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THE CHAIR: I'm calling to order the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Tuesday, September 25th meeting. Role call, please.

Vice Chair Gregory. Supervisor Dillon?

THE SPEAKER: Here.

Supervisor Pedroza?

THE SPEAKER: Yes.

Supervisor Ramos?

THE SPEAKER: Here.

Chair Wagenknecht?

THE SPEAKER: I'm here.

THE CHAIR: Please join me for the pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

THE CHAIR: Okay. At this point, we're going to move on to 10-B: Director of Planning Building and Environmental Services requests direction on the adoption of an ordinance regarding remote wineries.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I've asked Vince Smith, the Director of Planning
Division to join me this morning.

So I think it's -- what I want to do is tell kind of a brief narrative story in some ways. I think what and I'm kind of reframing what the information the staff report -- I won't bother to present that.

I think what we've seen over the past especially 10 years in particular is that as the valley floor has become either developed out, there are parcels -- there are 10-acre parcels that don't have wineries on them within the AP zone but there aren't many of them. The valley floor has more or less gotten very close to being developed out and has gotten very expensive to develop out. Prices especially in the Oakfield --inaudible -- area are $500,000 an acre now.

So as the wine industry has continued to grow in Napa County and as the valley has become either too expensive or unavailable, we've seen a lot of the more recent winery growth that's been occurring as far as new wineries, not expansion of existing wineries, but new wineries have increasingly been developed in the hillside areas particularly in the areas east and west of the valley.

As noted in the Staff Report, of the 500 or
so physical wineries that we have in the county, almost 60 percent now are located in the AW zone which also includes the Los Carneros area but generally are not located in the historical preserve. So it's 60 percent are now. The majority are not located in the area that's traditionally been associated with wine making in Napa County. So that's one trend, one development.

As these wineries have moved out into the hillside areas, we've seen more and more -- since they now represent a majority of the wineries in Napa County, we've also seen these wineries be located on the majority of what are essentially local roadways. Local roadways, under the general planning road classification, are two-lane streets. They're the lowest classification of street still allowed for businesses and homes, but they are the smallest unit of roads. So we're seeing more wineries not located on Silverado Trail, not located on Highway 29, not located on the major roadways within the county but on more of the minor roadways in the county, places like Sage Canyon or Soda Canyon or Dry Creek Road.

So it's second -- and while these wineries are not exceeding the level of service that's
referenced in the adopted general plan because they don't trigger the threshold that the plan has adopted, it's still a significant increase in traffic, from the local resident's perspective. It's not significant from a traffic congestion or management perspective but it's a noticeable increase for the traffic that was there ten years ago for the residents as the wineries push out into the hillside areas many of which have a number of homes in them.

Lastly, as wineries have pushed out into the hillside areas, they are being located on properties that may have -- may require more frequent variances because of slopes and other site features and also may not be as suitable or may not have much land that is suitable for planting. So we're increasingly seeing wineries that are -- may not have vineyards associated with them that are just wineries by themselves with no grapes on the site. Others still may have grapes under ownership or control elsewhere in the county or they may not. That's not a requirement. The requirement is that they have 75 percent of the source grapes within Napa, not that they actually own or control those grapes directly. However, most of these wineries are also fairly small as noted in the Staff
Report. The wineries in the hillside areas are generally about half the size in terms of production of the wineries in the AP zone and have maybe a 25 percent of the visitation rates as the wineries in those areas.

So we're seeing a proliferation of small wineries into the hillsides on local roadways and in some cases, that don't have any vineyards attached to them. So that has created some questions about whether this type of winery development is appropriate and if so, how it should be regulated or changed in the future. Those questions have been manifested in several of the appeals that have come to the board in the last year or two, most notably Mountain Peak and Casas of the Canyon but also the Dry Creek appeal which was drawn before the board had a chance to hear that. Several of these questions arose on all three of those projects and there are others currently that are coming before the Planning Commission that have similar issues as well.

The 2010 memo that referenced the word "remote winery" did not include any context or definition for what a remote winery -- what constitutes a remote winery and so for staff for the
applicants for the public of the Planning Commission, we're recommending that the Board provide some direction to staff, should they decide that action needs to be taken with regards to this trend in winery development. That if the Board so wishes, that they direct staff to prepare an ordinance that the Board intends any regulations or requirements that they wish to place on these types of developments to apply uniformly for all future they -- forward going modifications in new wineries and that we provide general direction. We're not looking for -- my request would be that the Board not provide necessarily detailed information because that will come about through the public process, through staff meetings with stakeholders both the industry and the public, through environmental review of the project, through Planning Commission hearings. And the Board, at the end of this process, would have a chance not only to weigh in throughout that process but also when and future ordinance would come back before it for final adoption but we need a starting place.

So I'm just not looking for 80 percent engineered drawings, I'm just looking for a starting place from the Board as to what -- is there a concern
if so what are the concerns and any suggestion about how staff may want to go forward in addressing those concerns.

THE CHAIR: I've never turned in 80 percent drawings yet. Good. Thank you for the introductions, are there questions from the Board at this moment? Supervisor Gregory?

SUPERVISOR GREGORY: It might be important for me to mention how this started with me, and I think we're all looking at it from different lenses but we had a recent application that was denied by our Planning Commission. It came to us on appeal but it was pulled last minute before we could act on it. But there wasn't a lot of love for that project, it had zero agriculture, it had zero --

So that's where I'm coming from, that was a problem. I don't think that project should have been submitted and I know we had a Planning Commission struggling with that, using that as a base for their decision but they didn't have a policy backup. So for me, that's why I'm here but I do -- and I've got some other questions that maybe after public comment but I'm really interested in hearing from the public on this.
THE CHAIR: Okay.

I don't see any other questions right now from the Board. I will open it up to the public at this point. I will mention that we have gotten quite a bit of correspondence on this and that comes into our thinking and so.

Now, public what are you thinking about this?

THE SPEAKER: Good morning Supervisors, Michelle Novi with the Napa Valley Vintners.

I don't have any comments about the substance of what Mr. Morrison said but rather a comment about the procedure.

As many of you know, in order for the NVV to take an official position on any issue, it usually has to go in front of our Community and Issues Committee. From there, they make a recommendation and then that goes to our board. Our CIIC committee meets the first Thursday of every month and then the NVV board meets the following Thursday. We only found out about this proposal being heard here about 10 days ago and so unfortunately, we can't offer any feedback and we would very much like to do that.

My recommendation would be that Director Morrison and perhaps one of the members of the Board
of Supervisors joins our upcoming CIIC meeting on the first Thursday of October. I think that's the 4th or 6th to discuss the issue and let the committee provide some substantial feedback.

