

“E”

## Public Comments

**From:** [Meg Heitz](#)  
**To:** [Dan Pina](#); [Ignacio Delgadillo](#)  
**Cc:** [Ginny & Gary Heitz](#); [Hade, Jason](#)  
**Subject:** Re: FLYNNVILLE project details / concerns  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 31, 2017 9:01:35 PM

---

Dan and Ignacio,

Thank you for sending your proposal for review and welcoming comments and conversation. I would love to see your proposed developemnt be financially successful as well as fit into the agricultural landscape.

In regards to the infrastructural aspects of the proposal I have the following concerns:

- Noise concerns:
  - The mechanical room doesn't detail which equipment would be included / excluded or levels of sound proofing (at least on the drawing supplied). The room size seems to indicate that much of the equipment set would not be fixed in this room. Equipment that should be placed in a sound deadening and covered location(s) include:
    - Direct expansion as well as glycol chilling and heating equipment, including circulation pumps, fan units etc.
    - Air / gas compressors/ generators and storage tanks.
    - Dumpsters, recycling bins, cardboard compactors etc.
    - Fire pump mechanicals/ alarm panels.
  - There appears to be no plan for interior bottling activity, so I assume that bottling would occur outside with a mobile truck bottling line. Typical bottling rates being 1,500 cases per day, the proposed scale of production would incur 4 weeks of bottling activity per year. As this activity is loud with supplies coming and finished product leaving the site and the 'clink clink' of bottles it would seem reasonable to detail where on the site this activity would occur, what the hours of operations are to be and what sound mitigating measures are proposed.
  - Automated sound systems including security and fire alarms should be audible only in interior areas and not broadcast to the surrounding agricultural neighboring area.
  - Is outdoor amplified music requested for the events that are proposed? If so what sound mitigating measures are in place?
- Nighttime lighting concerns:
  - Nighttime lighting is also not detailed (at least on the drawings supplied), but should be down cast and not consist of any flood lighting or pole type 'area' lighting. The area enjoys agricultural night time 'dark skies' now and this should not be altered by the proposed project as the area is Agricultural and not industrial zoned.

Areas of concern regarding the scale of the proposal given the Agricultural Preserve & Agricultural Watershed zoning include:

- The proposed production quantity of 60,000 gallons would require the processing of approximately 360 tons of fruit, which would be the result of at least 70 acres of vineyard land (based on a generous farming productivity of over 5 tons/acre).

- As your proposal doesn't indicate any agricultural use of growing the fruit that would be processed it would be interesting to know how this proposal fits into the agricultural use of the property considering the zoning of the proposed parcel is Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP).
- Should the entirety of the proposed parcel not under impervious surfaces / buildings with this proposal be in vines then these ~7 acres of productive farm land would seem to generate perhaps 35 tons of fruit, which would require a winery proposal for processing ~6000 gallons/ 2500 cases.
- It is therefore evident that the proposed scale of processing capacity stands at roughly ten fold what is reasonable from this as an agricultural parcel.
- The proposed visitation at 25 persons per day throughout the year would result in roughly 9,000 visitors. The roughly 2500 cases of agricultural production possible at this site seemingly doesn't call for this intense level of tourism.
- Perhaps there is no standing for the agricultural potential of the site, and that the production and visitation capacities of your proposal are completely uncoupled from agricultural use. Perhaps Napa County should take this aspect into account with all winery proposals within the agricultural zoning. I find the two to be intertwined.

Thank you for your consideration of what I believe to be reasonable concerns.

Peter Heitz  
 Shypoke Vineyard  
 4170 St. Helena Hwy  
 Calistoga, CA 94515  
 707-320-3575

On Jan 9, 2017, at 9:22 AM, Dan Pina <[Dan@WineCountryCases.com](mailto:Dan@WineCountryCases.com)> wrote:

Hi Peter

Happy New Year!

It was impressive to see so much intense rain cause relatively (by historical standards) little damage. I am becoming (slowly) a believer in the flood work being done down valley.

