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ABSTRACT

In the Temecula Valley, California, neoliberal development policies were implemented that had the potential to bring drastic changes to this semi-rural area, renowned for its wine production and idyllic setting as a wine tourism destination. In order to better understand the contested nature of these development plans, I conducted ethnographic and key informant interviews and public policy analysis research with policy-making officials, local residents and other stakeholding groups that formed in opposition to the planned expansion. This applied anthropology of policy was uniquely situated to explore the tensions between various stakeholders. This thesis serves to propose interventions that could have the intended impacts of the expansion plan, which included increasing tourism and bolstering the economy, while preserving the qualities that made the Temecula Valley marketable and consumable as a wine tourism destination. Bringing together diverse fields of study including economics, tourism and environmental anthropology, this thesis sheds light on policy making processes in the 21st century United States.
CHAPTER ONE:
AN INTRODUCTION TO WINE TOURISM POLITICS
AND NEOLIBERAL GOVERNANCE

I. Planning Development in Southern California’s Wine Country

At a Riverside County, California, Planning Commission hearing held on July 25th, 2012, in Temecula, California, a longtime resident made the following statement:

“I moved to Temecula to enjoy a rural lifestyle, and to a degree it’s degraded. But that comes with change and to date it has been reasonable. I have some concerns as this [development plan] moves forward. I understand the reason for it, to have consistent developmental standards so everybody knows what the rules are. One of the big issues where I live is noise. Noise is a really big issue. My wife and I were sitting out a few weeks ago enjoying the cool evening and I could hear four bands, some of which were over a mile away. It was like trying to listen to four radio stations at once. That becomes irritating. This issue degrades the lifestyle that I think we all moved out here for.”

This resident was speaking about his experience living in what is known as “wine country.” This semi-rural region in Riverside County’s Temecula Valley is home to thousands of residents, as well as approximately 40 wineries, numerous equestrian operations, and one church.

In 2008, the county of Riverside decided to embark on a massive expansion and development plan aimed at turning the Temecula Valley’s wine country into a world-class wine tourism destination. At the same Planning Commission meeting, in July of 2012, a local resident and member of Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship gave the following testimony against the Wine Country Community Plan, “I’m here because I do oppose the Wine Country [Community] Plan. I just have to wonder, are we a threat to the wineries? And if so, why? We’ve been a good
neighbor to the wineries. We’ve let them use our parking lots when they needed them for functions. It seems this [Plan] denies the people of this community the basic constitutional right of religious freedom.” Members of wine country’s only church, Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship, felt the existing and proposed continuation of the ban on houses of worship was unconstitutional and violated their right to religious freedom. Throughout the planning and policy making process, policy makers were forced to juggle the interests of countless stakeholders, each with their own vision for what the future of wine country should look like. While many individuals and groups were in support of the plan, there were those constituents who saw it as bringing unwanted urbanization to their rural way of life. After discussing numerous short-comings and problems with the plan a longtime resident stated, “I’ve come to the conclusion that common sense has become an endangered thought process, particularly in government circles where special interests seem to rule a lot of the decision making.” Throughout this thesis, I will discuss how this development began and took shape, the individuals and interests involved in crafting it, and how various stakeholders went about negotiating the policy making process. These are important questions for anthropological inquiry because their answers shed light on how critical decision making processes unfold. Whether looking at the local scale such as the Wine Country Community Plan, or the national and international levels of policy making, understanding what policies are, who has the power to create and enforce them, and how others go about contesting them is of interest to anthropologists.
Project Description

The current research project is centered on an anthropological exploration of economic development, neoliberal economics and public policy. For the purposes of this study, policy is understood as “a parameter-setting activity” (Cochrane 1980: 445). The Temecula Valley, California, is home to a wine production and tourism destination that is intensifying due in part to the efforts of a number of actors. Since 2008, Riverside County officials in southern California have been working hand-in-hand with local vintners, residents and other stakeholders to reach a consensus about the future of the Temecula Valley’s wine country. However, at this critical transition point there is debate as to the direction of development efforts. This study focuses on the creation of a commercial development and community expansion plan known as the Wine Country Community Plan (hereafter simply referred to as the “Plan”). This set of policy documents, which includes a general plan, community plan, zoning ordinance and a program environmental impact report (PEIR), is intended to turn the Temecula Valley into a world-class wine tourism destination. However, many groups and individuals are contesting it. The current study’s aim is to delineate the history and contents of the Wine Country Community Plan, outline its potential impacts, describe how impacted groups and individuals went about negotiating the policy making process, and link these local level processes to similar policy making processes that unfold at the national and international levels. This will be accomplished using anthropological methods and theory.