On another note aside from this discussion and I appreciate just how much is on the Planning Department's plate but in a community like ours that is solely focused -- not solely but largely focused on agriculture, to be having discussions around these types of policies right in the middle of harvest is very challenging. I'm sure it's challenge for the Planning Department to contemplate not bringing these types of policies for a whole three months out of the year. Of course, the fire has affected our timelines as well but in order for groups like the Vintners and the grape growers and the Farm Bureau and the wine growers to meet with our members and provide meaningful and thoughtful comments that will help make policies more effective, it's really important that we discuss this when it's not in the busiest time of year. So thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Yeah, I think as Supervisor Gregory said, a lot of this came to us kind of in the back door by --
we would have had a project that a lot of us had questions about and we might have been able to answer some of that that way. So we're just in the start of this process and I'm sure we'll have somebody come and visit and talk this through with the Vintners and other groups.

THE SPEAKER: Good morning Supervisors, Kelly Anderson. I'll be speaking on behalf of Saveral Angwin this morning. And I really appreciate this effort to discuss appropriate locations for rural wineries.

Saveral Angwin, as you know, is a volunteer grass roots organization, and we're dedicated to protecting and preserving the rural setting and community character of Angwin. We have participated in the Napa County general plan update arena APAC. We have been there.

One thing that I think is important for all of the areas of Napa County not just -- well, I'll talk about this specifically. In the agriculture preservation and land use element of the general plan, Ag Use Land 57 says, "The county shall seek to maintain Angwin's rural setting and character while providing opportunities for limited commercial
services focused on the Angwin community."

At this time, the Howe Mountain Vintners and Growers show 15 wineries located in Angwin with tasting rooms. I venture to guess there are more opportunities to taste in Angwin than 15. We, in Angwin, do not consider tasting rooms a local serving business. We are concerned about impacts to our neighborhoods and the safety of our families when we are reaching out into these roadways that people basically live on.

One example I'd like to give to the road bike people here is Ink Grade Road. We've all ridden up that road and you know the character of it, yet it is probably the number one large tour bus destination end point I'll call it Angwin. So we're putting Humvee size limos down Ink Grade Road at night for different winery-related events and as we learned at some recent fire-wise meetings, the proposed escape route, should we have a fire in Angwin, is down a gravel road off of Las Posadas down to the 4-H camp. So we're really confronted with an isolated mountain top and how many more visitors can we handle up there. We're of course concerned about the impacts to groundwater and waste water disposal. I'm welcoming more discussion about
this obviously.

I do have some questions. In the Staff Report, it mentioned the issue of sustainability and estate-grown fruit and I'm wondering and this is a question. I don't know the answer, Napa County is an Appalachian. So is an AVA Napa County. So if you're growing fruit in the Los Carneros and you're bringing it up to Mount Veeder, is that considered estate grown.

So we are kind of talking about estate grown being sustainable, and I have a question about what that means. So basically Saveral Angwin really appreciates this opportunity to participate and we seek to protect our residence and our neighborhood.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Further public comment?

THE SPEAKER: Good morning. My name is Chris Malin. I now live at 2945 Atlas Peak Road.

THE CHAIR: Congratulations.

THE SPEAKER: Okay. Where we built our home 40 years ago and lost it in the fire but we're up there temporarily in housing, so that's great. But with that experience, I have a little story for you.
Three times on Atlas Peak Road, I've been totally blocked from getting off the mountain from 16-wheelers, 18 wheelers, if you can believe that, jackknifed on Atlas Peak Road telling me that they're making deliveries to vineyards, wineries, whatever. The last time it happened was 2018. I actually had to go home and get our tractor and help guys that showed up straighten it out because the Highway Patrol could not get around the corner to pull the truck out of the ditch jackknifed across Atlas Peak Road. It took us half the day to get it straightened out. Then the Highway Patrol did cite him because we straightened him out twice, and he decided he could go back up, so he jackknifed again. So the Highway Patrol took a long time to get there and when he got there, he did cite him.

Another time a tour bus came up there, who knows why, got lost but got jackknifed. Another time another truck got jackknifed but all three times, we couldn't get off the hill for six to eight hours, so a major problem. The truck traffic cannot negotiate those steep mountain turns. It also happened to me on Spring Mountain Road. About 10 years ago, a truck jackknifed and we had to go a whole other route and it
was closed all day.

The other thing on the wineries is they should dispose of their wastewater on-site. Palmos does that, I've seen their operation, it's pretty nifty. They use the wastewater on-site. So that should be a given. No hold and haul. There should be no hold and haul of wastewater off of wineries to East Bay Mud, that just shouldn't be happening. Then especially in the MST wherein groundwater depletion.

This ordinance, if it does come to be, needs to coincide with the fact that we have groundwater depletion in the MST. There should be a thorough analysis on how long large these wineries are, how many gallons they're going to be producing because we all know that they pump groundwater to make wine.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Good morning.

THE SPEAKER: Good morning.

My name is Herman Frobe. I'm a resident of Dear Park. I've spent over half my life in the wine industry working in small rural wineries. I was impressed by Mr. Morrison's introduction regarding traffic load, winery location, et cetera.
I've owned my own label. At that time, I ran it out of my house and I made my wine at a large facility. I was allowed to store the finished product in a commercial warehouse. The only activity I was allowed to do out of my home was make phone calls, sales, business, paper, et cetera.

The advent of the Napa Valley wine auction, of course, led to the appreciation of Napa Valley as a destination, and we have seen the growth of these vanity labels. That's what we call it in production. These small operations, you know, small again you're going to have to define that but let's say 600, 1000 case operations versus 5000 versus 10 versus 30 versus 50. I'm not sure where you guys draw the line but small operations, it's the nature of the beast. They tend to want to become big operations. Then, you know, the traffic increases. Everything increases in dimensions.

You're all quite aware that we, as residents of Napa Valley, are already putting up with a lot. I mean, you know we hear fans. We hear refrigeration. We hear all this stuff. And okay, it's part of producing wine, right. It's production. Well, I'm next door to the Bremmers. You may remember my
comments and for all of us, these sort of small rural wineries with big aspirations have become a nightmare. Our roads flood now. We have traffic, we have accidents. The constant noise of construction and land use, bam, bam, bam, bam, beep, beep, beep, beep, beep. The impact on us as residents are huge. You know, I don't have a problem with a farmer producing his wine on his property but when these operations become bocce ball courts and wedding venues and concert things, you know, they look at the Mandavi's and wonder how come they have a concert and we can't. Well, they don't know it's been grandfathered. There's a lot of pressure and we, as residents, are indeed suffering. So that's what I have to say.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Frobe.

THE WITNESS: Hi. Bernadette Brooks, 3103 Dry Creek Road in Napa.

