

Winery Ordinance Public Meeting - Summary of Comments

August 23, 2012, 6:00pm-8:00pm

Santa Ynez Valley Marriott

555 McMurray Road, Buellton, CA Turf Club, Room B

Dear Interested Persons,

Below is a summary of the public comments received during the Winery Ordinance Update meeting held on August 23, 2012. Thank you to everyone that participated during the meeting. Your comments will be considered as we move through the process. The comments include those written on comment cards or sticky note as well as those spoken at the podium. Please keep in mind the following as you read through the comments:

- Some of the comments pertain to more than one key topic area. If you do not see your comment in one key topic area, look in the other key topic areas.
- If a comment was made more than once, it may have been recorded only once.
- All comments are weighted equally regardless of who made the comment or how the comment was made (comment card, sticky note, or public address).
- When necessary, comments were edited for grammar, punctuation, etc. but the original intent of the comment was retained.
- The comments are opinions expressed by the citizens and do not necessarily reflect County positions or policies.

Comments are organized into the following categories:

- Winery Ordinance Structure
- Food Service
- Tasting Rooms
- Special Events
- Neighborhood Compatibility
- Enforcement & Monitoring
- Other

Winery Ordinance Structure – Comments on the structure of the Winery Ordinance and definitions.

1. Add a Tier for wineries producing fewer than 5,000 cases that allow tastings by appointment.
2. Tier structure needs to be re-configured based on property acreage to host events versus case production.
3. Create a Tier for tasting rooms that are tastings by appointment only.
4. The Tier structure works but considerations should be made to add property size as a factor for the number and size of events.
5. Boutique wineries that produce 1,000 cases and under should have their own Tier.

6. Concerns over the cost of creating a new ordinance.
7. Special events and permitting should be made easier.
8. Permit process should be more accessible for small 5,000 cases boutique winery for tastings.
9. Tier I path should remain.
10. The ordinance is fair, clear, and consistent.
11. The County needs to develop ways to reduce the cost and time required to permit wineries.
12. Modifications need to be made to the definition of a winery, excluding tasting rooms for commercial purposes and limiting special events.
13. Clear definitions are needed for private and public tasting rooms.
14. Overlays or zones could be created where no new tasting rooms or special events will be allowed (e.g. Ballard Canyon).
15. There should not be umbrella rules for tasting rooms on varying sizes of property.
16. It is confusing as to why wine industry production is allowed on small acreages of agricultural land.
17. A new Tier should be considered for small vineyards/wineries to have a tasting room on their premises to reduce tasting rooms in towns
18. Wineries that produce 5,000 cases should only be allowed tastings by appointment.
19. Boutique wineries with minimum impact should have an easier permit process.
20. The current permitting process allows for exceptions and should be made more specific and mandatory.
21. Clarify the definition of a non-profit and how they are monitored.
22. The size of agricultural parcels should be a very important factor to the Tiers.
23. Tasting rooms should not be tied exclusively to case production as that encourages large projects and discourages smaller, often local family-owned, projects.
24. Permit process is burdensome for small businesses.
25. Clarify that tasting rooms are not wine bars and that wine bars do not produce their product, carry 1-2 years inventory, or hire production work force.
26. One size ordinance does not fit all.
27. The ordinance is not the problem and does not need to be updated.
28. Ordinance should be clear and concise.
29. The design of a winery can address any situation.
30. Ordinance should be reasonable, consistent, and rational.
31. All interests should be represented in the process.
32. Deliberative process in the existing winery ordinance.
33. Rules cannot be overly complex.
34. Ordinance should reduce the clustering of wineries and promote diffusion.
35. The Tiered system for events is appropriate.
36. Changes should not be retroactive.
37. There should be more support of small businesses as the existing ordinance encourages big businesses.
38. The existing process is too complicated and the language needs to be simplified.
39. Neighborhood contact needs to be a condition for applicants.
40. Local winery stakeholders should be part of the process of evaluating and drafting a new winery ordinance.

41. The winery ordinance presently balances business with impacts to the community and it should not be further restricted.

Food Service – Comments on the type of food, food preparation, etc. permitted at a Winery.