I have attached the most recent plan set. Also attached is the revisions made after our neighbor meeting last summer which were incorporated into the final application submittal. There is more supportive information as well at the county office. Jason Hade (707 257-8757) is the planner handling this application. If you would like us to meet with you to review either at the County review area (2<sup>nd</sup> floor of Admin building) or here in our office in St Helena, or onsite, we can make it happen. Let us know if you have any questions or if any details need to be explained

Thanks for your interest and followup

Best regards

Dan

PD PROPERTIES LLC

---

**From:** Meg Heitz [<mailto:mpheitz@icloud.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2017 8:17 AM

**To:** Dan Pina <[Dan@WineCountryCases.com](mailto:Dan@WineCountryCases.com)>; Ignacio Delgadillo

<[Ignacio@WineCountryCases.com](mailto:Ignacio@WineCountryCases.com)>

**Cc:** gary and ginny heitz <[ggheitz@comcast.net](mailto:ggheitz@comcast.net)>

**Subject:** Re: FLYNNVILLE project details

Thanks Dan & Ignacio. Trust and hope that 2017 is off to a good start for you both and that your properties stayed largely dry yesterday.

Could you please send me the project details or point me to whom / where at the county I can review them with /at?

Best,

Peter Heitz  
707.320.3575

On Jan 6, 2017, at 9:55 AM, Dan Pina <[Dan@WineCountryCases.com](mailto:Dan@WineCountryCases.com)> wrote:

**PD PROPERTIES, L.L.C**  
**995 VINTAGE AVENUE SUITE 100**  
**ST. HELENA CA 94574**  
**707 967-4805**

DATE :1.5.17

TO: NEIGHBORS OF FLYNNVILLE

SUBJECT: FLYNNVILLE WINE COMPANY USE PERMIT  
UP # P15-00225  
1184 MAPLE LANE CALISTOGA (APN 020-170-  
12 020-320- 003,006,009,015,016)

Happy New Year to all.

As most of you are aware we are in the process of finalizing our application for the above Use Permit. As we have met onsite with most of you and discussed the revisions from the original proposal back in 2013, it has been a while since those discussions took place. The changes that were made subject to those discussions (including driveway and access revisions) have all been included in the current proposal plans. Nothing has been added or deleted other than what was discussed with the neighbors that we met with. At this time we just want to make ourselves available if there are any questions regarding the application prior to the public notice and subsequent hearing. As the courtesy notice from the County went out in July some may have had a chance to review the plans and may still have unanswered questions. Hopefully we can answer those questions or direct you to someone who may be able to follow up.

Please feel free to contact us to meet any time prior to the February 15 (tentative) hearing date to answer any questions. We

have also included the County planner who is handling the application.

Best regards

PD PROPERTIES LLC

Dan Pina  
707 333-4304  
[dan@winecountrycases.com](mailto:dan@winecountrycases.com)

Ignacio Delgadillo  
707 333-6337  
[ignacio@winecountrycases.com](mailto:ignacio@winecountrycases.com)

Jason Hade (County Planner)  
707 259-8757  
[Jason.hade@countyofnapa.org](mailto:Jason.hade@countyofnapa.org)

<Flynn\_10-23-15 Use Permit Resubmittal\_Arch.pdf><FLYNNVILLE WINE COMPANY5.docx>



## Department of Toxic Substances Control



**Matthew Rodriguez**  
Secretary for  
Environmental Protection

Barbara A. Lee, Director  
700 Heinz Avenue  
Berkeley, California 94710-2721

**Edmund G. Brown Jr.**  
Governor

January 26, 2017

Mr. Jason R. Hade  
Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department  
County of Napa  
1195 Third Street, Suite 210  
Napa, California 94559  
[jason.hade@countyofnapa.org](mailto:jason.hade@countyofnapa.org)

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR FLYNNVILLE WINE  
COMPANY PROJECT, USE PERMIT #P12-00222 AND VARIANCE #P12-00223,  
1184 MAPLE LANE, CALISTOGA, CALIFORNIA

Dear Mr. Hade:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Initial Study (IS) for preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Flynnville Wine Company project, State Clearinghouse No. #2013082090, dated January 12, 2017. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) oversees the cleanup of sites where hazardous substances have been released pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.8. As a potential Responsible Agency, DTSC is submitting comments to ensure that the environmental documentation prepared for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) adequately addresses any required cleanup activities to address any hazardous substances release at the project site.