I want to say at a general level also, that this is a difficult time and short notice for all of us to participate in this. But my concern is that as we press into the hills and remote areas and truly local small roads, everything needs a variance, a road exception, this, that or the other thing. Then we're
being told by the Planning Commission well, you know, it would be even worse if we didn't give them this variance and exception because they would have to tear down more trees or they would have to affect more erosion.

What I say is no. If are rules are there for variance and exceptions, they should be really, really rare and instead once again, they are becoming the normal. We had this issue come up once before with APAC but now because of where these things are trying to be put, they almost can't be put on their sites without these things. The mitigations that are put in place for all of the different reasons why they don't fit well are becoming a nightmare for the Planning Commission's compliance.

You know, there's mitigations like saying well, we're going to put up walls. So if you have a 300 person event, the sound decimal level in the hills won't bother your neighbor. Well, you know, who's going to be able to go there and even know they're going to do that necessarily. I know there's permits for special events but there's mitigations like that over and over and over again.

We're even hearing mitigations on what we
think is the key mitigation of groundwater extraction and measuring and then we have neighbors in our area who have asked for those reports that are mandated by the mitigations. They cannot get them for the last two years. They have no way of knowing that their next door neighbor who they believe is impacting their groundwater domestic needs, they can't get the reports that were part of the mitigation of their approval.

So the mitigations, the variances, the exceptions are getting out of control because where we're trying to fit kind of a 10-pound bag of potatoes in a 5-pound sack Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Bernadette.

THE SPEAKER: George -- inaudible.

THE COURT: Good morning.

THE SPEAKER: Good morning.

This is a big issue, it involves devastation, access, fire, traffic. As was the issue of annexation that we talked about before, they all have the potential of impacting the future of Napa Valley. Rightly so, you're placing a lot of resources, administrative resources on the strategic plan and hopefully by December 15th, I don't know how you're going that do it, but at least you may come up with
some suggestions about the future of Napa Valley.

So my suggestion is that you delay decisions
like the one we were talking about before, annexation,
which really at times could be a circumvention of
major -- inaudible -- and this one. So this is my
suggestion. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Further public comment at this
point?

THE SPEAKER: Good morning to the Board.

It's Gary Morgan from up on Mount Veeder Road.

I live very close to one of the wineries you
were speaking about that was turned down because it
didn't have any vineyards on it. Also, the thing is
is that that particular project had wanted a variance
because it was steep which the Planning Commission
looked at and said you must be crazy. The whole place
on Mount Veeder is steep so why would you get a
variance for that sort of thing?

These are some of the problems that we are
having with the wineries coming up into the hills
because we don't know what your objectives are. We
really don't know how you see it and how you are going
to manage it and neither does the Planning Commission.

What we would like is really some guidance and some
leadership from you on this issue. I think that that would be most appropriate because we're really tired of the ad hoc basis as to how it's been decided in the past, you know, it doesn't make good planning decisions about what this is which is essentially what we're talking about. We think that this is a zoning issue about what you're going to do in the mountains and what you're going to do in the agriculture water shed.

So you've heard other people talk about it already. You heard Chris Malin mention about the risks. You know, these roads aren't places where you can have an easy detour around stuff. So there are major risks for you and for Mr. Letterer who is now in the audience, and we would like to see that, you know, we are considered. You know, is it a bigger benefit for the community in that area?

You mentioned Saboral Angwin and Kelly Anderson spoke about it here. What does this do for the community up there. If it's only dealing with -- because somebody wants to put a -- I call it a 7-11 winery, that's what we were going to have near us because it wasn't going to have any vineyard on it, it was just going to be a store front. This guy wanted
to just flip it.

So we're concerned about, you know, the future. We want to know what your view -- what your suggestions are for a uniform future for us to decide about what's going on in our neighborhood. We really, really do need that leadership from you. I think the strategic plan, as other people have mentioned, you know George mentioned that we -- we're looking for something. We're looking for something in there. We have the ability to come to speak to you about it but the proof is going to be in the pudding in December as to what you really want to do.

So please, step up, we would really enjoy it.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. We don't need -- wait come on up. I'm just -- let's keep the discussion moving.

THE SPEAKER: My name is Roxanne Hogan and I live on Fresian Drive in Angwin. There is a proposed winery on that road at this moment in front of the Planning Commission. We've lived there for 27 years. When we moved there, there were maybe three or four full-time residents. There were no wineries. There's some vineyards but there weren't any wineries. We let one winery go in with the stipulation that there would
be one visit a day, that kind of thing. Now there's
many visits a day and of course events.

With this new one that's coming in, Fresian
Drive is a very narrow -- I don't know if you've all
been on but it's have narrow. There's a cliff that
goes off. One car, so someone always has to back up.
The problem with it is if we have a jackknife
situation like the woman suggested or said that she
had on her road, it's our only way out, in and out for
our residence to get out. We have families with small
children. We've had three dogs hit by cars as we were
on the road because they go too fast. I put one of
those little yellow men out a couple of months ago,
and there isn't a day that goes by where he doesn't
get run over. There's plenty of room to go around, if
you're a car or a truck, even the grape trucks but
they just go too fast. It is so narrow.

Where this winery is planning to go is
another road that goes up and it's even worse. You
would have to see it. I mean, they could go down this
cliff and the two residents up there would have no way
out if a truck blocked them. They also planning on
bringing in grapes because their vineyard isn't big
enough for what they want to produce. They also have
their own winery elsewhere. So we don't understand why it's necessary that they build a winery.

Everyone has talked about the technical stuff. The groundwater, we have those wonderful lakes that the Fresian family had the foresight to, you know, use for the community. There's already been problems in the lakes from the residue or whatever. I don't know all the technical stuff, but what I do know is quality of life. It's a private road, private and when we moved there, we assumed that meant things like this wouldn't occur. Unfortunately, they are occurring and I hope that maybe you'll see fit to do something about it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any other comments?

THE SPEAKER: Good morning, Michelle Benvito, Wine Growers of Napa County. As Michelle Novi said with the Napa Valley Vintners, this is really difficult to respond to an issue that you gave a Staff Report on Thursday and you have no time to meet with your members and discuss this, and this issue is complicated. I mean, how are we defining rural wineries.

Remoteness and access are very different.

For example, in Hope Valley, you might have a winery,
it might be considered ruler but access may not be an issue. Also each application should be reviewed on a case by case basis taking into account the parameters of each site. We have examples of this already that have been mentioned, the Mount Veeder Winery, the Mountain Peak like already these are being looked at on a case by case basis, and different restrictions are being put on those.

There's also seems to be a misunderstanding about the intent of grape sourcing. The 75 percent grape sourcing is tied to maintaining the Ag Preserves legality and ability to not negate the commerce clause. Aside of all that, this is an issue that has a big impact on the wine community.