1. Need to allow food service in tasting rooms.
2. Charity events need to offer food/dinner/lunch or they can't charge enough.
3. Questions as to why food is regulated.
4. Allow picnic boxes made by local businesses to be sold at wineries.
5. Food should be allowed, just not restaurants.
6. Limited food service should be allowed and encouraged, i.e. picnics, box lunches, BBQs, etc.
7. Feeding people is a good thing.
8. Where food is prepared is irrelevant.
9. Do not restrict food service.
10. Restaurants are a hospitality business, not agricultural.
11. Dispensation for locally grown agriculture products.
12. We should encourage the consumption of food at tasting rooms and winery events as food and wine have been culturally important together for centuries.
13. On-site preparation of food cuts down on traffic activity.
14. Any kind of food should be allowed.
15. Food and wine make a perfect marriage- you cannot educate the public on wine and wine consumption without food pairing.
16. Food is a great mitigating measure for those concerned about drunk driving.
17. Serve hors d'oeuvres or tapas, not meals.
18. Food for recovery cost only (not profit), similar to Napa.
19. Equal enforcement and requirements for any other food service business, i.e. restaurants, caterers, bars. Including equipment, prep areas, and fixtures.
20. Allowance of catered food at events as well as food in tasting rooms.
21. Food service should be very limited based on zoning of the land.
22. Wine without food is trouble.
23. No food service, wine only.
24. Serving food is important when going to multiple wineries.
25. Make sure to talk to hotels about food prep issues.
26. Nice restaurants and food service bring taxes and jobs.
27. Let the market regulate them through competition as food service is tough enough anyway.
28. Allow dinners that promote the winery.
29. Serving food with wine alleviates more people drinking and getting on the road.
30. Food preparation at the winery or catering is okay.
31. Food should not be allowed as it expands the idea of a tasting room.
32. Food enhances the enjoyment of wine and increases sales.
33. The country of Spain made serving wine illegal without food which brought on the invention of tapas. Alcohol without food is dangerous.
34. Since the County does not regulate what food is served at a private birthday party, the County should not regulate food at events.

35. Food is essential.

Tasting Rooms – Comments on tasting rooms at a winery, including the definition of a tasting room.

1. Tasting rooms promote wine education and a safe wine lifestyle.
2. Tasting rooms should have limited hours, i.e. not open after 7pm.
3. Tasting rooms offer respectable part time jobs for the community that adults can feel proud of doing, especially for those who run non-profits and cannot work full time.
4. Tasting rooms on vineyards are the engine of winery agricultural land, jobs, and taxes.
5. Number of visitors should be documented each day.
6. Vineyards without a winery should be allowed a tasting room.
7. Tasting rooms are better at wineries rather than taking over other downtown spaces.
8. Tasting rooms should be concentrated in city/industrial areas as increased traffic is a major issue in rural neighborhoods.
9. Clarification on the definitions and differences of tasting rooms and bars.
10. Tasting rooms provide the opportunity to sell bottles of wine that will promote the growth of Santa Barbara County.
11. Selling wine in tasting rooms is the economic viability of the business.
12. Tasting rooms should not be allowed in residential and agricultural zones.
13. Tasting rooms should be allowed on vineyard/winery properties rather than having to be moved into towns.
14. Towns are too small for more tasting rooms and could become “ghettos.”
15. Tasting rooms bring business to wineries and benefit the whole community economically.
16. Not all tasting rooms should be judged on the grievances of a few people.
17. Tasting rooms are hard to regulate.
18. Impacts of tasting rooms on surrounding properties should be considered.
19. Provisions should be made for private tastings for boutique wineries.
20. Tasting rooms should be kept in towns.
21. Tasting rooms should have an incentive program for designated drivers so that those who abstain are rewarded.
22. A tasting room is a specific building used primarily to sell wine.
23. If traffic is the problem with tasting rooms, then traffic should be regulated, not the tasting room.
24. The bucolic valleys, especially Ballard Canyon, need to be preserved from wine tasters.
25. Tasting rooms and special events are the core of the wine industry’s economic health and future.
26. Tasting rooms are not supermarkets and therefore the sales of goods and food should be limited.
27. The County should not regulate how much a tasting room should charge for wine and food.
28. There is concern over noise, light pollution, and drunk drivers.
29. Winery tourism is the best way to add jobs to the area.
30. 20.7 million tourists come to the state each year due to wineries.
31. Wineries are the economic engine to agri-tourism.
32. Small scale operations should be encouraged.