The Temecula Valley was chosen for this project for three main reasons. First, compared to other wine regions such as Napa, Temecula Valley was much more manageable in size, with roughly 40 wineries in various stages of production, and covering less than 6,000 acres. Second, the region’s recent commercial wine production history made it possible to interview some of the
very first winemakers in the region, giving this thesis a historical and unique perspective. Similarly, the fact that I was able to watch “history in the making” so to speak by attending meetings and interviewing policy makers while the Plan was being created and contested gave this project an in situ nature that was incredibly valuable. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this thesis represents part of a collaborative National Science Foundation funded research effort by Dr. Kevin Yelvington, Dr. Jason Simms, Elizabeth Murray, M.A., and myself.

**Research Questions**

The present study was motivated by several primary research questions. Early into my research I became fascinated with understanding the policy making process and discovering how people take an idea (in this case the idea that the Temecula Valley could become a world-class wine tourism destination) and turn that idea into a set of public policy documents that have the potential to bring about the desired changes. To that end, I asked the following research questions:

1) What is the history of the Wine Country Community Plan, and how did it come into existence?

2) How did residents of “wine country” feel about the Wine Country Community Plan?

3) How had stakeholders, individuals, and groups made their concerns known to policy makers? Which groups and individuals were the most and least successful at getting their concerns addressed in meaningful ways?

In addition to analyzing the formal stages of the public policy process, an exploration of how stakeholders negotiated the policy making process is critical. All too often major policy decisions are made without public input or involvement. This is not the case in the Temecula
Valley. There was a great deal of resistance to the Wine Country Community Plan from a number of actors, as well as vocal support from proponents. In addition to exploring what stakeholders said about the Plan, a key component of this analysis lies in determining how stakeholders were able to influence policy makers and encourage them to change their policies. As will become clear, the policy making process that unfolded in Riverside County, California, was not a neutral or value-free endeavor, but instead represented the will of a wealthy winery-owning capitalist class. In order to gain a deeper understanding of how these processes unfolded and why, background information on the setting and stakeholders is necessary.

II. Setting: The Temecula Valley

The Temecula Valley, California, sits in what is known as the Inland Empire. This industrial, agricultural, and residential region is home to many bedroom communities linked socially and economically to the metropolitan hubs San Diego and Los Angeles. The city of Temecula and the wine country, which lies just outside its limits in unincorporated Riverside County, is approximately 60 miles north of San Diego and 90 miles south of Los Angeles. This location puts Temecula within about a two-hour drive of approximately 25 million people. This is an ideal location for a wine tourism destination, making it much more accessible for a weekend or day trip than the world famous Napa and Sonoma regions of northern California.

Residents of Temecula talk about it as a rural paradise. Home to approximately 100,000 people (http://www.CityofTemecula.org) and some 40 wineries (http://www.Temeculawines.org) this small city is surrounded by rolling hills and semi-desert landscapes. Just outside city limits is the Temecula Valley’s wine country where bright green vineyards stretch into the distance (see Figure 1). This picturesque landscape at the confluence of natural beauty and culturally
constructed visual appeal attracts both tourists and residents alike. The Temecula Valley is also home to a thriving equestrian community and is world-renowned for horse breeding and training.

Figure 1: Vineyards in the Temecula Valley, CA. (Photo by author)

Site Description: Wine Country and Wine Tourism

Renowned for its idyllic setting, this wine tourism destination could soon see a massive state-led expansion. The Temecula Valley is often discussed in comparison to its northern neighbors Napa and Sonoma, California. However, proximity to urban centers is not the only difference distinguishing the Temecula Valley from its more famous northern counterparts. Many of my contacts informed me that Temecula has a reputation for being a more “social” wine country, perfect for birthday parties and rowdy bachelorettes (see Figure 2). This is in striking contrast to what many people described as the intimidating, more highbrow atmosphere cultivated in the Napa region. As I will demonstrate below, this has a lot to do with Temecula’s relatively lax zoning laws and enforcement regarding what can be done with the land in wine country. Restaurants, gift shops and “non-wine related ancillary operations” are, for the most
part, outlawed in the Napa region. However, in the Temecula Valley, these auxiliary operations are encouraged as a way to supplement what is sometimes limited wine-related income.