So as I mentioned earlier, I mean Director Morrison mentioned stakeholder meetings going forward but this seems backwards. Shouldn't we have already been having stakeholder meetings. To review the intended and unintended consequences of whatever is being discussed today.

I also wanted to correct a couple of things that have been said earlier for when groundwater depletion and MST. I mean as you guys have seen since you have added additional restrictions, that has
stabilized so the MST has stabilized. Also, this idea that everything needs a variance and is becoming the norm is inaccurate. Aside from the fact that wine growers and the wine industry in general has said we should not be granting variances willy-nilly, that there should be a very strict reason to grant a variance.

So maybe we could have Director Morrison talk about the issue of variance. I know that's been looked at in the past on how many is being granted and it's not every single application is needing a variance. So thank you very much.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you Michelle.

Further comments?

THE SPEAKER: Julie Ironoski, I live in Alta Heights.

I guess I want to invite and request really a deeper consideration of what the word "sustainability" means. In one of the reports, there was a comment tying sustainability to a estate production, and I think we need a fuller and more holistic, a more realistic discussion of what sustainability means. I don't see that happening in a lot of the planning discussions in Napa County.
Other people have spoken about the issues regarding water, traffic, increase of fire danger because people are moving more out into remote areas, access during emergencies, being able to leave your home in an emergency, but I just want to bring up two other questions that are really significant in my mind.

One is sustainability in terms of community support. I think everybody wants to continue support of agriculture in Napa County, but the more people are affected in ways that they can't control where they feel like they don't have a voice in the process and where they feel frankly sometimes bullied by the industry, that's really going to eat into community support for agriculture, for the Ag Preserve, and I think that's something that we should really think about because I think we want more people invested in protecting agriculture, true agriculture but that's limited by things like the bocce courts and the restaurants out in the AW and the parties that go on all night and other things that are disturbing and I want to get to the last thing.

Sustainability, there's nothing sustainable that doesn't have a limit. I think we really struggle
with the idea of limiting the wine industry in Napa County because we do see all the benefits that we get from it but there's nothing good without a limit. There's nothing sustainable without limits.

To the point of limits, I think we really have to look at the whole idea of the negative declarations that are being used. There's a winery that's going from 30,000 gallons to 100,000 gallons, that's going from, I don't know a five time increase of visitors. I don't have the statistics right at the front of my brain. This is proposed under a negative declaration. People look at this and they say how is this not going to have an impact in any one of the ways that has been brought forward today. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Julia.

Any further comments? We have two speaker platforms so one can be at the other one ready to go.

THE SPEAKER: David Heightsman up at Circle Oaks, President and -- inaudible -- Napa Watersheds.

A couple of issues I haven't really heard addressed specifically and one was that if you put a development if these are a development, let's call it like what it is, you're going to incur further development. You put a winery at the end of the road
where there aren't enough grapes to support it, you're going to encourage vineyards to go in there because it would be more sustainable. You're not going to have to be trucking them further. You're going to hear the sustainability argument and there's validity to it.

Any time you're going to put these wineries, you're going to get further development into the hillsides and that should be a concern and part of the plan because it's going to happen. I realize you don't have to do that and under Sequa you don't have to do that but you know it's going to happen. You see it happening throughout here. Okay, that was the first point. What was the further development going to be on and all the other problems that everyone has been bringing up.

The other one was an emergency plan. You're putting further impact to these communities. There should be an emergency plan. Okay. We saw the fires and we've addressed that. I've fought fires for three years, rangeland fires and specifically, didn't move up to Soda Canyon or Atlas Peak because of them and you saw the results. It's a chimney up through there. There's other places throughout the county including Circle Oakes incidentally, not as bad but
It's still there.

Could we come up with an emergency plan. One of my major concerns now is during earthquakes now that we know we're in an active seismic zone, the biggest danger for life in earthquakes isn't falling buildings, it's fires, alright. Can we have an emergency plan. If we have a fire and fires take off and there's a pretty damn good chance it can, your resources are going to be concentrated down in the city and rightly so. We're going to be left to our own resources up there.

There should an emergency plan of how the hell people can get out another way because you're going to be left on your own or if the fire takes off like what we saw, you're on your own until people can muster and you can get emergency responders up there and it's -- and that's difficult to do to coordinate emergency response like what we saw in the fires that we had, it's tough and it takes 24 to 48 hours before things are actually coordinated.

Could we have an emergency plan before anything else comes up there so we know where people can go whether it's grading a road out of there. Maybe people up in Atlas Peak there is the
right-of-way exists to take it down on the other side of the hill, some things like that. Let's think about the people that live here. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, David.

THE SPEAKER: He said a lot of what I was actually just going to say. I'm Rebecca Dice. I live on Fresian Drive and of course, I'm looking at the Red Leg Ranch Winery application with great interest since it's several hundred feet from my bedroom window.

You know, we don't -- this as an agriculture area. We're excited about agriculture, to some extent, and it's important to the area but looking at the staff notes here, it's saying if we make some ordinances or, you know, kind of beef up the ordinances and define it, we might deny some applications and you know what, that may be entirely appropriate.

They're asking for a 30,000 gallon winery on a single-lane road, it's a private road. The county is never going to maintain that road, it will be up to the citizens. Historically, the wineries have not lived up to their agreements to maintain those roads. So as a resident on the road, I'm very concerned about my ability to get out with my children if there's a
fire. I'm very concerned about the groundwater, and I'm really concerned about the lakes. Fresian Lakes is the town water supply. If that project is approved, I feel like the water supply there for the entire town is at risk. So if we're limiting development in these areas especially on private roads, that may be appropriate. I don't think that we should be afraid to do that. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

We've had 12 speakers so far, how many more are we looking at? Okay, two. Why don't you come and be ready and then perfect.

THE SPEAKER: Cynthia Greu, Soda Canyon Road.

Heads up, cell phones down. Thank you.

Last summer I spoke to you all about the fire potential on Soda Canyon Atlas Peak area, the fact that this has historically burned and it did again and the fire last October, the Atlas fire, well, I thought that the '81 fire, the Atlas Peak fire was the worst fire imaginable, it wasn't even close to last October.

You have approved three wineries on Soda Canyon Road in the last few years, two of them with no grapes at all with the idea or the argument that they would be getting grapes from Stagecoach where they
would be saving the trips down the road. There would be less movement of grapes up and down the road because of course they had a contract or a contracts and now those contracts are probably very much up in the air since Stagecoach has been bought by Gallo.

The wineries -- if you allow wineries in the AW in these remote areas and I don't think you should, there should no visitation. No visitation at all and they should only be allowed to use estate grapes.

One of the things Director Morrison said is that wineries in the AW tend to be smaller. Well, maybe initially but then they come back for their modification as we saw with Revery also on Soda Canyon, the caves of Soda Canyon. They violated their permit, but they were forgiven and given an increase.

