



# MEMORANDUM

---

**To:** Mr. John McDowell  
Deputy Planning Director  
Planning Division  
Zoning & Land Use Permits  
County of Napa, CA

**Date:** August 5, 2014

**Re:** **Response to Comments on the  
Traffic Impact Analyses for the  
Proposed Raymond Vineyards Winery  
Use Permit Modification (P11-00156)**

**From:** Omni-Means Engineers & Planners  
Walnut Creek, CA

**Job #:** 35-5629-01

**Project:** Raymond Vineyards Winery  
Use Permit Modification P11-00156

**File #:** C1557MEM003

---

Dear Mr. McDowell,

The following memo provides responses to staff and public comments received regarding the traffic impact analyses conducted by Omni-Means for the proposed Raymond Vineyards Winery business (Use Permit Modification P11-00156) located at 849 Zinfandel Lane in the County of Napa.

In review, a traffic impact analysis report was prepared (Traffic Impact Analysis for the Raymond Vineyards Winery Expansion Project, November 16, 2011) reflecting the original proposed use modification. Subsequent to that report, an expanded traffic analysis incorporating additional information requested by County staff was prepared (Updated Traffic Study for the Proposed Raymond Vineyards Winery Use Permit Modification P11-00156, April 5, 2013). In January 2014 we were advised that the Use Permit request had been reduced to exclude the production increase portion of the project. A memo identifying the resulting trip reductions was prepared and submitted to the County (Vehicle Trip Reduction for Permit Application Without Production Increase, January 22, 2014.) We were also advised of additional approved developments for inclusion in the Near-Term conditions analysis. A memo containing analysis of the revised Near-Term conditions with the additional approved developments was prepared and submitted to the County (Traffic Analysis With Approved Developments Update, January 27, 2014). The revised Near-Term scenario was also incorporated into the updated traffic study of April 5, 2013.

We have subsequently been informed that the use modification request has been further reduced and now excludes the requested increase in daily visitation (100 additional visitors) above the current permit use level (400 daily visitors) as well as the winery production exclusion. The responses to the comments herein have considered the reduced use permit conditions.

With the information outlined above for reference, the following responses have been provided:

The methodologies for conducting the traffic impact analyses, including the scope of work, the evaluated scenarios, vehicle trip generators, and trip rates were determined in consultation with County staff for analysis in accordance with the policies established by the County of Napa. We find the County's methodology utilized for these studies corresponds with industry accepted practices for such studies.

The comment letter contends the calculated number of project trips is under represented and that only the net increase in trips from the current use permit were applied to the background volumes. The letter states that in this regard the baseline condition excludes other potential trips generated up to the current use permit levels and states the total increase from existing conditions should be applied. However, the methodology used in the traffic study evaluated the project conditions reflecting the growth from existing conditions (actual counts) up to the proposed use levels. The project trip generation was calculated for the proposed winery modification using the *total* number of trips generated by the winery (not only the increase) as shown in Table 6 on page 19 of the traffic report. This total includes existing use levels up to the current use permit and the proposed use levels. The calculated trips reflect total visitation, onsite employees, and wine production trips generated by the winery.

The original use permit's total winery trip generating components consisted of 500 visitors, 90 employees, and 1.5 million gallons annual wine production. The resulting trips equated to 410 weekday daily, 73 weekday peak hour, 403 Saturday daily, and 130 Saturday peak hour total winery trips. The total volumes represented an increase of 111 weekday daily, 41 weekday peak hour, 240 Saturday daily, and 88 Saturday peak hour trips compared to the existing volumes counted at the winery. These were the trips added to the existing volumes for analysis.

As stated above, the use permit modification request has been reduced from the size evaluated in the traffic report and no longer contains the wine production nor visitation increase elements. Therefore, the reduction in trip generating components makes the original traffic analysis more conservative. Total vehicle trip generation by the winery is now calculated to generate 378 weekday daily, 63 weekday peak hour, 332 Saturday daily, and 105 Saturday peak hour trips. This represents an increase of 79 weekday daily, 31 weekday peak hour, 169 Saturday daily, and 63 Saturday peak hour trips compared to the surveyed existing volumes counted at the winery. These are 24%-30% lower than the original study.

It is noted that two surveys of the existing winery traffic were conducted during separate peak times of the year (harvest and summer). The surveys found the winery was not experiencing visitation as high as the permitted levels. Thus the visitation levels used in the proposed use permit trip generation calculations may overstate visitation, and therefore volumes, for typical days based on the surveyed levels.