Tourists and residents alike are able to sample Temecula Valley wines, made with locally grown grapes and processed onsite in most cases. Leisure and trail rides are available for people interested in the equestrian sport, and many wineries host music and entertainment events. Weddings in wine country also are very popular. Visitors are able to host weddings amongst the vines, enjoy the rustic beauty of wine country, sample gourmet foods and wines, and spend the night in locally owned bed and breakfast inns. My interviews and fieldwork suggest that the vast majority of tourists travel to the Temecula Valley from Los Angeles or San Diego, making a day or weekend trip. In order to understand how the Temecula Valley’s wine country developed over the past decade and the potential impacts of the Wine Country Community Plan, I use a theoretical framework grounded in political economy, the anthropology of tourism, and based on recent research in the anthropology of policy.

Figure 2: Winery tour guide serving tourists (Photo by author)

III. Theory
Literature Review

This thesis is at the nexus of a number of areas of social science research. Specifically, this project is situated within the framework of the anthropology of policy, and it draws heavily on environmental anthropology and tourism studies. My work explores how various stakeholders tried, and often failed, to gain access to key policy makers and the policy making process in Riverside County, California. This research also contributes to tourism studies due to the nature of my field site. The anthropology of the environment, economic anthropology, and political economy also have been critical to the theoretical framework of this study, and bringing these topics into dialog is crucial for framing this issue in the proper context. It is important also to explore how notions of “community” and solidarity are or are not mobilized by residents and stakeholding groups as they attempt to negotiate the policy making process.

What is fundamentally at stake is the notion of development in the United States in the 21st century. While numerous scholars have explored the concept of “development” (Crewe and Harrison 2002; Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1994), my work fills an important gap in the anthropological literature. I cast a critical gaze toward development practices in the Western world and ask the question “Who has the power to make these policies, and who reaps the benefits?” Understanding the policy making process is the first step toward having an impact on it, and my research provides a vivid case study for grasping how public policies are made and contested in the contemporary United States. Policies shape people’s daily interactions and set parameters for individual and group actions.

The notion that expansion and development are positive and will lead to a stronger economy, and society is implicit and explicit in the Wine Country Community Plan. Indeed, this is a common trope in much development discourse (Escobar 1995). Development is seen as the
remedy to cure a stagnant economy and high unemployment. However, there is an acceptance that without protections and regulations this unique region could be threatened by over-development. There is a tension between “preserving vineyard lands” and “encouraging development” which are the two main objectives of the Plan, according to the Plan’s official website (http://www.socalwinecountryplan.org). The area’s natural/culturally constructed beauty and rural aesthetic are understood as important economic resources. According to Riverside County Assistant Executive Officer George Johnson, there is a palpable tension between the desire for development and the need to “keep the country in wine country.” However, many important issues are not adequately considered, such as the availability of suitable lands, the impact of this plan on the environment, residents’ quality of life and the farm labor population. These issues will all be addressed in this thesis.

Wedel et al.’s discussion of policy (2005) is valuable for an analysis of the Wine Country Community Plan. The authors point out that despite its frequency of use, there is little consensus on an authoritative definition of “policy.” It is argued that most citizens are unaware of who makes the policies that affect their lives. This resonates with Shore and Wright’s discussions of the policy making process (1997). Wedel et al.’s discussion of policy sheds a unique light on the question of who has the power to create policies and make critical policy decisions. As the authors state, “Policies are no longer formulated primarily by governments, but additionally by a plethora of supranational entities, businesses, NGOs, private actors or some combination of these” (Wedel et al. 2005: 39). This could be seen in the Temecula Valley, where the Wine Country Community Plan was crafted by a complex amalgamation of county officials, city planners, residents, winery owners, developers, and equestrians. However, while I find Wedel et al.’s approach useful and insightful, I also find it lacking in one dimension. The role of the state
and state actors is not adequately addressed. In some ways the state is rendered as a monolith, and the individuals who make it up are de-personalized to the point where it does not make sense to imagine them as having personal, ambivalent or contradicting interests. The nature of the state, its complexity and its fluidity are important aspects of the policy making process. Understanding how neoliberal economics (understood as a phase of capitalism) creates the conditions of possibility for something like the Wine Country Community Plan is crucial for this study. The role of the state in the process of fostering neoliberal economic models of development will be analyzed in this thesis.