33. Tasting rooms are important to the Santa Ynez Valley.
34. Wineries have a positive effect on the City of Solvang.
35. It is a mistake to make wine in the city.
36. Tasting rooms are a business of education, not entertainment. Tasting rooms sell wine, not tastes.
37. Small producers of grapes on large parcels should and need small tasting rooms, 0-2000 cases, from estate grapes.
38. Ballard Canyon road is too narrow, curvy, and dangerous to support the cars that will venture to wine tasting and special events. Growing of grapes and making of wine are supported, but not the tasting rooms or special events proposed at wineries.
39. Requiring a small wine business to rent out another property in a town for their tasting room to sell their product is an economical detriment.
40. Pushing all wineries in just a few locations to taste adds to the carbon footprint and is not ecologically sound. It also builds up too much traffic into these areas and harms other businesses, costs the small winery, cheats the tourist out of fully enjoying the Santa Ynez Valley by not seeing the vineyard and wineries from where the wine came.
41. Growing grapes and bottling wine for sale is agricultural. The exchange of money for a glass of wine and the addition of commercial events are commercial uses.
42. Vineyards are not landscaping, but family businesses. Wineries are the retail outlets that support these families and allow them to live in the area.
43. The ability to sell or produce wines locally (tasting rooms, etc.) is an important part of preserving the agricultural heritage of the Santa Ynez Valley.
44. Tasting rooms at wineries in vineyards in the countryside are essential to build a customer base as customers want to see the winery, the grapes, the vineyard, the land, and the process.
45. Small wineries, just a few thousand cases, receive few visitors and the retail sales are the life blood of the business.
46. Wineries and social responsibility are not mutually exclusive. Wineries take very seriously their role in monitoring and regulating abusive alcohol consumption. Wineries are very effective in their job of social and environmental responsibility.
47. The resolution should not be moving wineries to cities.
48. Visitors to wineries go in to the cities and help support the local economy.

Special Events – Comments on special events at a winery and what might be considered a special event.

1. Events do not need to be disruptive and serve a need for the winery.
2. Events at wineries are important to non-profits. Non-profits need reasonable access to wineries/vineyards for fundraising and appreciation events.
3. The wine industry in partnership with area non-profits is a powerful force for philanthropy.
4. Non-profits need events to support their missions, which are different than winery events.
5. Concern over noise impacts of concerts.
6. Noise levels at events should vary by distance to surrounding neighbors.
7. Consideration should be made for average citizens (i.e. not vendors) who use winery facilities for events such as weddings.
8. Winery facilities are used for fund-raising events.

9. Charity events should be considered differently than other events.
10. Special events are critical and essential for local non-profits.
11. Vineyards provide community ambiance, views, and agricultural character, and therefore cost money to operate. Winery events are necessary to maintain those benefits to the community.
12. It should be ensured that events are consistent with the nature of the neighborhood.
13. Concern over the impacts of lighting from concerts.
14. An overlay should be created to limit areas that can have events, i.e. unsafe or rural areas are inappropriate.
15. Venues for events such as weddings and anniversary parties are limited in North County. Wineries provide venues for such occasions.
16. It is impossible to distinguish charity events from other types of events; therefore, there should be a cap on any type of event.
17. Wineries should not be limited to help non-profits with fund-raising.
18. Special events are imperative to our local economy. They help supplement the income of a farm or winery.
19. 80+ people attending an event will produce noise, but only for one evening.
20. More special events should be allowed as it provides income for many companies, e.g. restaurants, hotels, florists, shuttles, etc.
21. Traffic, parking, and noise concerns should be addressed, not the number of events.
22. Special events should not be limited by the size of the production facility. It should be decided by the size of premises and capacity of roads.
23. North County in particular has a dearth of venues to use for the kind of events needed to host area philanthropists.
24. Non-profits should not be punished by limiting events.
25. Non-profit events should not be counted as parties for profit.
26. Concern that permits will be appealed and a few locals will cause a stalemate in progress.
27. Events are no longer ancillary, they are major quality of this County- "The American Riviera" has put this County on the map.
28. Solutions for noise, traffic, and parking should be worked on.
29. The financial contribution the events bring to locals in the County should be considered.
30. Special events should provide the spirit of generosity and celebration, but done so respectfully.
31. Special events support the local community as well as tourism.
32. There should be a revocation of Conditional Use Permits (CUP) for violators (>3), not just a \$100 fine.
33. Special events are important in showcasing the beauty of our land.
34. There should be consideration of parcel size.
35. Late night traffic and noise from Special Events could have adverse impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.
36. Special events bring jobs to the valley.
37. Clarify who will enforce the number of events and people attending.
38. Special events need to continue or several businesses will go under and will affect the lives of many as they will not be able to generate necessary income to live in this area.
39. Instead of capping the number of events, provide an easy one page form letting the County know of each event being held.

