director
Save The Bay

Additional Public Comments Received

Via Project Website – www.NapaATplan.org

Comment #	Jurisdiction	Comment Text
1	City of Napa	<p>I am supportive of this plan and endorse these investments in bicycle infrastructure for Napa County. I am very pleased to see more connectivity to and across downtown Napa, particularly on Third Street, as well as linking and extending the Vine Trail southwards to American Canyon. These will be important improvement.</p> <p>In the future, I hope to see improvements to the bicycle infrastructure on Route 29 near St. Helena (where there are wide grates in the bicycle lane) and on Silverado Trail where some parts of the bicycle lane are dangerously narrow.</p>
2	City of American Canyon	<p>As we develop our local active transportation network, providing a way for the majority of the population to access major transportation hubs is vital and should be top priority. Closing the gaps to bicycle from Napa to the Vallejo ferry and bus terminal is critical for those who commute and to offset the increasing traffic congestion. Therefore, I believe everything possible should be done to prioritize bicycle access along or around Devlin Rd between Soscol Ferry Rd. and Airport Blvd. I have had to make the hard choice to stop commuting by bike along this route because of two near-misses that could have easily ended me. However, I still see others to continue riding this route. I applaud their courage but fear for their safety. Could Devlin Rd be painted and/or signs be placed to make drivers more aware of bicycles until the safe access is addressed? Additionally, the County could do a better job at keeping the weeds down all the way to the curb on this narrow road. The more weeds that encroach the shoulder, the less room bicycles have to distance themselves from passing cars. Honestly, I fear that if something isn't done about this situation soon, someone is going to get hurt or worse. Lives are at stake.</p>
3	City of Napa	<p>I am supportive of this plan and endorse these investments in bicycle infrastructure for Napa County. I am very pleased to see more connectivity to and across downtown Napa, particularly on Third Street, as well as linking and extending the Vine Trail southwards to American Canyon. These will be important improvement.</p> <p>In the future, I hope to see improvements to the bicycle infrastructure on Route 29 near St. Helena (where there are wide grates in the bicycle lane) and on Silverado Trail where some parts of the bicycle lane are dangerously narrow.</p>