

“L”

Staff Response to Comments
Staglin Family Vineyards Major
Modification
P18-00253-MOD

February 10, 2021
File: mpm\staglin winery RFI 1

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
Attn: Trevor Hawkes, Planner III

Re: Request For Information #1
Staglin Family Vineyard/Staglin Winery
Major Modification #P18-00253-MOD
1570 Bella Oaks Lane
Rutherford, California

Mr. Hawkes;

After discussions with several neighbors and so that we are better prepared to discuss the Major Modification with the Applicants, the neighbors have a series of questions that we are hoping to get responses and/or clarifications to. Obviously sooner is better so that we can be prepared to have meaningful negotiations with the Applicants well before the March 3rd Planning Commission meeting. Written responses would be preferred but if we should discuss via a phone call, that is also an option.

1. The January 13, 2021 Memorandum from Ahsan Kazmi, PE, Napa County Public Works' Senior Traffic Engineer indicates there should be no employees or visitors during Saturday non-harvest season and no visitors during Saturday harvest season. The Staglin Application allows tours and marketing on Saturdays. What is the status of this discrepancy and will one document (the January 13th Traffic Memo or Staglin Application) be modified so that Planning and Public Works are not in conflict?

The discrepancy in the January 13, 2021, memo from the Public Works department was a holdover from an earlier version of the approval memo when the project TIS had been reviewed with an error in it itself. These errors have been rectified and the memo will now match the project scope.

2. The June 12, 2018 Summit Engineering Water Availability Analysis suggests there is a groundwater overdraft at the site. Summit provided an Engineer during the February 3, 2021 Planning Commission meeting to say this is not the case. Will the Summit report and specifically the "Estimated Annual Recharge" exhibit (last page) in the Summit Analysis be revised and resubmitted with additional discussion so the Staglins can "prove" there is no increased groundwater deficit?

As mentioned by a representative of Summit Engineering, the groundwater recharge number on the last page of Attachment G was provided in error, and is not an appropriate calculation for recharge given the location of the project. This corresponds with the narrative of the project WAA (pages 1-11 of Attachment G) wherein the recharge number in question does not appear, and the explanation for how recharge is calculated for the project is provided on page 9 of Attachment G. The recharge calculation provided in the WAA narrative is in compliance with County Guidelines for calculating recharge on the Napa Valley Floor.

<https://www.countyofnapa.org/DocumentCenter/View/1056/Water-Availability-Analysis-Adopted-Policy-May-12-2015->

[PDF#:~:text=In%20general%2C%20the%20acceptable%20water,foot%2C%20or%20325%2C851%20gallons\).](#)

3. *If large marketing events are held in the Steckter house to reduce noise impacts to the neighborhood, has the Fire Marshall determined a maximum occupancy or is there a County-imposed limitation on occupancy? We understand the tasting/marketing room is 863 square feet and the porch addition/enclosed outdoor area is 1286 square feet for a total of +/- 2150 square feet. Our question is what is the maximum allowable number of people in this enclosed space given its intended use?*

Occupancy loads for buildings are determined during building permit review. I do not know the building's current occupancy off hand.

4. *Could we get a map that clearly marks the location and name of the outdoor terraces and parking spaces?*

The project site plans were provided in Attachment J of the February 3rd, 2021, Staff Report.

5. *Why does the Staglins' current website advertise tastings at the Steckter House, when the current permit clearly states all tours and tastings are to take place inside the cave or in the outdoor area adjacent to the south cave portal?*

3 days per week of Tours and Tastings were approved in the Steckter House with Minor Modification P08-00053 (page 3 of the Staff Report and background section of CEQA document)

6. *From the Staff report, p. 5: "Portable toilets to be made available at all events". Where will these be located?*

Staff has not requested this information.

7. *Staff report, p. 8: "Larger marketing events will use shuttle buses, vans and limousines to transport guests to the project site. In some cases, buses, vans and limousines may drop off and return later to pick up guests...." In this case, the number of vehicle trips would double - has this been factored into the traffic impact/report?*

The modeling used in the project's Traffic Impact Study utilizes the proposed project scope for tours and tastings visitation and observable current conditions to make an assumption of how the proposed project will impact daily operating conditions and change "Average Daily Trips" to the project. The nature of marketing events (temporary nature, when they are held, whether they are held at all, percentage of shuttles utilized, etc) is not easily transferable into this modeling and so while return trips for high occupancy vehicles are discussed in the TIS' parking analysis, they are not included in how the trip generation is determined.

8. *Attachment A to Staff Report - p. 2 - "The proposed project includes the renovation and expansion of the winery facility, construction of a new 16,428 square foot winery building, increases in production, employment, visitation, and marketing program." What is the new winery building? Shari emphasized no new construction.*

Appears to be a section I missed when I used a prior project's 'Findings' document as the template to begin writing this one. This has been corrected now.