40. Provide a simple one page form and the person holding the event sign off on following rules of neighborhood, parking, noise, etc.
41. Proximity to neighbors and on-site parking is more important in determining the number of events allowed, rather than the number of cases made.
42. Donors of non-profits spend thousands of dollars supporting the wineries that support their non-profit.
43. Special events should be allowed more than 200 people.
44. Nighttime noise or lights should not be allowed.
45. Including non-profit events in the number of allowable events results in few opportunities for charity events.
46. Weddings with amplified music should not be allowed.
47. Special events are an important part of diversification on agricultural properties as it makes them more viable.
48. The number of special events does not matter when complaints are not received.
49. Rural neighborhoods will be changed by Special Events.
50. There is no way to determine impact of unlimited charitable events.
51. Impacts are the same to neighbors whether it is a charitable, personal, or commercial event.
52. There should be higher limits on any type of event.
53. Appoint a representative to coordinate with winery special events and produce a master calendar for public access.
54. Special events are not agriculture.
55. Do not try to stop private parties on vineyards; do not confuse public and private.
56. Daytime and weekday events should be evaluated differently from evening and weekend events.
57. The economic impact of winery events should be recognized and supported with reasonable regulations.
58. Special events allow wineries to connect to clients on a more personal intimate level, thereby creating a quality client who will come back and support the winery and surrounding businesses (hotels, restaurants, etc.).
59. All non-profit events should be allowed as well as some for profit.
60. The County should not stifle an economically viable source of income for the community by restricting use of the land. Events bring people to the valley.
61. Increased traffic is unsafe for all travelers.
62. There is very little (or no) evidence linking traffic related injuries or DUIs to special events or tasting rooms.
63. There is no reason for wineries to have different special events rules than farms.
64. Decrease of special events will cause a financial loss to our County. This affects the County's schools, police, and fire.
65. The entire valley should not be affected by the complaints of 1 or 2 people.
66. For winery special events: change current threshold from 80 people to 150 people, include caveat for wine club members (50% wine club members).
67. There should be a set time that functions end.
68. Noise should be regulated, not the special event itself.

69. Special events with over 50 attendees should require a traffic control system to avoid difficulties on County roads.
70. Wine lifestyle equals wine education equals culture, growth and tourism.
71. Include the hotel industry when discussing special events.
72. Limousine services can reduce drunk driving.
73. Concerned that the number of special events will not be tracked.
74. Since there have been only 11 complaints within a 3 year time period, there are questions regarding if winery events are really a problem.
75. Agriculture needs to be viable by being able to sell wines and showcase in vineyards.
76. Events should not be regulated by number, just by parking and noise.
77. Events should be treated the same- winery or not.
78. With proper enforcement, special events are okay.
79. Consider the overlay concept for precluding events and wine-tasting in areas not suitable for their activities, i.e. threat to public safety.
80. Wineries are beautiful and it would be sad to see special events ended.
81. Wineries are very generous and positive.
82. If events are the issue, then just change that.
83. Address enforcement, not events.
84. More traffic is generated from high schools than from wineries, special events, or tasting rooms.
85. There is a long history of building business goodwill with community outreach to support charities. These events have been at wineries and are vital to build a clientele for the winery, and any other business that participates. This is also done to give back to the community.
86. [name redacted]winery has had events almost every weekend, whether charity or not, causing drunk drivers, noise, and traffic. The neighbors have had to be the policemen.
87. A CUP should be required for Special Events that consist of less than half wine club members.
88. Tasting rooms are okay, but not weddings every weekend.
89. The Special Events Ordinance should not be applied to Wineries.

Neighborhood Compatibility – Comments on the effects wineries may have on the neighborhood such as those from traffic, noise, parking, lighting, public safety, etc.

1. Neighbors need to be aware that agriculture is a business and the basis of agricultural economy.
2. Better communication among neighbors would solve most issues.
3. Traffic in some areas is already a safety hazard, which is not given enough weight in planning.
4. Some vineyards would be a negative for the community if they become a winery.
5. Parcel location in the County should be a consideration.
6. Special events need to be limited as they are not compatible with County living- amplified music has no place here.
7. Wineries are on agricultural land and are separated far enough to allow wide use of winery property.
8. If neighbors enjoy the vineyard views they should also accept that those vineyards must be supported by a winery which needs a tasting room.
9. Traffic on Ballard Canyon Rd. is a big concern.