The project site is located on the east side of State Highway 29, at 1184 Maple Lane in the City of Calistoga, Napa County, California. The proposed project would merge six parcels of various sizes into one 10.09-acre project site that includes the following parcels: 020-320-003 (0.99 acres), 020-320-006 (0.95 acres), 020-320-009 (2.67 acres), 020-320-015 (2.15 acres), 020-320-016 (1.19 acres), and 020-170-012 (2.14 acres). Approximately seven acres of the project site is currently developed with a carport and ten commercial/light industrial structures. Five of these structures would be demolished and replaced with the proposed winery system and a 3.2-acre vineyard. The Use Permit application proposes: construction of a phased 60,000 gallon per year winery, two winery buildings, 20,000 gallon water storage tanks, and parking spaces; road access improvements; installation of a wastewater treatment system; and



Mr. Jason R. Hade  
January 26, 2017  
Page 2 of 3

demolition of five buildings. The Variance application requested construction of the winery buildings 150 feet within the 600-foot winery setback from State Highway 29; 78 feet within the 300-foot setback from Maple Lane and 84 feet within the 300-foot setback from Ida Lane.

The IS states that a variety of industrial uses have been operating on the project site since the early 1960s. In 1985, the industrial zoning of the project site changed to Agricultural Watershed and Agricultural Preserve. The IS does not include a thorough description of the past historical uses of the project site. Without more detailed historical information, DTSC is unable to determine whether hazardous substances may have been released into the soil at the project site.

DTSC therefore recommends that a historical assessment of past uses in the project site be conducted. Based on that information, sampling may need to be conducted to determine whether there is an issue that should be addressed in the CEQA compliance document. At a minimum, soil sampling is recommended for pesticides/herbicides that may have been used for past agricultural and for other chemicals that were used in the industrial operations at the project site. If hazardous substances have been released, they must be addressed as part of the proposed project.

The proposed project also includes demolition of five existing structures that appear to have been built before 1978 when lead-based paint was banned for residential use. Therefore, there is a potential of soil contamination from lead-based paint. The IS did not address the impact and mitigation measures for potential lead contamination in soil around the structures from lead-based paint. The mitigation measures should include soil sampling around the structures where lead-based paint might have been released in the surrounding soil.

If lead and/or other chemical contamination is present in site soil, it will need to be addressed as part of this project. For example, if the cleanup activities include the need for soil excavation, the CEQA document should include: (1) assessment of air impacts and health impacts associated with the excavation and disposal activities; (2) identification of any applicable local standards which may be exceeded by the excavation activities, including dust levels and noise; and (3) assessment of transportation impacts from the soil removal activities.

In the event that chemical contamination is found at the project site, the contamination must be characterized and cleaned up under a regulatory agency oversight. The following paragraphs explain the process that should be followed to seek State regulatory agency oversight for the: preparation of a Soil Management Plan; characterization and disposal or reuse of contaminated soil; and additional soil sampling to confirm cleanup of the project site to unrestricted land use standards.

Mr. Jason R. Hade  
January 26, 2017  
Page 3 of 3

On March 1, 2005, DTSC, the State Water Resources Control Board, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards), and the California Environmental Protection Agency issued a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) aimed to avoid duplication of efforts and improve coordination among the agencies in their regulatory oversight of investigation and cleanup activities at brownfield sites. Brownfield sites are generally those that are contaminated and potentially contaminated where some type of development or redevelopment is planned. Under the MOA, anyone requesting oversight from DTSC or a Regional Board must submit an application to initiate the process to assign the appropriate oversight agency.