9. *Attachment B to Staff Report - p.2: "All staff costs associated with monitoring compliance with these conditions and project revisions shall be borne by the permittee...." What are the monitoring costs and which items will be monitored by the county?*

This is a standard condition in the event compliance monitoring needs to take place, thus I do not have any monitoring costs or items to be monitored to provide to you.

10. *Attachment B to Staff Report - p. 5: "All marketing event activity, excluding quiet clean-up, shall cease by 10:00 p.m. If any event is held which will exceed the available on-site parking, the permittee shall prepare an event-specific parking plan which may include, but not be limited to valet service or off-site parking and shuttle service to the winery." Where will the offsite service be located? When will quiet clean up end - in other words, what is the true end time of evening events?*

Identification of an offsite service location is not considered necessary for project analysis and permit issuance. Quiet cleanup begins at 10pm and ends at 11pm.

11. *Attachment B to Staff Report - p. 5: "Visitation log books, visitor reports, custom crush client records and any additional documentation determined by Staff to be necessary to evaluate compliance may be requested by the County for any code compliance." Are these records currently available for 2020 and prior years that we could review? What is the collection and transmittal process on the County's part?*

The COA is referring to the applicant's responsibility to furnish those records should a Code Compliance case be opened on the winery. I am not aware of the transmittal process nor is the data public record.

12. *Attachment B to Staff Report: - p. 8: "Within 30 days of permit approval, the permittee shall submit a Traffic Management Plan to the Planning Division and the Public Works Department for review and approval which includes, but not limited to measures that will reduce peak-hour vehicle trips program...." Since traffic is of major concern to the residents on BOL, why is this plan not submitted prior to permit approval?*

This is a standard condition issued for all winery Use Permits and their modifications. Those plans do not impact the findings of the project's TIS and represent measure's which will reduce traffic impact caused by the project.

13. *What new fire mitigation requirements, if any, have been enacted since the LNU Complex, Mondavi, and Glass Fires in the summer and fall of 2020?*

I am not aware of any. Should CalFire issue new regulations which would impact the review and approval of land use permits, those rules will be applied, just as current CalFire regulations were applied in review of this project.

14. *How can the Staglins and the County consider the crude number of visitors as the total number of "permitted visitors," when the Staglin winery sits at the end of a dead-ended lane such that the aggregate amount of traffic for visitors, plus service providers, plus staff is multiple times the non-Staglin traffic on Bella Oaks Lane. When we speak of*

17,500 guests, we are talking about 13,500 vehicle trips (35,000 one way trips ÷ 2.6 people/car) and this doesn't include the staff and service providers. Is this what the County has in mind for a narrow residential lane in the unincorporated area of the county? Should a privately owned winery be able to inflict such commotion, pollution, and vehicular movement off a main arterial road like Highway 29?

I'm not sure entirely sure I understand what the first question is referring to with the term "Service Providers" but the Project's Trip Generation Sheet, which was provided in Attachment E of the February 3rd hearing, included employees when calculating Average Daily Trips for the proposed project. The final two questions appear to be rhetorical questions and I would simply say that the county's intention for all aspects of land use is contained in our General Plan.

15. In Exhibit C of the Planning Commission docs, none of the use permits and use permit modifications state the 10 visitors/day condition for the tours and tastings. Was there a per week and per year allowance designated as well? There is reference to a Project Revision Statement that may have that information, but that document is not included in Exhibit C. We need to see the official use permit stating the current 10 person per day entitlement.

Staglin's Original Use Permit was established at a time when the County's Conditions of Approval documents were not as detailed as currently. The 10 visitors/day was contained in the original Use Permit Application.

16. In order to respond to the current proposal, we need to see the historic visitation and event data. Please provide a 3 to 5 year history of the daily tours/tastings visitation count along with the location of the tours/tastings and the events held (date, number of attendees and location).

That data is not public record.

17. The County winery database indicates that the current tours/tastings allowance is 10 persons per day, 100 persons per week and 5200 persons per year. The math doesn't work if the allowance is 10 persons per day. Please describe the discrepancy.

Staglin Family Vineyard is currently entitled for 10 visitors per day, Monday through Friday.

18. On page 9 of the Use Permit Major Modification Application, the existing hours of operation is listed as 10:00 AM through 4 PM Monday through Sunday which is not correct. The proposal hours of operation are listed as "unchanged" which is incorrect and misleading when in fact the days of operation are requested to be increased to Monday through Sunday and the existing entitlement is Monday through Friday. Please clarify.

Applications for Use Permit Modifications occasionally have incorrect information, which Staff discerns during the review process, and in some cases requests that the applicant update the application and in some cases does not. The existing and proposed changes are discussed correctly in multiple other locations of the February 3rd, 2021 agenda packet, including the Staff Report, Findings, Conditions of Approval, and Previous Conditions of Approval.

Thank you for addressing these questions and please call me if we should discuss?

Mike Morisoli
8471 St. Helena Hwy
Rutherford, California
415-246-7011
mmorisoli@millerpac.com