10. There is adequate design review processes in place to ensure wineries and tasting rooms are compatible with neighborhoods.
11. Special events are not agricultural and not compatible.
12. There should be consideration of the small amount of actual complaints there have been.
13. Road safety, traffic, noise, and public safety are issues of concern in determining neighborhood incompatibility.
14. Intensity increase of traffic and drunk driving from wineries are cause for concern in the neighborhoods.
15. Vineyards are already very noisy, which intrudes on neighborhood activities.
16. Agriculture and growers are not a problem, events and tasting rooms are what generate traffic, DUI, noise, and are not good in County neighborhoods.
17. There would be increased traffic on inappropriate roads, noise and lights on quiet canyons, and close surrounding neighborhoods will be affected.
18. Rural agriculture should be kept, not commercial.
19. Clarification regarding whether the Sheriffs will monitor County roads as well.
20. Conducting traffic studies would be helpful in reducing neighborhood complaints.
21. There is not enough law enforcement to maintain basic public safety- more wineries and more events will lead to more impaired drivers.
22. Those who move into wine country should expect to see wine being made and sold.
23. Be respectful to the neighborhoods without shutting down the growth of industry.
24. Discussion required of how schools and quiet neighborhoods will be negatively affected.
25. Agricultural needs, including commerce (e.g. tasting rooms), on any area originally zoned as agriculture, should trump residential concerns. People should move to the suburb or city if they want to avoid agricultural noises, traffic, etc.
26. The noise ordinance that already exists should be used.
27. Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) belong to Texaco and the like, not family businesses.
28. Good design and planning allows a winery to fit into any community.
29. Ballard Canyon is a beautiful road and people like to drive it.
30. Wine tour operations reduce traffic and DUI.
31. Neighborhood compatibility is important.
32. If there is an issue in a specific area, then it should be addressed for that specific area, not the entire County.
33. When a particular vineyard applies for tasting room/event tier status, the traffic evaluation needs to fit the quality of the roads surrounding.
34. Size limitations are a must in rural areas.
35. Wine is agriculture and should have in agricultural areas.
36. There is significant impact to those living on small parcels next to small vineyards seeking to be wineries. This is due to the machinery used, necessary over-size buildings, trucking in grapes, insufficient room for on-site parking, and often there is no one living on-site to provide supervision.
37. Zoning is not respected by the increase of commercial activities in wineries. Wineries bring cars, people, noise, pollution, concerts, and these wineries do not grow the majority of their grapes on-site.

38. When houses live in rural zones, they need to accept the rural activities needed to maintain crops.
39. The Valley hosts a huge horse industry, and many people ride on the roadsides of Baseline-Mora-Roblar and Refugio Rd. These roads are affected by the surrounding commercial business of wineries as it puts drinking drivers on the road, increased traffic, and amplified music for special events.

Enforcement & Monitoring - Comments on the enforcement and monitoring of Wineries.

1. Monitoring whether a winery keeps to the specific number of events allowed per year by having them call in when they are scheduled.
2. The current complaint-based process is proven to work and no change is needed.
3. Complaint-based process could be held as a personal attack.
4. Replace complaint driven with County inspection and monitor proactively and enforce. An enforcement fee could be charged to all permit holders.
5. Complaint driven system does not work and divides the neighborhood.
6. Complaint must be verified and substantiated.
7. Questions regarding whether there is enough staffing for enforcement.
8. Planners are not cops and there are questions of whether enforcement is feasible if there is expansion.
9. Enforcement is needed, especially for loud and unruly events.
10. 2-3 strikes should result in permit revocation for at least 1-3 years.
11. Wineries support productive monitoring and will help develop a constructive system.
12. Monitor the specific number of events allowable per year.
13. Wineries should submit schedule of events and random audits could be done (police, fire, etc.).
14. Measurements should be made of people attending and cars present.
15. Penalties and fines that are meaningful should be set in place for large companies; it must be large to be effective.
16. Anonymous reporting is unfair; a business cannot be built anonymously but an anonymous person can destroy it.
17. Regulation must be based on rational basis, not on existence of a winery building on a premise.
18. There should be no more anonymous complaints. Resolution cannot occur when there is no chance for dialogue.
19. Consider procedures for handling vexatious complainers (and proxies).
20. Complaint based enforcement is arbitrary and leads to uneven application of law.
21. Appoint a representative that actively monitors winery events.
22. There is concern that by the time someone complains, the noise of an event will be finished.
23. Devise a system to address serial complaints; charge fees for unfounded/frivolous complaints to serial complainers.
24. Enforcement is only focused on already permitted wineries, not neighborhoods who conduct business illegally.
25. Have the Department of Health do random inspections like they do for food events.
26. Special use permits can help regulate and support wineries without disrespecting neighbors.