For the Near Term (approved developments) scenario, the comment letter points out a number of approved wineries were not included in the traffic report. As stated above, in January 2014 we were advised of two additional approved wineries in the nearby vicinity to include in the Near Term analysis (Castellucci Winery and Zinfandel Lane Winery), both located on Zinfandel Lane. The near term conditions were re-evaluated and the analysis findings were provided to the County. The inclusion of individual approved developments is predicated in part on the timeline and proximity of these developments to a proposed project. The General Plan transportation model forecasts take into account traffic growth from approved/potential developments, including expansion of wineries and vineyards. The anticipated growth and mitigation measures provided in the General Plan reflect regional growth by individual projects, such as along the SR 29 and Silverado Trail corridors.

The traffic report prepared for the Raymond Winery evaluated operating conditions at the intersections of Zinfandel Lane/Wheeler Lane (winery access road) and SR 29/Zinfandel Lane. The scope of the evaluated intersections is consistent with the methodologies of other winery studies. The comment letter requested inclusion of the Zinfandel Lane/ Silverado Trail intersection for analysis. At the County's request, a level of service traffic operations analysis for the Zinfandel Lane/Silverado Trail intersection has been conducted in conjunction with this memo.

There were no significant impacts found at this intersection based on the County standards. The analysis found that the proposed use permit would add vehicular traffic above existing conditions, but within the standards of significance. As noted in the analysis, the findings/recommendations in the Raymond Winery traffic report would remain applicable, particularly the construction of a westbound left turn lane on Zinfandel Lane at Wheeler Lane which would mitigate the left turn lane volume warrant conditions at the winery access intersection.

The comment letter states that the traffic report recommended winery traffic be routed through the neighboring residential streets. However, the report recommended the winery should inform employees of the neighborhood concerns and request they avoid using the neighborhood streets.

Even though there were no significant impacts found based on traffic, the traffic report recommended several measures to reduce vehicle trips, including the scheduling of employee work shifts to facilitate carpooling and minimize traffic during peak periods and to schedule event times so that vehicle trips occur outside of peak background traffic hours. The comment letter states these are vague and therefore should not be considered at all. However, trip reduction strategies to minimize traffic during peak hours have been codified in the Napa County General Plan. Mitigation measures 4.4.1e & 4.4.1f state: The County shall include a policy to the General Plan that supports programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle use and encourage carpooling, transit use, and alternative modes such as bicycling, walking, and telecommuting and to implement programs encouraging the use of alternative travel modes including preferential car pool parking and ridesharing incentives; flexible working hours; a purchasing program that favors hybrid, electric, or other non-gasoline vehicles; secure bicycle parking; and transit incentives. As provided in the traffic report, the General Plan states: "The project should support programs to reduce single occupant vehicle use and encourage alternative travel modes." Scheduling work shifts to begin and end outside of the peak background periods on weekdays and Saturdays would reduce such trips during those time periods. The recommendations given in the report are the result of these specific policy guidelines.

Similarly, measures for reducing marketing event trips during peak periods were recommended in the traffic report, such as scheduling event times so that trip generation occurs outside of peak hours and closure of the winery to visitation for events that generate onsite attendance and parking maximums. Other specific measures include a parking plan that was prepared by the Winery and submitted to the County. It is our understanding additional specific measures relative to marketing event trip generation have been presented to the County for inclusion in the use permit application.

In summary, the traffic impact analysis was conducted based on the methodologies prescribed by the County regulations. The study conservatively evaluated conditions based on the change in volumes with the proposed use permit above existing traffic volume levels (not the current use permit levels). The use permit modification request has been reduced in scope and now excludes the winery production increase and visitation increase levels that were evaluated in the traffic report.

The Zinfandel Lane/Silverado Trail intersection has been evaluated contemporaneously with this memo. The originally proposed use permit modification (and thusly the reduced modification request) were not found to have a significant impact based on the County standards of significance. The eastbound Zinfandel Lane approach operates at LOS 'F' for existing, near term, and long term scenarios without the project and would continue to do so with longer delays for some approaches. Vehicle queues were calculated to increase by one to two vehicles eastbound at times during the peak hours based on the calculations for the original use permit modification. The current proposal is calculated to add 10 weekday peak hour and 18 Saturday peak hour trips to the Zinfandel Lane/Silverado Trail intersection. However, it is noted that actual visitors (compared to the current permit level) are lower in proportion to the levels used for the trip rate calculations, indicating actual volume increases may be less than calculated during typical conditions. It is our understanding a travel demand management program with trip reduction strategies would be provided to winery employees. The calculated winery trips would be expected to be reduced with the implementation of travel demand measures. For example, if 25% of employees can be encouraged to rideshare, daily and peak hour trips would be reduced by 20%-26%.

We trust this provides you with the requested information. Please feel free to contact us if you have any additional questions or comments.

[Comment Letter and Zinfandel Lane/Silverado Trail intersection analysis submitted separately.]