Shore and Wright’s 1997 book Anthropology of Policy provides a vital theoretical foundation for framing this applied anthropology of policy. The authors state that, “A focus on policy provides a new avenue for studying the localization of global processes in the contemporary world” (Shore and Wright 1997: 13). My work stems from a concern the authors highlight, namely that “citizens are becoming alienated from an increasingly remote and commercialized policy-making process” (Shore and Wright 1997:1). However, my approach is distinct from other works in the anthropology of policy. Specifically, instead of focusing solely on the language of the policy document, or its impacts after implementation, I place my work firmly in situ and explore the policy making process as it unfolded on the ground in real time. I argue further that the policy in question (the Wine Country Community Plan) is not merely a “political technology” but a means for furthering about specifically neoliberal goals (Foucault 1977). Neoliberalism involves processes of deregulation and re-regulation, privatization and marketization, and the purported withdrawal of the state from areas of social provision (Harvey 2005).
One fascinating aspect of the Wine Country Community Plan is the way in which democracy and capitalism were explicitly linked and purportedly promoted through development. After an impassioned speech about the Plan, its architect and chief supporter, Riverside County Supervisor Jeff Stone stated, “Democracy and capitalism are alive and well in Riverside County” (Dillon-Sumner fieldnotes, recorded at South Coast Winery, 06/05/2013.) The democratic process, however, does not provide for equal representation for all stakeholders. Similarly, state-led neoliberal economic development plans should be understood as furthering the goals of a specific class (in this case a winery-owning capitalist class) over others. As anthropologists Okongwu and Mencher state, “It is important to recognize that ideology and public policy are critically linked” (2000: 101). The authors also support Shore and Wright’s delineation of policy as impacting human society both broadly at the national and international levels, and intimately at the local level (Okongwu and Mencher 2000: 101; Shore and Wright 1997).

Okongwu and Mencher provide an enlightening analysis of the role of policy in shaping agricultural and environmental realities (Okongwu and Mencher 2000). The authors stress the importance of not only studying policies and the policy making process, but also “working as advocates and with the people they have studied to put pressure on governments, international agencies, and multinational corporations to get them to change” (Okongwu and Mencher 2000:119). While I find this refreshing and inspiring from an applied anthropological perspective, I do not feel it goes far enough. I absolutely see the value in advocacy, but there is one piece missing. Top-down change is important and enviable, but change can also come from the bottom. My position is that all citizens should be made aware of how the policy making process unfolds and empowered to strive for meaningful changes.
As stated above, this thesis is not exclusively concerned with the anthropology of policy. It is also about broader social and environmental issues, all of which are intimately related to and affected by policies. Agriculture, including viticulture, is uniquely situated at the crossroads of what social scientists refer to as the nature/culture divide (Cronon 1996). Farming is a fundamentally cultural practice, but is also thoroughly entrenched within the natural environment. In the Temecula Valley, some stakeholders are advocating for policies similar to those enacted in the Napa Valley which established the country’s first agricultural preserve (similar in spirit to natural/ecological preserves including national parks). However, these policies are not widely embraced. This is due in part to the highly restrictive nature of pertinent zoning laws, which would essentially forbid high-density development within the preserve.

In agricultural practice there is no clear line demarcating where nature ends and culture begins, making the nature/culture dichotomy not only useless, but confining. This is especially true in viticulture, where grapes are often pruned and cared for entirely by hand. Massive machines do exist for harvesting grapes, however the hilly terrain of the Temecula Valley and the relatively small size of vineyards makes these machines largely impractical. The result is a shifting but steady supply of migrant farm laborers, organized and employed by a small number of wealthy capitalists. Asplen (2008) argues that by looking at policy practices related to agriculture and the environment we can see how humans and nature interact and shape each other. She sides with Casagrande et al. (2007) who see adaptive management strategies as a path to a more responsible policy making process (Casagrande et al. 2007). Adaptive management and experimentation include strategies aimed at making the policy making process more fluid, transformative and responsive to changing circumstances (Casagrande et al. 2007). Within this
paradigm human and environmental variables are understood as important and constantly shifting.

Zlopniski’s 2011 article “Water Flowing North of the Border” is an exceptional example of cultural anthropology applied to agricultural and natural resource issues. Zlopniski’s research site in Baja California is situated in the same geographic region as the Temecula Valley, making the issues addressed by the author especially enlightening. The author claims that the finite and precarious state of natural resources (such as water) is often obfuscated by policies that promote privatization and intensive use (Zlopniski 2011). Specifically, the author claims that neoliberal economic policies similar to the one being proposed in the Temecula Valley promote the overuse of water. This is a notion that Yelvington, Simms and Murray reiterate in their recent publications (Yelvington et al. 2012; Simms 2013). By focusing on the short-term economic benefits of the overuse of water for agriculture, policies encourage farmers to keep using more and more, despite mounting difficulties in procuring enough viable water. Interestingly, in December, 2012, the long-standing state subsidies for agricultural water expired in California, resulting in farmers being required to pay higher residential rates for their water. In Zlopniski’s site in Mexico, the privatization and over exploitation of water “has exacerbated social inequalities and consolidated structural violence against the poor” (Zlopniski 2011: 568). While most would agree that this is not yet the case in Temecula, the implementation of similar neoliberal policies suggests that situations in Baja California may foreshadow comparable consequences in the Temecula Valley.