So on Soda Canyon in the fire, let me just point out that if there had been an event at the -- as has been permitted, it hasn't -- it's still under litigation but Mountain Peak, if they were permitted and enjoying an event on that Sunday night of 150 or 300 people and the event was getting out about 10:00 when the fire started, they wouldn't have gotten out of there. Where would they have gone? Well, there were helicopter pilots that risked their lives getting
residents out of there. I mean, some of us -- I live four miles up the road and barely got out of there and a number of us were stuck behind a fallen tree. You can't increase that risk.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Cynthia.

THE SPEAKER: My name is Keith Glance, I live at 390 Cold Springs Road in Angwin. I have lived there for 32 years.

I first came to Angwin in 1968 with my parents and attended Pacific Union Prep, Pacific Union College and have lived pretty much in Angwin ever since. I'm very well familiar with Cold Springs Road. When I was in college, we used to walk it, it was a gravel road, it became paved but with no base preparation.

A lot of the discussion this morning has -- I believe was supposed to be aimed towards defining "remote." My home is remote but yet I'm five minutes from the high school. I'm five minutes from the college. I'm five minutes from daycare. I'm five minutes from an Ace Hardware, a supermarket and a gas station. So how do you define "remote."

My immediate neighbors on my left, right and across the street combined have eight children who
ride their bikes on Cold Springs Road. My children used to ride their bikes back and forth to school. I'm very happy that they are grown and out of Angwin right now. To put a winery as is being sought at the end of Cold Springs Road bringing 18 wheelers and tankers, grape trucks, flatbeds with valley bins on them, just scares me to death when I think about the kids. It's bad enough with just us neighbors there. When we greet each other on the road, you put your two right wheels in the ditch and you very carefully pass each other. The winery workers do not do that. The winery vehicles do not do that. They have a mission, they have a job and they're trying to get it done.

My fear is that if we define "remote," that we create policy and if you create policy, then when somebody comes to you and says can we do this, you could say no, it's not in the policy or yes, it's in the policy. You don't have to think about it. You've got this wall of paperwork and words, it's our policy. You don't have to think about it.

Every one of these applications needs to be considered. Very little has been said about everyday safety. We've talked about fire safety. We've talked about disaster safety. My children, the children
across the street, like I said, it terrifies me to think of them under the wheels of an 18 wheeler. If that winery is allowed, it probably is going to happen some day. So the quality of life and the safety need to be considered. I appreciate your efforts here today. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Keith.

At this point, I'm going to return us back to the Board. You've heard from 14 folks having different things to say about this. I think they've helped us set parameters around this discussion or at least opened up some of the issues that we are talking about. This is meant to be a -- not -- this is not going to be anywhere near a finished product today. It's meant to be a start of this product.

So I see Supervisor Pedroza.

SUPERVISOR PEDROZA: Thank you, Chair.

There's a lot of good comments heard. You know, it's not often Gary and I agree on a lot but I will say Gary, I think you're right. We do have to show leadership. I think this is a critical point to talk about the future and the vision of Napa and a very singular issue.

For me, I'll kind of kick it off as
Supervisor Gregory said, you know, my district it's Atlas Peak Road, it's Soda Canyon. So I hear from my constituents about the challenges and concerns they have about wineries up rural network roads. I want to be consistent. I want to make sure that our Ag Community has a predictable, dependable process but also our residents know what the expectations are.

I think at this point, one of the concerns I see that really resonates, at least in my district, there's a lot to be discussed in the details but it's looking at the appropriateness of wineries that are going up these rural roads with no vineyards on-site, defacto custom crush facilities. I think there are better areas that are suited for this type of production. Look at Corporate Park, I think that's very appropriate.

So having said that, I think we do need to have a community discussion around this. There's an outreach component that will happen but a lot of this needs to happen with the five of us talking about our vision, talking about policy statements. Then we provide direction to the Planning Commission as well and I want the industries to provide comment. I understand it's a difficult time, but we're going
through a difficult time as a community, and we can't keep waiting to have some of these discussions.

So I hope that as we're going through this discussion, we're listening to the input of everyone but again, the problem I see and the problem I want to address is those wineries that are going up in rural areas that have no vineyards on-site. I do not think that's an appropriate use. I want to keep an open mind if there's a different way to address that. That may not be an estate component. I'm definitely open to that but I think we do need to start defining some of our tolerances, our vision and what the vision is for Napa and our community. I think this is a great starting point for me.

So those are some of my interests as we go forward.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Supervisor Gregory?

SUPERVISOR GREGORY: I'll start with a question either for C E O Tran or Director Morrison.

It was brought up that we're in the middle of a strategic plan, how does this fit. I think the reason -- well, first the strategic plan will be a broad document setting our priorities for the next
three years, it would very likely say do this, this thing we're doing so why wait. We're responding to a real topical issue of a project that withdrew itself and who knows what they're thinking. We need to do this sooner rather than later. How does moving this forward fit with our strategic plan, have you thought about that?

MR. TRAN: Yes, we have. In terms of the strategic planning, that is not to be mistaken to be -- inaudible -- amendment of zoning and things like that. So the strategic plan is intended to be all things inclusive. The County does many things including land use. So there is a distinction.

Obviously, this Board always has and can exercise its discretion in terms of giving forward any item. This -- inaudible -- is strategic -- inaudible -- land use, however, there's really no need to have to wait for that process because as you know, that process will take until December to finish.

So it's certainly up to the Board. Giving direction and I think that what Director Morrison is suggesting or proposing is getting direction from the Board going back because any type of planned use ordinance typically would have to go through the
Planning Commission and that by itself is a process that would involve public hearing opportunities. There will be time for notice. There will be time for stakeholder for input and things like that but having some general direction from the Board would be a tremendous help to get this started.

DIRECTOR MORRISON: I would agree with Mr. Tran. I would in most cases anyway but just this morning, the Board talked about annexation policy and in recent meeting, we talked about developing customs and standards on bird cannons. I'll be coming to the Board next month on the residential development and -- inaudible -- sheds. The circulation element is going forward. The climate action is going forward.

There's a number of processes that are going parallel to the strategic plan. The strategic plan, in my view, is intended to be a -- is intended to encompass every single thing the County is doing with 1400 employees that would be impossible, it's really to prioritize what we're doing.

So I think it's is the Board's prerogative if they feel it's imperative that issues relating to remote wineries be addressed sooner, then I think the Board can give that direction to staff and we can
proceed without affecting the strategic plan. That's really up to the board how urgent -- if there's an issue and how urgent that issue may be.

THE CHAIR: I have to imagine also that if we were talking about this and there was -- in the community groups in the community meetings we were having, there was a strong push back against us looking at this, that we would hear that in the strategic plan and I don't think that's what we've heard in our discussions so far.