The completed application and site information may be submitted to either DTSC or Regional Board office in your geographical area. The Brownfields Coordinators in those agencies will contact the other agency and reply to the applicant with the name and contact information of the selected oversight agency. The link for the Request for Agency Oversight Application and additional information follows:

<http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Brownfields/BrownfieldsVoluntaryProgram.cfm>

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (510) 540-3840 or [remedios.sunga@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:remedios.sunga@dtsc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,



Remedios V. Sunga  
Project Manager  
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

CEQA Tracking Center  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
PO Box 806  
Sacramento, California 95812-0806



**From:** [ggheitz](#)  
**To:** [Hade, Jason](#)  
**Subject:** Flynnville use permit P-15-00225-UP  
**Date:** Thursday, September 03, 2015 3:54:15 PM

---

Dear Jason,

Thank you for the courtesy notice re the subject permit. Our home is located about 1500' toward Calistoga on the east side of Hwy. 29. We are generally accepting of this scaled down project as it has been described to us by Dan Piña. Most of the problem areas from our prospective have been addressed.

A couple of things still concern us that we would like to go on record about. There is an existing line of trees on the east end of the project that do a fairly good job of screening Jim's Supply building and storage yard from our view shed. Unfortunately, the trees are deciduous and we get to look at the winter sun rise over a really ugly sight. Would it be possible to require a replacement of evergreen vegetation for this situation? The problem also occurs further north beyond the project boundary along the same line of trees. We have voiced this issue to Dan and he says he'll take care of it, but we would feel more comfortable with something stated in the plan. Along these same lines, there are obnoxious security lights on the existing buildings. I have repeatedly asked Dan to install glare shields on these, but nothing happens. Could this issue be resolved in the plan also?

One other area that is of great concern to us is the likelihood of future expansion of the project. There have been a few wineries in our area who build and then get permitted to expand winery operations to fill their new structures. Seems to be an easier way to "get your way". I've expressed this issue to Dan also and he assures us that he has no such plan. He was unwilling to be this in writing to me however. Could the permit address this issue? Lastly, there are unforeseen issues that come up after the fact that cause us grief. For example, the Satui Castle. A small percentage of the visitor horde end up missing their turn off and in our driveway either to make a U turn or ask directions. This happens several times a day on weekends and is very disruptive to our lives and causes dust and wear and tear on our road. We have tried to put up signs, but they are ignored. Now, we are going to have to install a gate which will cost us plenty and add a great deal of inconvenience, all because of Satui. Our remedy is a lawsuit. Is it possible to ask the Flynnville project to post a bond that would cover unforeseen happenstances such as this example, for a period of several years after the completion of the project?

Thank you for listening to our concerns. Please let us know if you need any additional information from us.

Sincerely,  
Gary and Ginny Heitz  
4170 St. Helena Hwy.  
707 942-4157

Sent from my iPad

February 12, 2016

Jason Hade

Subject: Flynnville, past, present and future.

**Past and Present:** Please review Master Plans, use permits and conditions of approval for existing warehouse and storage uses. Current uses are not in conformance and required improvements have not been completed. I have not received answers from my inquiries of non conformance.

The culverts under Flynnville do not allow the water to drain from the State Hwy to Ida Lane. The restricted culverts cause sheet water runoff and water buildup and has in past rains restricted the access to Hwy 29 at Drew Drive. Were these culverts constructed in conformance with Napa County permits?

Jim's Supply, barrel building, "green" wine production and box production are not warehouse and storage activities; they are commercial production activities.

**Future:** If ten acres are required for a winery project, will the entire ten acres be considered in the approval? Will parcels be merged to one parcel of ten or more acres? If yes, what is the process of such a merger?