In their comparative study of two wine producing regions in France, Lemaire and Kasserman (2012) address the nature/culture dichotomy and point out that “the finest wines in the world” are only possible given the fortuitous combination of natural resources and creative
genius. Great grapes are a prerequisite for making great wine, but grapes alone are not enough. It takes a great winemaker to bring out their natural potential. It must be noted that the tourism complex, including wine country, Old Town Temecula and the Pechanga Casino, is the engine of Temecula’s economy, bringing in some U.S. $625 million annually (Dean Runyan and Associates 2013). Wine tourism depends not only on the production of great wines, but equally important is the rural aesthetic that wine tourists expect. Through interviews with tourists, tourism officials, and winery owners I gleaned that it is Temecula’s semi-rural atmosphere and picturesque vineyards that are the main “hook” that brings tourists from the nearby urban centers.

It is at this point that the notion of neoliberalism as a political project comes into play. Bockman (2012) discusses the fact that neoliberal economic strategies for development constitute a specific and decisive conceptualization of the “market” and the “state.” The primacy of the market as the engine for progress goes unquestioned and the illusion of deregulation creates opportunities for businesses to expand to arenas that were previously closed to them (Brown and Getz 2007). Environmental and social concerns are downplayed in favor of a worldview in which enhanced economies benefit everyone, especially those who are the hardest workers. Inequalities in access to the policy making process further hinder the ability to contest these notions. This study seeks to build upon the existing literature on neoliberalism and the capitalist state by providing a case study in lived neoliberalism, or as some have refer to it, “actually existing neoliberalism” (Wacquant 2012, Goldstein 2012). However, my position is that neoliberal projects are not simply handed down from the state to imbue policies and a passively receptive populace, as is often portrayed. Instead, many of the individuals in my field site actively contested the neoliberal policies that were being proposed. A recognition of this
contestation as well as the impacts of such efforts on the outcome of the policy making process is vital to understanding how neoliberalism functions.

Finally, this study would not be complete without an examination of the literature on tourism. As Stronza (2001) discusses, “Despite its association with things shallow and frivolous, tourism is relevant to many theoretical and real-world issues in anthropology” and goes on to note that “tourism is often the catalyst of significant economic and social change” (277). Most tourism studies tend to focus on either the origins of tourism from the tourist’s perspective, or on the impacts of tourism from the local’s perspective (Stronza 2001:262). However, this study fills in a gap in the tourism literature because it focuses primarily on the policies that make tourism possible in the first place. Without protective zoning laws and ordinances it is very likely that housing developments could overtake vineyards and diminish the aesthetic and economic value of wineries in the Temecula Valley’s wine country.

This thesis research project is part of a larger, National Science Foundation funded project. It builds on and contributes to the ongoing work of Dr. Kevin Yelvington, the principal investigator for the overarching project. Yelvington et al.’s recent publication on the Temecula Valley wine tourism industry provides a theoretical and methodological foundation for this analysis. The authors’ use of ethnographic and historical data is compelling in framing this issue around policy, economics and development (Yelvington et al. 2012:51). The authors provided a holistic framework for this study, and include insights of critical importance to an understanding of wine country as an anthropological site, and the Plan as public policy.

As this overview reveals, this study is located at the confluence of many theoretical traditions. It is my aim that by exploring the links between policy, tourism, and neoliberal governance, this study will not only contribute to the literature of anthropology, but will act as a
case study for policy analysis. This research addresses a gap in environmental anthropology as well by shedding light on the complexities of the policy making process, and delineating some appropriate methods for citizens to successfully negotiate the policy making process and have their concerns vetted to those in positions of power.

This study aims to contribute to the anthropology of policy, as well as the anthropology of tourism, political economy and the environment. My work provides a case study on the policy making process in Riverside County. Through my archival and ethnographic work I document the history of the Wine Country Community Plan, delineate the contents and implications of the planned expansion and address how power, solidarity and discourse are mobilized by some to shape the outcomes of policy making process.