27. All laws should be enforceable and enforced- if it cannot be enforced, do not permit it.
28. If a means to enforce is found, the penalty for violation must sting.
29. If anonymous reporting is allowed to continue, the reporting party should somehow be held responsible (perhaps financially) for wasted staff time if no violation is found as there should be some accountability.
30. Rather than increase regulations, violators should be punished.
31. Planners are not enforcement agents.
32. Enforcement is what should be concentrated on and focus on the problem areas.
33. Stay specific and do not generalize.
34. The complaint-based enforcement process should be used; otherwise it will be a slippery slope.

Others? – Comments on any other topic.

1. There is unequal treatment of agricultural properties regarding selling their products, e.g. farms cannot sell their plants or flowers.
2. Questions regarding special events on non-winery agricultural land.
3. Agricultural land, with or without wineries, should be treated the same. There should be reasonable regulation for legitimate County needs.
4. The County is arbitrary in enforcement and treatment of applicants.
5. Some winery owners do not reside on the property- they avoid the noise pollution and do not realize or care about the impacts on neighbors.
6. Wine industry is essential to economic sustainability of the community.
7. Vineyards are not landscaping, they are part of why people live there.
8. Agriculture equals jobs.
9. The rural roads are substandard and need upgrades.
10. The County is fishing for issues, and it is questioned as to why it is even doing this.
11. If wineries and vineyards go, houses will come.
12. Wineries preserve open land.
13. It is better to keep wine tasting rooms on vineyards rather than downtowns.
14. New rules should be applied to everybody.
15. Question regarding whether there is County money to upgrade the rural roads.
16. Neighborhood peace is already broken by foul mouth farmers.
17. The new ordinance should be stopped as it is too expensive during a time where there is not enough money.
18. Business growth should not be suppressed.
19. Tough permitting process is ruining character of the towns as it is all tasting rooms and no other businesses.
20. Clarification on the definition of a “small vineyard,” as well as criteria for private parties in small vineyards.
21. Vineyards are agriculture, where grapes are grown and turned into wine, the wine then needs to be sold. Vineyards are farming, not growing parks.
22. Economic impact of what the wine industry brings to the County should be remembered.

23. The growth of the wine industry in a fair and sustainable manner equals revenue which means the County will be better equipped to serve.
24. Agriculture is about commerce, no matter cattle ranching or winery.
25. If wineries go, no one will have jobs to build or buy homes in the Santa Ynez Valley.
26. Concern regarding the effect on property values of neighboring residences as owners will need to disclose noise, traffic, etc. when selling homes.
27. The Tier level permit presently travels with the property, application should be required each time a vineyard changes ownership.
28. Hotels should be included as stake holders.
29. The Special Events Ordinance as revised is a horrible burden to those wishing to have events.
30. Overnight stays, hotels, and Bread and Breakfasts should be allowed.
31. Permitting and regulation are already onerous.
32. Arbitrary treatment of applicants/applications for permits (wine operations, tasting rooms, events).
33. Increased role of public transportation in the wine world and private.
34. Lodging should be added to wineries.
35. 99% of agricultural production in Santa Barbara County is exported, 98% is imported, and only 1% of the County's agricultural products are consumed within the County.
36. Export sales help promote agri-tourism.
37. Vintners are stewards of the land.
38. The wine industry is important to local hotels.
39. Wine is agriculture and it is one of the few areas of business which actually can thrive while preserving and conserving the natural beauty of the area.
40. Agriculture is not tourism, as tourism is of the hospitality business. Agriculturally zoned lands must be preserved and not be turned into hospitality commercial venues.
41. There are questions regarding why neighbors are still fighting the County over winery issues when they have received over 300 signed petitions and hundreds more are in full agreement. The Neighbors are seeking a "No More Tasting Room Zone" east of Hwy 154.
42. Wine is the poetry of the earth.
43. It is a myth that wine jobs are minimum wage.
44. This is an expensive process, \$750,000 to \$1 million, and the Board of Supervisors should revisit this request and determine if there really is a problem. This issue is too expensive in a changing economy.

G:\GROUP\COMP\Ordinances\Winery Ordinance\Outreach\MeetingNotes\SummaryOfCommentsFromAug232012mtg.doc