Road circulation should include Ida Lane, Drew Drive, Frontage Road (Access Road) and Maple Lane. These roads meet the winery definition of a road; they serve the Drew three parcels and the current two dwellings. Setback limits should be considered. Landscaping, curbs and gutters on the development side of the development should be included as required by past use permits and conditions of approval. Drew easements of Ida Lane {parcel 3} and Drew Drive ownership and easements have been established by the Napa County Superior Court and are recorded. The new development should not impede fire protection access to the Drew parcels. The flag lot parcel (APN 020-170-012) extends to the center of Maple Lane and the NBA Waterline Easement extends from the center of Maple Lane to the Napa River to the West. This entrance to the easement is the only access the City of Calistoga has to the entire 1000 foot plus easement to maintain and inspect the waterline and working parts.

We continue to support improvements of the Flynnville complex. It is also our hope the approved and completed project will result in a facility of pride for the Napa Valley as well as the Flynnville neighborhood.

Are you available to meet with me to discuss this subject? A morning meeting between 9:00 AM and noon would be best for me. I will be available for any meeting time you schedule.

Hoping to hear from you,

Will Drew  
707-579-7861  
wmwerd@att.net

**From:** [Will Drew](#)  
**To:** [Hade, Jason](#)  
**Cc:** [McDowell, John](#)  
**Subject:** Flynnville wine company  
**Date:** Monday, April 18, 2016 12:55:42 PM  
**Attachments:** [Southern Pacific purchase.pdf](#)  
[NBA Cityeasement.pdf](#)

---

Hello Jason,

The attached documents will show that the Flynnville Winery Parcel 012 extends to the center of Maple Lane. The Southern Pacific parcels I purchased extended from the center of the Napa River on the Northwest to the center of Maple Lane on the Southeast. The boundaries of Maple Lane at this location are fluid. The Shamp to Rose etal. deed contains the original "meets and bounds" to the road purchase. The new owners of the Powell Dwelling, The Blanton Family Vineyards opposite the flag lot at Maple Lane has applied for an on sale liquor permit from ABC ? I do not know if the county of Napa becomes involved in this process. This kind of activity in the neighborhood is known as Progress.

The North Bay Aqueduct waterline easement to the City of Calistoga extends from the center of Maple Lane to the Napa River. The Maple Lane entrance provides the only access for the City to monitor the easement and pipeline. The developers have fenced across the 12' easement which blocks the City from inspecting the easement.

The October 2013 Flynnville Winery application clearly shows the intent to access the flag lot via Maple Lane. The new project seems to distance itself from this entrance.

Will a traffic study update be completed for the new winery project? The last one contained errors and the Superior Court ruling establishes Ida Lane and Drew Drive uses as roads. It is imperative to continue Drew Drive traffic to and from the State Hwy. Should the Flynnville Winery project impede the Heitz Way/Drew Drive intersection, the new project should mitigate a safe State Hwy Intersection for the Flynn, Heitz and Drew properties.

Thank you for your patience and listening to my concerns. We do border the entire proposed project, Ida Lane road access to our parcels and a covenant of 70'x451' on parcel 009 adjacent to our home.

Sincerely, Will Drew

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:  
 Lester Cavagnaro  
 City Administrator  
 City of Calistoga  
 1232 Washington Street  
 Calistoga, Ca. 94515

Exempt from Government Code 6103 -Record

GRANT OF EASEMENT

Preamble

THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into as of the 31  
 day of October, 1983, by and between the CITY  
 OF CALISTOGA, a municipal corporation in the County of Napa,  
 State of California, party of the first part, hereinafter  
 referred to as "CITY," and WILL J. DREW, a married man, party  
 of the second part, hereinafter referred to as "GRANTOR."

Recitals

WHEREAS, GRANTOR is the owner of certain real property  
 commonly known as County of Napa Assessor Parcel Nos.  
 20-170-08, 20-170-09, and 20-170-10, hereinafter referred to  
 as the "Servient Tenement" and more particularly described in  
 Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this  
 reference (Exhibit "A" is comprised of a description of the  
 construction easement, permanent easement, and the servient  
 tenement); and

WHEREAS, CITY desires to acquire certain rights in the  
 Servient Tenement;

NOW THEREFORE, it is agreed as follows:

Grant of Easement

1. For valuable consideration, GRANTOR hereby grants  
 to CITY an easement as hereinafter described.

Character of Easement

2. The easement granted herein is an easement in gross  
 and the easement granted is non-exclusive.

Description of Easement

3. The easement granted herein is the right to con-  
 struct, maintain, and repair a potable water pipeline and  
 appurtenances, including above-ground cathodic protection  
 equipment as well as other required vents or valves necessary  
 to the operation of the pipeline.