As an example of an applied anthropology of policy, an important component of this project is the applied intervention. I will share an executive summary of my thesis findings to be distributed to my informants and other community stakeholders. I aim to promote dialog among the various stakeholding groups about the Wine Country Community Plan and its possible future impacts.

More broadly, this study will benefit the discipline of anthropology by providing a uniquely applied perspective to policy analysis. By providing a case study for analysis, this project will serve as a model for future policy analysis. Anthropologists are beginning to see how important the policy making domain is in effecting society on a massive scale. Policy analysis is the first step toward engaging more meaningfully with this hugely important aspect of contemporary society. This study will bolster our theoretical understandings of how policies are created, contested, and implemented in the United States. I echo Nader’s (1969) plea for
anthropologists to cast our gaze upwards upon the people and processes that have so often been mystified from our view.

IV. Conclusion

The following chapters will address these issues in greater detail. In Chapter 2, I provide the historical background to this ethnographic study. I address the history of wine making, specifically in southern California. The rise of viticulture in the Temecula Valley and the key actors involved is of critical importance. I then go on to discuss the creation of the Wine Country Community Plan and its inherent tensions. This chapter ends with a discussion of codes and zoning laws in Riverside County as they impact development plans.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the methods used to gather data for this thesis. The methods used in this study represent an anthropologically based, systematic and robust format for data collection. In this chapter I discuss the uses of archival research, key informant interviews and participant observation in my field site. I conclude with a discussion of the challenges faced during this research project.

In Chapter 4, I explore the data and analysis of my work. I begin with a detailed analysis of the region’s economic and agricultural history. I move on to discuss the Plan’s history and development, providing a thorough timeline of events. Then I provide a discussion of the stakeholders involved in creating and contesting the Plan. This chapter ends with a section on revisions to the Plan and its eventual approval.

Chapter 5 concludes the thesis. In this chapter I provided a detailed discussion of the theoretical contributions this thesis makes to the anthropology of policy. I also provide an overview of my critiques of the Plan and potential issues. This chapter concludes with my
applied implications and a discussion of how this research contributes to the anthropological literature.
CHAPTER TWO:  
FROM RURAL WINE MAKING TO COMMERCIAL WINE TOURISM:  
SETTING AND SITE DESCRIPTION  

I. Viticulture and Wine Making in California: A Brief History  

Cultural History of Wine: Status and Satisfaction  

Throughout history, wine has been imbued with a social significance and cultural value unmatched by any other beverage (Campbell and Guibert 2007). Since the making of the first known wine it has been much more than the sum of its parts. As Michaliski (2013) states, “Wine is a social thing” (64). From the cultivation of grapes, through harvest, fermentation, and finally consumption, wine is “a vibrant cultural product” with a complex relationship to its producer and its consumer (Michaliski 2013: 64).

In the United States, wine is typically as a marker of high status. More than any other drink, wine is associated with class and privilege. There is dialogue, created partly by wine producers and distributors, about the prestige associated with drinking the right wine. Many individuals use wine as a social currency in an attempt to bolster their own status and upscale their lifestyle through its consumption (Jamerson 2010). However, as Jamerson aptly states, “Not all wines are equal, nor are all consumers” (iv). This is especially evident in my field site, Temecula Valley, California, where consumption and production are constantly being enacted in a complex relationship with the world-renowned wine regions of Napa and Sonoma. Temecula Valley wines are constantly being compared to Napa wines, and the wine tourists and consumers
who visit each destination are reified in entirely different ways. Through an examination of the ways wine is produced, consumed, talked about and understood this study sheds light on the epistemic horizons that made it possible for key policy makers and other stakeholders to imagine a future in which the Temecula Valley is “a world-class wine tourism destination” and to understand the steps they took to try to make that vision a reality.

The 18th Century to the Present in California

The rise of California wine making to the global fore was a long process that unfolded over more than two centuries (Geraci 2003: 192). California is the largest producer of wine in the United States (Geraci 2003; Yelvington et al. 2012 Pinney 1989, 2005) and Napa and Sonoma are California’s most popular and critically acclaimed production regions. California accounted for about 90 percent of the value of United States wine production in 2012, and that share is unlikely to diminish any time soon (Miller 2012). However, the road to international recognition had a long history.

