

From: [Thomas Adams](#)
To: [Balcher, Wyntress](#); [Hawkins, Michael](#)
Cc: mikebasayne@gmail.com; anne.cottrell@lucene.com; [Terry Scott](#); joellePC@gmail.com; JeriGillPC@outlook.com; [Morrison, David](#); [Smith, Vincent \(PBES\)](#); [Anderson, Laura](#); [Joy Caldwell](#); [John Caldwell](#); [Susanne Madigan](#)
Subject: FW: Caldwell Winery
Date: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 9:35:30 AM

Wyntress,

I am re-forwarding the W-Trans response to the comments submitted by the Kreuzer Lane Neighbors on the Focused Traffic Analysis for the Caldwell Vineyards winery use permit. For ease of reference I have am copying the Commission and others at the County. The gist of the response is that the despite the comments the analysis was conservative in nature and W-Trans conclusions have not changed, that is the project will result in no significant impacts, the same conclusion reached in the original analysis. As for the question of whether an additional stop sign should be installed at the corner of Kreuzer Lane and 4th Avenue, this reflects an existing issue that is not changed by the proposed project, that said, the Caldwell are not opposed to the County installing additional signage or stop signs within it public right of way and would be supportive of such actions if the County determines it necessary. However, we wish to emphasize that this is not a project related impact but as users of the intersection the Caldwells will support any improvements that are deemed appropriate. It should also be noted that the Caldwells are supportive of installing traffic calming measures on the private portion of Kreuzer Lane but such improvements do require Fire Marshall approval.

Regards,

Tom

THOMAS ADAMS
707.261.7016 | TADAMS@DPF-LAW.COM

From: Dalene Whitlock [mailto:dwhitlock@w-trans.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 9:13 AM
To: Thomas Adams; John Caldwell
Cc: Balcher, Wyntress; Michael.Hawkins@countyofnapa.org
Subject: Caldwell Winery

I have reviewed the comments from the neighbors provided to me yesterday. Following are my thoughts regarding the issues they raised.

The issue as presented to us for review was to determine whether or not **all-way** stop controls were warranted. As noted in our report, we reviewed all of the available potential criterion that may indicate need for all-way stops, and determined that none were met. The neighbors have questioned whether our evaluation of sight lines based on images from Google Earth was accurate, though the photos they provided support a finding that the sight distance is adequate for a driver approaching at 25 mph to have time to stop before hitting an object sitting in the road at Kreuzer Lane, which is the minimum standard indicating that the condition is safe. The fact that one warrant may be met does not, in and of itself, indicate need for all-way stops, so we maintain, and the neighbors agree, that all-way stops are not necessary.

Item 7C
PC

RECEIVED

MAR 7 2018

Napa County Planning, Building
& Environmental Services

However, upon understanding their root concern as presented in the documents reviewed, I agree that it may be appropriate to install a stop sign on the eastbound 4th Street approach. It is noted that because the opposing leg (Kreuzer Lane) is stop-controlled, this would result in a somewhat more conventional control pattern, though it is most typical to have the “stem” of a tee intersection stopped and not the top; in other words, usually the two opposing legs are not stopped and the terminating leg is. The County policymakers could decide that a stop sign should be installed on the eastbound approach. Should such a decision be made, the project could offer to fund the installation, though this is an issue related to an existing potential deficiency, and not a project-related impact. It is recommended that in addition to a stop sign and stop-ahead sign, both approaches should be signed to note that the southbound 4th Street approach is not stop-controlled as this would remain a non-standard condition.

In response to some of the other comments made regarding the analysis of the project-related issues, the following is offered.

Collision report: the comments note that we “ignored” property damage collisions, which is untrue. We included all of the data available to us; if collisions are unreported, there is no way for us to include them, but we also didn’t ignore them. In fact, the comment indicating that there are often unreported crashes was made specifically because of this issue.

Speed limit: the assumption that the speed limit on Kreuzer Lane is 25 mph as used for our analysis is actually quite conservative as this translates to a lower volume being accommodated while maintaining acceptable operation. Because of its character, the enforceable speed limit may be higher, so the County may wish to review the roadway to determine if additional signing, such as a “Stop Ahead” sign, is needed due to the unusual stop configuration (drivers may see that the road extends and not expect to stop).

Added trips: the winery will generate approximately the same number of daily trips as six single family homes on a typical day, with the only exception being on days when there is a promotional event. It is noted that the event trip generation table is mis-labeled as being for 150 persons, but the numbers accurately reflect a 200-person event, as proposed and as shown in the trip generation form on Page 13. Also, in/out splits were estimated based on data collected in Sonoma County because there is no such data available from Napa County. It is unlikely that visitor patterns are significantly different between the two Counties in terms of time of day, and this data has been used for many studies for Napa County wineries.

With a daily volume of just over 400 trips, even with trips added for a 150-person event the daily volume of 564 would remain below the capacity of this roadway, as indicated by the level of service analysis. There is no evidence that merely adding traffic results in increased safety concerns; in fact, unfamiliar drivers typically drive more slowly and carefully as they don’t know the road.

Plus Project: the assignment of trips was conservatively assumed to be via one leg of 4th Street rather than both as the more trips are dispersed, the less their impact. This approach was taken to provide the most conservative assessment possible in terms of potential impacts. The results show

that the impact on traffic operation is less than significant; line of sight, whether adequate or not, has nothing to do with the operational results.

I hope this information is of use to staff and the policymakers as they consider your project.

Dalene

Dalene J. Whitlock
PE, PTOE Principal



Office 707.542.9500 Mobile 707.486.5792
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 201 Santa Rosa, CA 95401
www.w-trans.com