OFFICIAL RECORDS  
 NAPA COUNTY, CALIF.

MAY 7 1984

AT 1:36 P. M. MDH3544  
 ELEANOR E. KIMBROUGH  
 COUNTY RECORDER

*Nofee*



4. CITY shall have all rights of reasonable ingress and egress, via Maple Lane only, to and from the easement area to patrol, maintain, and repair the pipeline and its appurtenances.

5. For the purpose of the initial construction hereof, CITY may enter into and utilize a strip not to exceed fifty feet (50') in width, as more particularly described herein-after.

Location

6. The permanent easement granted herein is located as follows: a twelve-foot (12') strip described in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

Except for appurtenances, the pipeline shall, throughout its length, be at least three feet (3') below the surface of the adjacent ground and shall be used only for the conveyance of potable water.

*the ground elevation of the completed permanent easement shall be equal to that of the adjacent ground levels,*

7. The construction easement granted herein is located as follows: a strip not to exceed fifty feet (50') in width as hereinafter described in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. The 50 foot construction easement will terminate at the completion of construction or on June 1, 1985, whichever comes first.

Use by Servient Tenant

8. GRANTOR retains the right to make all uses of the property that do not interfere with CITY's use of easement, including the right to plant and maintain grape vines and/or other crops in the easement area, to construct a driveway, and to construct and maintain appurtenant irrigation, frost protection, and other devices.

9. No structures or improvements other than those described hereinabove shall be permitted within the permanent easement.

Vol. 1336 pg. 656

interference with GRANTOR's use of the easement area.

Entire Agreement

23. This instrument contains the entire agreement between the parties relating to the rights herein granted and the obligations herein assumed. Any oral representations or modifications concerning this instrument shall be of no force and effect excepting a subsequent modification in writing, signed by the party to be charged.

Attorneys Fees

24. In the event of any controversy, claim, or dispute relating to this instrument or the breach thereof, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover from the losing party reasonable expenses, attorneys fees, and costs.

Binding Effect

25. This instrument shall bind and inure to the benefit of the respective heirs, personal representatives, successors, and assigns of the parties hereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this instrument the day and year first above written.

GRANTOR

Will J. Drew  
Will J. Drew

CITY OF CALISTOGA

Robert B. Wickham  
Mayor of the City of Calistoga

ATTEST:

Mary Ann Duffy  
City Clerk

4104 ST HELENA HWY N  
CALISTOGA, CA 94515

VOL 1257 page 116

RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS  
OF NAPA COUNTY  
NAPA LAND TITLE CO.  
OCT 1 1982  
AT 3:10 P M.  
ELEANOR E. KIMBROUGH  
COUNTY RECORDER

MAIL TAX STATEMENTS TO

Same as above

ABOVE

21.00  
1.00

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

20017-00 L-7783

The undersigned Grantor(s)  
Declare: Documentary Trans-  
fer Tax is \$19.80  
Computed on full value  
 (X) Unincorporated area

# Grant Deed

SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, a Delaware corporation, Grantor,  
hereby GRANTS to

WILL J. DREW, a married man, Grantee,

that certain real property situated in the County of Napa, State of California,  
and more particularly described in Exhibit "A," attached and hereby made a part hereof.

Grantor excepts from the property hereby conveyed that portion thereof lying below a depth  
of 500 feet, measured vertically, from the contour of the surface of said property; however, Grantor,  
or its successors and assigns, shall not have the right for any purpose whatsoever to enter upon, into or  
through the surface of said property or any part thereof lying between said surface and 500 feet  
below said surface.