SUPERVISOR GREGORY: Maybe just some comments. I'll hopefully give you some direction to work with but again, I want also to get direction from the community and district partners.

So in going back to this project we keep talking about, you know, it was a -- I agree there are places for custom crush in certain areas of Napa County but to have a commercial building out in the middle of the Ag Watershed Zone up a rural road with zero agriculture I think would be the poster child for years to come of losing our connection to agriculture. So we've got to fix that.

Again, that's why we're moving this faster than anything else and the strategic plan. What's the
number. We know that to be AVA label, you have to be 85 percent. There's these numbers out there, but I don't know what number is. That is getting into the business of making wine, and I'm not an expert so we'll need to hear more on that.

Where should the supply and really how do you define remote? Is this all of Ag Watershed are is it those properties along certain roads. I think we need to figure that out and really look at different scenarios.

I agree there should be some connection from visitation to a remoteness discussion and again, I'm not sure what that is but we need to define it. Last, I've heard a lot about carrying capacity in recent conversations. One real way to address carrying capacity is do you have land, do you have enough room for a septic system. That's the most physical manifestation of carrying capacity I can think of.

So that said, we're solving one specific thing that's come up recently but this is certainly a much bigger issue, and I look forward to digging more into it with our partners out there, all of you.

THE CHAIR: You're done?

SUPERVISOR GREGORY: Yes.
THE CHAIR: Supervisor Ramos?

SUPERVISOR RAMOS: Thank you, Chair.

I'm having thoughts and thinking oh, I think I said this before and I said much of this when we kicked off our strategic planning journey. One of the things that I had said that I think there's consideration and this is in fact doing that is the differences between the AP and AW.

I mentioned back in July that I think one of the things, as we venture down looking at our future and the way in which we carry out the general plan, is that we need to live within our means. So when I think about remoteness and what that means, I think remoteness is perhaps a word we need to be careful in use of because as was said, when you look at certain areas like Angwin, if you've got a grocery store there, you're not quite that remote. I used to live in Berryessa Estates and I could get Popsicle three blocks down the road but nothing else.

So I just want us to be careful in terms of the remote and think more in terms of access, accessibility in the roadways. I think that that is a key component for us here. We have the unfortunate benefit of understanding how important ingress and
egress is especially in a fire prone areas, and I think that we need to utilize that.

October causes me pause when I think about variances. Variances for roadways, for example, they're there for a reason. So when thinking about a remote winery, I think that the access whether they are the rural arterial roads or those single-lane roads. I think that's something that we certainly need to consider in a policy.

The other part is related towards the agricultural activity. We find ourselves I think in this really -- in this classic chicken and egg scenario because if we say -- right now I did the math, 56 percent of the wineries in -- 56 percent of the wineries are using some form of estate component of 20 percent of 40 percent or more of their production of an estate component. If we were to say have a policy that said you need to have an estate component, then we are in fact encouraging more development of the vineyards themselves.

So I'm cognizant of the fact that -- estate component to me was very informative in the Soda Canyon process when I helped those parties address their concerns, it was a very informative factor for
me in the Mountain Peak decision. In fact, something that we required as an additional condition of approval and the reason was there are grapes and they will stay off the roadways, that to me is what informed that estate component and those scenarios.

It's a different story to say there will be grapes that will stay off the roadways. To include the estate component, I absolutely agree with my colleague it very much is -- it enhances the agricultural connection, it takes away that commercial feel of there are no grapes on-site but what that threshold is I think we really do need to understand from the community, from industry groups, from everyone because how much more grape production will we mandate. That's what we would be doing if we have an estate component. This is -- it's different from those scenarios with Mountain Peak that have the grape contracts already in place.

So I just -- I don't want any custom crush facilities in these rural areas, that's for sure, that has no place. You are welcome in the 5th district. I'll find you space in the airport industrial area or out in the Corporate Park and we will welcome you with open hands and I'll be there for the ribbon cutting
but out in the hillside areas, custom crush facilities
don't think enhance the agriculture area of those
portions. With that said, we have to be very cautious
of the requirement of the vineyards, balancing that
with the permitted capacity and the estate -- and all
of the Napa grown crop.

The other one to me that is of concern is the
hold and haul concept. Hold and haul to me is it has
its benefits, it has its downsides. One of the
downsides for hold and haul, when we look at the
nature of the truck traffic involved with hold and
haul going down to presumably East Bay Mud because
that's the cheapest place to process this industrial
waste water that is practically drinkable, it goes
through our roadway system. So it's a full travel
down through American Canyon and that number of just
that increased whether it's one, whether it's two, yes
it's a very small number but we need to consider the
safety of all involved and that's the community nature
itself but also the load -- the truckloads that are
being put on to our roadways.

With regards to sustainability, I think
sustainability needs to also consider the commercial
aspect. One of the things that when we -- that has
troubled me is we permit the number of employees and we're not tying that necessarily to the capacity of the land itself and those roadways, it's really about life and safety, accessibility, what is a safe number of people to have present to and from including that travel up to these locations.

Then I'll just end with saying we have an amazing opportunity to allow the community to fully participate in this. I don't see that we would have any reason to proceed in the next couple of months without that valuable input from the strategic planning process. I think that's a great opportunity for others to weigh in, especially when it comes to our tolerance of where we want to go. I think that also gives us an opportunity to work with our industry groups, like issues that are more urgent and immediate. I think that is one that can certainly benefit from great input and allow us to move in a -- move forward with a policy that is reflective of our community.

Supervisor Dillon said -- I think that's really helpful when she said in 2010, there wasn't the need to define this but now there is, and I think it would behove us to do so in a grander way than just
the five of us.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Supervisor Dillon?

SUPERVISOR DILLON: Thank you.

I have so many notes written here. I know you asked for not having 80 percent drawings, but I think that one of the challenges we have right now is because we have not given specifics to this process and specifics are what are used at the planning desk when the applicant comes in and passes over the threshold to move towards the Planning Commission. Then perhaps if citizens have the energy and resources to appeal to get to here, I mean this is the challenge that we're addressing.

I think given what we all went through last October, safety issues are paramount in addressing this. I find it interesting that you briefly addressed the road, RSS, Road and Street Standards issue that's before the Board of Forestry right now and it's interesting to think that that requires a 20-foot wide minimum road. Well, Fresian Road is not 20 feet wide, it's 12 feet wide and the idea that it's okay to put a winery down there because the winery has no control over that part of the road. I mean, it defies common sense and parts of Cold Springs probably
are not 20 feet. I don't have a tape measure and haven't been on it.

I think perhaps one thing we could do is say that that road requirement has to apply to the public road, to all the access to the winery, if that's what we need our threshold of safety. I think I'm just going to throw out some suggestions here but this is the way I'd like staff to be thinking about this.