Grape vines are native to California, but the indigenous varietals are not considered to be conducive to the production of palatable wines. In the 1700s missionaries imported the first non-native grape vines to California, presumably of Spanish origin (Rodriguez 2010: 55). These grapes produced wine for religious ceremonials, sacrament and personal use within missionaries. However, by the 1800s Spanish missions were producing wine for local consumption. After California’s annexation by the United States in 1850 the wine making experience of the eastern and western ends of the continent were united and the industry explored with promise. However, due to many factors, including prohibition, the Great Depression and World War II, the wine industry in California collapsed between 1918 and 1945 (Geraci 2003: 194; Rodriguez 2010;
Campbell and Guibert 2007). The wine industry’s former success crumbled, and it was not until the mid-20th century that the wine industry began to recover. “After the long forced hiatus of prohibition, Great Depression and World War II, the American wine industry underwent a renaissance financed by the entrepreneurial energy and capital of wealthy professionals” (Geraci 2003: 194-195). A seminal moment in California wine history occurred in 1976 (Taber 2005). In a blind tasting competition between French and California wines, two Napa wines were selected as superior. This was a crucial moment of self-realization for California wine makers, who had long been considered inferior to European wine makers (Geraci 2003: 202). It was after this victory in Paris that “world-class” became an attainable goal for California wineries. It takes great wine makers as well as great grapes to create “world-class” wines, and this event proven that California had both.

Consumption for Enjoyment

California wine making changed the world of wine consumption and production in one critical way. Prior to the Napa renaissance, wine was judged primarily based on the pedigree and prestige of the wine maker and the relative prestige of the region the grapes were grown in. Certain Chateaus and districts were considered to be inherently superior to others, and European wines, especially French wines, were thought of as inherently superior to United States wines. This relates to the notion of terrior, which can be loosely understood as a taste of place (Yelvington et al. 2012). With regards to terrior, Trubek notes, “In France, food and drink from a certain place are thought to possess unique tastes” and goes on to state that, “Terrior and gout de terrior are categories for framing and explaining people’s relationship to the land, be it
sensual, practical, or habitual. This connection is considered essential, as timeless as the earth itself” (Trubek 2008:18).

With the blind tastings and California’s victory in Paris, 1976, what was in the glass began to become more important than what was on the label. Chateaus and reputations became less important than personal taste. Drinking wine became more of a source of personal enjoyment, and at least for consumers if not for critics, an individual’s relationship to and enjoyment of the wine became more important than highbrow “deference to vaunted labels” (Michalski 2013: 64). However, tensions remained between consumers and critics who care about reputation and terrior, and consumers who simply want to “shut up and drink” for the pure enjoyment of wine tasting (Michalski 2013: 63).

II. Southern California Wine Making and the Temecula Valley

Colonial Roots

As mentioned above, European farming practices were introduced to California in the 1700s, and with that came grapes (Geraci 2003: 193). California produces a huge amount and variety of agricultural goods, earning it the nickname “Harvest Empire.” Indeed, the Temecula Valley is located in what is now known as the Inland Empire, a vast agricultural, industrial and residential region in southern California.

According to an official from the Temecula Valley Museum, in much of California, Spanish mission planted the first wine grapes in the Temecula Valley in 1798. Due to the area’s favorable climate, excellent soil and drainage those initial vineyards were successful. Vineyards continued to be operated by missionaries and Native Americans throughout the 1800s.
**California Wine Regions**

At the time of statehood in 1850, southern California led the nation in the growing of grapes and the production of wine (Geraci 2003: 197). The Los Angeles area in particular, which is 90 miles north of present day Temecula, was a center for viniculture. The first commercial vineyards were located in Los Angeles in the 1830s, and by the end of the decade were being constructed in the Cucamonga Valley. Many of Temecula’s pioneer viticulturalists came from the Cucamonga Valley. However, while southern California produced the most wine, its vines did not yield the highest quality grapes (Rodriguez 2010: 56).

In search of the best grapes, Agoston Haraszthy, known as the “father of the modern California wine industry” collected cutting of vines in Europe for experimentation in Sonoma county, located in northern California (Geraci 2003: 197). In the 1880s, thanks in large part to the establishment of a viticulture program at the University of California, Berkeley, the California wine industry found great success in Sonoma and Napa (Geraci 2003: 197; Campbell and Guibert 2007).

There are currently four wine regions in California: North Coast, Central Coast, South Coast and Central Valley. Within each of those regions are numerous American Viticultural Areas or AVAs. The North Coast is home to Napa and Sonoma, while the South Coast is home to the Temecula Valley.

**III. Temecula Valley Wine Country**

**The 1960s and the New Wine Industry**

While grapes were planted in the Temecula Valley centuries ago, the modern wine industry only took hold in the last 50 years. In 1964 the Kaiser Land Development Company
purchased a total of 97,500 acres in the Temecula Valley to create what was known as Rancho California. Soon after, Kaiser hired an agriculturalist and viticulture expert named Richard “Dick” Break to plant test crops in the area. He quickly determined the Temecula Valley was an ideal location for vineyards. Kaiser’s master plan for the area included a significant amount of land for agriculture.