This grant is made subject to easements, covenants, conditions, reservations and restrictions of  
record.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has caused these presents to be executed this 27<sup>th</sup>  
day of SEPTEMBER, 1982.



That certain real property in the County of Napa, State of California,  
described as follows:

PARCEL ONE

A strip of land sixty-two feet in width bounded on the Southeast by the lands conveyed to Seneca McCrory by Deed recorded April 10, 1868 in Book K of Deeds, at Page 435, and on the Northwest by the lands conveyed to Charles H. Parker by Deed recorded September 16, 1868 in Book L of Deeds at Page 138, and lying between parallel lines 31 feet on each side of the center line of the former Napa Valley Railroad Company's track.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM that portion lying Southeasterly of the Northwesterly line of Maple Lane.

VOL 1257 PAGE 117

PARCEL TWO

A strip of land sixty feet in width bounded on the Southeast by the Lands conveyed to Samuel E. Strode by Deed recorded July 7, 1869 in Book M of Deeds, at Page 48, and on the Northwest by the lands conveyed to Ralph L. Kilburn by Deed recorded November 14, 1866 in Book J of Deeds at Page 243, and lying equally on each side of the center line of the former Napa Valley Rail Road Company's track.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM that portion lying Northwesterly of the center of the Napa River.

The purpose of this Deed is to combine the above described parcel with AP# 20-170-04, 05, & 07.

Together with all of the right, title and interest of Grantor, in and to the land underlying that portion of the northwesterly half of Maple Lane abutting upon the above described Parcel No. One.



Jason Hade

June 23, 2016

Flynnville Winery P15-00225

Thank you for your past responses to questions.

Past master plans, use permits and conditions of approval exist with this proposal for a winery. I have asked Linda St. Claire to respond to these violations.

If a minimum of ten acres is required for winery, will the ten acres become involved in the new permit process?

If parcels are to become merged, will this process involve input from neighborhood shareholders?

Will the road circulation pattern of Ida Lane and Drew Drive include the easements recorded as a result of the recent Napa Superior Court rulings?

Does irrevocable mean irrevocable or does it somehow becomes subject to interpretation (see past history of parcel 3, Ida Lane and dedications adjacent to Drew Drive)?

Summit drawings do not show:

1. Correct width of deeded right-of way as 12' + 12' of Drew Drive (nor the 40' width of Conditions of Approval of Drew Drive and Ida Lane).
2. Parcel 020-170-012 as extending to the center of Maple Lane as purchased from Southern Pacific.
3. Correct width of the flag entrance to this parcel of 62' and not 60'.

Past use permits, past conditions of approval, past irrevocable offers of dedication and current uses as Agricultural Services all add to make a confusing view of the current proposed project.

We continue to hold a positive view of a fitting, improved Flynnville Complex.

Will Drew

Jason Hade, Ida Lane and Drew Drive July 26, 2016

Ida Lane has been established as a road and by Napa County Winery definition is subject to setbacks (hopefully landscaping, drainage and development screened from public view). This road serves four parcels other than the winery project.

The attached recorded Superior Court Order includes the following parcels:

020-320-003 Ida Lane prescriptive easement to three Drew Parcels  
Ida lane development is to be without the obstacles of gates.  
020-320-003 deeded 12' deeded easement to Drew  
020-320-001 (now 009) 12' deeded easement to Drew  
020-320-004 deeded 12' deeded easement to Drew  
020-320-007 (now 015) 12' deeded easement to Drew  
Three Drew parcels 020-170-11, 020-170-008 & 020-320-018 (Drew Drive)

Will the above deeded easements be identified on final plans including possible parcel merger changes? None of these facts have been applied to the new proposed winery plans.

Ida lane serves the parcel 020-320-004 as listed in the ABC application & permit. This is a wine aging function and not warehouse and storage per the Napa County use permit and the conditions of approval.

The prior permit conformance combined with the proposed project causes confusion. Thank you again for your willingness to address both the past and proposed projects.

Will Drew