I think that -- I mean, Ms. Grupp made a good point. We would have had a disaster if there would have been a major event happening of any kind but we don't have control over somebody's private birthday party. The things over which we do have control like winery permits, you build in something that says -- and it's just an example. I'm giving this as an example the direction I think we need to go. It would say, the event is automatically cancelled, if there's a high red alert, red flag warning.

I mean, what's left the room, so to speak, since 2010, is a common sense application of the guidelines. I understand how that's happened in the more competitive environment that we live in. The only way I think we can get around it is by bringing specifics back to the situation unfortunately. So
those are the kinds of things that I would like staff to creatively think about.

We've been talking about using vehicle miles traveled and car trips, not numbers of people since we had the Milca hearing several years ago and I know it's being proposed but let's put that in right now especially where -- in consideration of I'll just say new wineries in the AW because I think that is what the distinction is here.

I don't think every winery in the AW is necessarily considered remote. On one side of Silver Trail, it's considered AW and on the other side, it's AP or AR. So that can't be the threshold. Maybe we should be using a map to say where these special parameters are going to apply in terms of future winery development, a map that embraces width of existing road, not kind of road because they're all different in size, a map that addresses topography, maybe that's the threshold criteria -- the threshold look of when these criteria that we're talking about kick in because as has been said, defining remote and then it may not be what we need to define.

We need to be able to set some expectations so that we're not met with a situation we were met
with and I think Supervisor Pedroza said this of the Oakville Winery. I mean, those folks it was unfair for them to get that far through the process.

So this needs to be addressed sooner rather than later because every week, you have folks down at the front desk starting to go through the process and it is unfair for them to go through this process and then be met at the end with nope, this doesn't work. So they need to have reasonable expectations and that's a reason why we need to set these parameters.

I'm concerned about saying things like "estate grapes" and then if the vineyard has a problem, what are we going to build in there to say your vineyard has a problem. You don't get to haul grapes just to keep your winery in business; are we prepared to do that? I mean, those are the things we need to look at because if estate grapes was the reason for saying, oh, you're going to have less truck traffic.

I mean, we've got to have some expectations here that we set for the prospective business owner, the winery owner, of what's going to happen if they are seeking to have their business established in these certain areas. I don't want to call them remote
because of that five minutes from an elementary school situation. So I'll leave it at that and -- well, I won't leave it at that.

I'm curious about why we have to do an ordinance and go through that long process and why we could not have adopted a resolution as we did in 2010. At the end of your Staff Report, it says that you recommend an ordinance to ensure enforcement. I'm unclear because what we enforce ultimately are the conditions of approval. We're -- what we're doing here is defining the process for how you get to a permit with conditions of approval.

MR. MORRISON: No, Supervisor Dillon, you're exactly right. The conditions of approval are what's enforced for the use permit, the code, for anything not covered under the use permit. My concern is that the marketing guidelines established on the 2010 memo may not be perceived as being as enforceable as they are guidelines and not codified.

I think the Board can adopt a resolution, if they so choose. I just think that at the end of the day, if in a contentious code enforcement situation, I just think an ordinance is more defensible but I think that guidelines could certainly be used if that's the
Board's preference. I don't know if counsel has anything.

SUPERVISOR DILLON: We may need an ordinance for the menus and lunches and food situation but for this --

MR. MORRISON: Well, I guess like I said, the Board could -- my concern would be that some applicant's would say oh, well those are just guidelines so I'm not mandatorily obligated to follow them and so I'm going to submit my application anyway, that would be my concern. Guidelines are seen as not being as much of a statement of County practice as an ordinance would be.

SUPERVISOR DILLON: So maybe this needs a discussion at another time but it seems to me that a guideline that says we're not going to be favorably looking at putting a winery at the end of any public road that's less than 20 feet wide.

MR. MORRISON: Would set the expectation.

SUPERVISOR DILLON: Would set the expectation and then the winery either decides to go forward and gets a permit or doesn't, and I don't see that as an enforcement issue.

MR. MORRISON: Okay. We will take a look at
that. I think that's certainly a worthwhile option to consider.

SUPERVISOR DILLON: Yeah. All right. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: I appreciate what you're saying. Having lived through the 2010 and thought what we put there in resolution in guideline and how it's morphed into something else, I would like to do this better than what we did with the 2010 resolution that has been interpreted a number of ways and it would -- this process I would like if we're going to -- I think there's some value to doing a resolution but it should be pointing to that we're going to follow it up with ordinance to -- as we develop this whole ordinance to beef it up.

I have a couple of things to say. One of them is that one of the things that Mr. Morrison pointed out at the beginning of this is that we had about 500 wineries -- about 500 big boxes in the Ag Preserve Area and about 300 in the Ag Watershed because that's 60/40 and it's really nice to have 500 as a number so that you can get that in your head, and that's still quite a few boxes in the whole Napa County.
I've just gotten back from traveling the Rhone Valley, the Moselle Valley and the Alsace Region in France. You look at the vineyards, and there are almost no boxes in those vineyards. Mostly the wine action is done in the villages. They do have small villages that are relatively centrally located in all of those wine regions. Mostly wine production inside in those small villages and not in the grape area of the agriculture. I can see some value to that.

So in my mind, we may not -- we may be talking already that we're near carrying capacity for the numbers of wineries -- numbers of large boxes that we have in the county. One of the issues and I was thinking of this in illustration, we don't have this rapid stream of permits coming. What we have is more kind of a rising tide. I used to try to build -- it was nice having Salmon Creek Beach in our -- in my growing up. We used to build sand castles by Salmon Creek. The creek was rushing by but you never worry about losing your sand castle because the creek is rushing by. You build it out on the beach and very soon the tide is coming in and over topping what you're trying to do.

What we have is oftentimes we make an
approval for a small project at a remote location and over time, that small project increases because it's being successful. It's doing what it does and it just increases. That's kind of what we feel we've had success of the rising tides in Napa.

So there's a real value for us having this conversation, whenever we have it, because one of the things -- and I've taken good notes from each of our supervisors, as we discussed it. I've taken good notes from the public comments also but taken good notes from each of our supervisors and each of them are talking about there needs to be some real clear indication that this tide can't continue rising the way it is because we're soon going to be over topped all around.

So there is concern in letting future developers, future winery owners, future folks know that is better to let them know now. My goal has never been to turn down projects. My goal is that we have clear enough rules and regulations and expectations that they -- that bad projects aren't coming forward and that we're not having to turn them down. I tell people it takes millions -- many no's to make a final, yes. Most of these projects come in and
they get changed around over time.

I think size of traffic, amount of traffic, the sustainability and the estate vineyard, those are all things that we should be talking about. Hold and haul, you know, one of the things that the size -- the size of road and requiring that you have water and sanitation at your place, it's natural constraints. So natural constraints should be taken into account of that project. I think that's -- those are the things I want to say right now.

