

May 17, 2017



Mr. Guy Byrne  
Leslie Rudd Investment Company, Inc.  
PO Box 105  
Oakville, CA 94562-0105

## **Response to Public Comments on the "Revised Traffic Study for Rudd Wines Winery & Tasting Room"**

Dear Mr. Byrne;

As requested we have reviewed comments regarding the sight distance analysis provided in the "Revised Traffic Study for Rudd Wines Winery & Tasting Room," May 11, 2016, W-Trans, as presented in a letter dated May 10, 2017, from Mr. Marc Bommersbach as well as an email entitled "Neighbors - Mark Your Calendars - Plan to Attend Hearing," dated May 14, 2017. The following information is provided in support of County staff's finding that the sight distance analysis is adequate.

### **Sight Distance Analysis**

In his opening paragraph, Mr. Bommersbach indicates that questions about compliance with "significance thresholds and mitigations required for Discretionary Use Permit project per the *Sonoma County Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies*" (Guidelines) were not answered. It should first be noted that there is a very important distinction between a guideline and a significance threshold. The traffic impact study guidelines are intended to inform the process and provide guidance. They are quite specifically not *requirements* as roadway configurations and geometrics vary so widely that it is often infeasible to achieve desired design values, including width, grade, sight lines, etc. Within the document there are guidelines relative to desired sight distance; however, unless specifically adopted by the Board of Supervisors, these are not thresholds of significance, and the General Plan does not include policies requiring a threshold of significance for sight lines.

Further, the Guidelines do not apply to existing driveways. The letter from Mr. Bommersbach asserts that the practice of applying stopping sight distance to rural driveways conflicts with the Guidelines. However, in citing the specific criterion, it is noted that it specifically states that it applies to new unsignalized intersections (including driveways), while only existing intersections to which traffic is added are also included; existing driveways are not noted as being subject to this criterion. It may be argued that because the driveway is being moved 20 feet to the south, it is a new driveway; however, the relocation of the driveway improves sight lines compared to existing conditions. If left in its current location, no sight distance analysis would be needed, but sight lines would be less. To achieve improvement in sight lines while still maintaining only a single access point to the property appears reasonable.

It is noted that the title of the table included in the Guidelines providing the sight line recommendations is called, "Suggested Sight Distances for Passenger Cars Entering Two Lane Roadways from Stop with Various Speed Limits." The use of the word "suggested" in this title is intentional and underscores the need to apply engineering judgment when using these criteria given the physical constraints often present that make achieving ideal conditions infeasible. In the forward of the AASHTO publication *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, the reference from which the recommended sight distances were drawn, it says:

*The intent of this policy is to provide guidance to the designer by referencing a recommended range of values for critical dimensions. It is not intended to be a detailed design manual that could supersede the need for the application of sound principles by the knowledgeable design professional. Sufficient flexibility is permitted to encourage independent designs tailored to particular situations.*

As now understood, the project is expected to have 13 employees total, including three in the vineyard. Each of the 13 employees is assumed to generate three trip ends daily, or 39 daily trips for all employees. Based on year-long counts taken at a wine tasting facility, visitation was found to range from 47 percent of the maximum number of tasting visitors during the winter months to 100 percent during the summer and up to 99 percent during harvest. The tasting room is expected to serve a peak of 200 and an average of 140 guests on a daily basis. Per County policy, assuming an average of 2.5 persons per vehicle, the tasting room operation will generate an average of 112 visitor trip ends daily. The sum of these typical daily trips is 153 trips per day, which includes employees and tasting visitors, as well as deliveries of materials and supplies. The estimated truck traffic is approximately two trips per day on average. These results are summarized in Table 1. Special event traffic is not shown in either of the tables below.

**Table 1 - Trip Generation Summary - Average (non-Harvest)**

Trip Type	Unit	Daily		PM Peak Hour			Weekend MD Peak		
		Rate	Trips	Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out
Winery Employees	6	3	18	6	2	4	6	3	3
Vineyard Employees	3	3	9	3	1	2	3	1	2
Tasting Employees	4	3	12	4	1	3	4	2	2
Tasting Visitors	140	0.8	112	11	4	7	15	8	7
Truck Traffic	2	n/a	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total New Trips</b>			<b>153</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>

Note: Trip generation does not include special event traffic

The employee count is expected to increase to 29 employees with extra staff hired during harvest, including eleven vineyard workers. The 29 employees for the winery and tasting room operations as well as vineyard workers during the harvest season are expected to generate 87 daily trips. Peak visitation during harvest is expected to be 198 visitors or 158 daily trips. Truck traffic is expected to be 1.67 daily trips, so was rounded to two trips, as shown in Table 2, which presents the anticipated peak harvest-period trip count.

**Table 2 - Trip Generation Summary - Harvest**

Trip Type	Unit	Daily		PM Peak Hour			Weekend MD Peak		
		Rate	Trips	Trips	In	Out	Trips	In	Out
Winery Employees	12	3	36	12	4	8	12	6	6
Vineyard Employees	11	3	33	11	3	8	11	6	5
Tasting Employees	6	3	18	6	2	4	6	3	3
Tasting Visitors	198	0.8	158	16	5	11	21	11	10
Truck Traffic	n/a	n/a	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total New Trips</b>			<b>247</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>

Note: Trip generation does not include special event traffic

## Winery Trip Generation

Winery: Rudd Wines Winery & Tasting Room  
 Location: 4603 Westside Road  
 Annual Full Production: 10000 cases

### WINERY OPERATIONS

Employee traffic using passenger vehicles, in average ADT

Item Description	Employees				Trips			
	Existing	Proposed (year round)	Proposed (harvest period)	Proposed (bottling period)	Existing	Proposed (year round)	Proposed (harvest period)	Proposed (bottling period)
Winery Production	0	2	5	--	0	6	15	--
Cellar / Storage	0	1	4	--	0	3	12	--
Administrative	0	1	1	--	0	3	3	--
Sales	0	2	2	--	0	6	6	--
Bottling	0	0	--	5	0	0	--	15
Other staff (describe):					0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>15</b>

Truck traffic associated with winery operations (average ADT during period of activity)

Item Description	Existing	Average	Harvest
Grape Importation			
Truck loads per year: 20.2; 17.96 truck(s) at 6 tons/truck; and 2.24 truck(s) at 12 tons/truck	0.00	0.00	0.70
Dates of Activity: August through September			
Juice Importation			
Truck loads per year: None	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dates of Activity: through			
Juice/Fruit Exportation			
Truck loads per year: None	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dates of Activity: August through September			
Pomace Disposal			
Truck loads per year: 0	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dates of Activity: August through September			
Disposed:			
Bottle Delivery			
Truck loads per year: 4.2 truck(s) at 2380 cases/truck	0.00	0.40	0.00
Dates of Activity: July through July			
Barrel Delivery			
Truck loads per year: 0.88 truck(s) at 150 barrels/truck	0.00	0.03	0.03
Dates of Activity: June through August			
Finished Wine Transportation to storage/sales			
Truck loads per year: 8.12 truck(s) at 1232 cases/truck	0.00	0.77	0.00
Dates of Activity: July through July			
Less Backhauls			
Truck loads per year: 0	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dates of Activity:			
Miscellaneous trips			
Truck loads per year: 119.52 trucks	0.00	0.95	0.95
Dates of Activity: January through December			
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>1.67</b>

### VINEYARD OPERATIONS

Employee trips associated with vineyard operations (in average ADT)

Item Description	Employees		Trips		
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Average	Harvest
Vineyard Maintenance: Year Round	0	3	0	9	
Vineyard Maintenance: Peak Season	0	11			33
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>33</b>