Supervisor Ramos?

SUPERVISOR RAMOS: Thank you.

I forgot to ask for this but I think it might help at least to inform the conversation a little bit more for me is if we take maybe I don't know what a good measure of time would be, if eight years is too much but if we look at the requested variances for projects that have occurred in the AW, those that have come up on appeal and what the nature of those are, I know there are a number of them that we've seen, roadway standards and driveway variance -- roadway standards, variances, left turns, just accessibility type variances is really what I'm looking at and then also setbacks. That's the other one that comes to
mind when we look at this. I think that would help to inform the process.

I think one of the -- we have a set of rules of which variances have been requested and now we're being asked to clarify further. So knowing what is working, what isn't working I think would certainly help to inform the process a bit better for me.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, that was a robust conversation about remote wineries and hopefully -- I know I've got a good number of things talked about.

C E O Tran?

MR. TRAN: Thank you, chair.

Would it be helpful -- I know staff has taken a lot of notes and the video is also available too but would it be helpful for staff to sort of summarize and capture all the main points. Also, a lot of ideas are put out here today and I thank Supervisor Gregory for asking the question about strategic planning. This I do so as a complimentary item too what is going on because the County's business goes on as normal. We don't stop and wait. We don't -- what needs to be done will be done. We don't need to stop and wait for anything.

So that maybe a summary maybe if available,
just a highlight summary of that and then in addition
also to manage expectations is the timing as to when
should the timing for some of these items to come
back, all of them to come back so that way we have a
clear understanding because staff does have a lot on
their plate and it would helpful to sort of get that
direction.

THE CHAIR: I think that would be helpful to
be able to see what was said and what we talked about
and kind of some -- kind of a path forward from there.
Thank you.

MR. MORRISON: Certainly and these are in no
particular order.

The question of whether a site can support
its own septic system requires hold and haul.
Question of no custom crush on rural roads. The
accessibility in general and traffic safety with
regards to roads. A connection between visitation and
remoteness was mentioned. Safety especially
cancelling marketing events if a red flag warning is
in effect. Not going by the AW zone but by using a
map looking at such things as road classification
topography. The question of whether this should be
guidelines or an ordinance and including numbers on
accessibility and setback variances are exceptions. I would probably just include -- inaudible-- exceptions in that as well in case there was any interest in that.

Those are the general areas I heard. I heard several of these items mentioned by more than one board member, and I think staff has a very good sense of how to proceed forward and very much appreciate the discussion this morning.

THE CHAIR: Good, good. Yeah and I realize that each of us have probably a small item that we mentioned that we didn't hear but we'll get to opine on that when you come with our compiled list.

MR. MORRISON: As always, Planning has a very lengthy and publicly involved process, and there will be many opportunities for board members, if they have forgotten anything, if they wish to let either Mr. Smith or myself know at future hearings. So there's plenty of opportunities for further comment.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

MR. TRAN: And I'm sorry, the second item was timing and the expectation or leaving that to staff?

THE CHAIR: Yeah, at this point, I realize you have to judge what we can do. But I think it's
helpful to have the discussion out there in the community so that there aren't any surprises.

MR. MORRISON: I think Mr. Tran was referring more to in terms of managing workload and priorities if the Board has an expectation about when they wanted this to come back so the staff can adequately try and gauge how much -- where to fit this in with the other directions that we received.

THE CHAIR: That might be helpful in your recitation of what was said today to put down, "Here's what our workload looks like right now," in one sentence format and then we can see what that looks like.

Supervisor Gregory?

SUPERVISOR GREGORY: I just want to clarify when you say come back, do you mean come back to us or send to them and the Planning Commission; what are we talking about?

MR. MORRISON: Well, I think that -- my thought was and I'm certainly open to correction by the board, was that staff would start to put some details on these items in working with the community to develop how these concerns that the Board has addressed, how they might be stated in either
guidelines or an ordinance and then to circulate that
draft to the public. Why it maybe hearing from at
least Chair Wagenknecht and interest in having a
summary memo including what items that were discussed
as well as an overview of workload and whether that
would be just provided to the Board as an
informational item or to come back as another
discussion item. I'm not sure what the Board's
pleasure is.

THE CHAIR: I'm not sure either.

Supervisor Dillon?

SUPERVISOR DILLON: Yeah. I think you ought
to come back with -- I mean, you recapped verbally but
I'll just say I don't think the idea I was presenting
was captured except to some specific aspect of it.

So I think you need to come back to us and
that's just me and perhaps that happened with others
and you were doing that on the fly and from your
written notes. So I think coming back to us with some
clarification on direction, and that can happen sooner
rather than later in a week or two because it's
refining direction and then there would be engagement
with --

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, absolutely. The next
regular board meeting is October 9th. That's been set aside or emergency preparedness so the 16th.

THE CHAIR: But looking at sometime in October would not be a bad thing.

Supervisor Pedroza?

SUPERVISOR PEDROZA: I think that's a great approach. Maybe coming back, David, with the comment about visitation, I think we already have tools in place to address that. So if there are something that we're already doing, including that in summary. And also some of the history of these topics because we have talked about some of these in the past so include that in the analysis that you present to us or the summary.

THE CHAIR: It's getting bigger.

Okay, Supervisor Ramos?

SUPERVISOR RAMOS: Thank you. This is sounding like a binder and not a memo.

Words matter and I'm concerned with continuing to call this "remote wineries." I think we really need to come back to our tool kit at zoning and what we're really talking about and to be very careful with rural as well. It doesn't inform our process to use rural and remote. I think that all the
supervisors have opined as to what does inform the process of what we're looking at and for us, it's that sustainability and living within our means and from the roadways, from carrying capacity all those things.

So I'd really like to make sure we encompass that, define it differently. I'm very concerned about the further development of how the conditions of approval come into this mix here. I think that would be something for staff to speak with County Council about of whether this would require a different standard set of conditions of approval for those areas going forward and what that -- what is our flexibility in terms of creating essentially a second set of conditions of approval for those areas affected by this potential policy change.

THE CHAIR: Thank you and thank you for the discussion.

We're going to take a break, it will be 12 minutes, according to the clock I see. We'll be back at 11:30. We need to be done at noon.

(The discussion was concluded.)
STATE OF NEVADA

COUNTY OF WASHOE

I, GAIL R. WILLSEY, do hereby certify:

That I was provided a recording and that said recording was transcribed by me a, Certified Shorthand Reporter, in the matter entitled herein;

That said transcript which appears hereinbefore was taken in stenotype notes by me from the recording and thereafter transcribed into typewriting as herein appears to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability and is a true record thereof.

_________________________________________

GAIL R. WILLSEY, CSR #359