In 1968, Audrey and Vincenzo Cilurzo planted the first family-owned commercial vineyards in the areas budding wine industry. A few years later, in 1974, Ely Callaway opened the first commercial winery. This opened the door the creation of what would become the Temecula Valley wine country. In 1984 the United States government established the Temecula Valley AVA (American Viticulture Area), including 33,000 acres, about 5,000 acres of which comprise the current boundaries of the Temecula Valley’s wine country (Yelvington et al. 2014). Throughout the 1970s and 1980s a few more wineries and vineyards were established and by 1999 there were fourteen wineries in various stages of development.

Temecula wineries are very small in comparison to those in Napa. Average production is between 5,000 and 10,000 cases of wine annually (Miller 2012: 30). One major difference between Temecula and Napa is that in Temecula 90-95 percent of the wines produced are sold on-site to visiting tourists (Miller 2012: 29). In Napa by comparison, a much larger percentage of wine is distributed, sold and consumed off-site.

The 2000s and the Business Boom

Since 2000, the wine industry in the Temecula Valley has grown tremendously. This dramatic increase in the number of wineries has occurred in sync with a population boom in the city of Temecula itself. From 2000 to 2010 the population of Temecula skyrocketed from 57,000
to over 100,000 and continues to grow. In that time, the number of wineries went from fourteen to over forty, with new wineries being established every year. The Wine Country Community Plan aimed to continue that trajectory. The Plan intended to foster growth and encourage as many as 95 wineries to be established by 2020 (http://www.socalwinecountry.com).

Not only has the number of wineries increased, but the business at those wineries has increased as well. Every wine maker and winery owner I interviewed spoke about increased business in the past several years, many of them seeing sustained business growth of 15 percent year after year. As the popularity of Temecula wine tourism grows, residents from San Diego to Los Angeles are venturing into wine country to enjoy its rural charm, breath-taking vineyard landscapes, and of course, taste wine (see Figure 3). As one San Diego resident and Temecula wine tourist was quoted, “We could have gotten a glass of wine in San Diego, but it’s not the same” (Downey 2014). Temecula’s rolling vineyard covered hills make it a beautiful destination, and as one wine tourist stated, “It’s very relaxing. Very inviting. Very romantic” (Downey 2014).

Figure 3: Wine tourist among the vines (Photo by author)
As Miller discusses, “The region of Temecula Valley, California, has seen the emergence of a small, dynamic wine region over the past several decades” developed through the combination of geography, soil and a market of some 25 million people within a two hour drive (Miller 2012: 28). The fortuitous combination of climate and soil in such close proximity to two metropolitan hubs makes Temecula a prime location for a wine tourism destination. However, as I will discuss below, the nature of the destination, the quality of its wine and the characteristics of its consumers are still in question. A pioneering winemaker was recently quoted as saying, “There’s nothing wrong with a good hotel out here. And there’s nothing wrong with an occasional wedding. But it can’t be the primary driver” (Downey 2014). While some growth may be inevitable, but there are questions about the direction and scale of development under the Wine Country Community Plan. Will Temecula become another Napa; a world-class wine producing region catering to serious wine tasting customers? Or will it become a “Disneyland in wine country;” a phony wine country serving mediocre wine to badly behaved bachelorettes? While the future is unknown, the present reality is that the Temecula Valley is closer to a playground for adults than a wine connoisseur’s paradise.

IV. Initiating the Wine Country Community Plan

Development and Housing

The Wine Country Community Plan has a complex history, one that will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four. However, it is useful to provide some of its background at this time. The Wine Country Community Plan’s major proponent and most vocal supporter, Riverside County Supervisor Jeff Stone, initiated the Plan in 2008. Supervisor Stone is a
pharmacist by training, and held several seats in public office, including on the Temecula city council. Supervisor Stone is vocally pro-business and ran as a Republican candidate.

After years of rapid development both in wine country and the city of Temecula, Supervisor Stone, in conjunction with winery owners, decided to initiate a new land use plan to promote wine tourism and discourage housing developments. Prior to 2008 the housing market was booming and according to winery owner and developer Bill Wilson, at the time, as now, the price of agricultural land was significantly cheaper than residential land (Dillon-Sumner interview with Bill Wilson at Wilson Creek Winery, 07/02/2013). As one winery owner told me, “There was a time when the number one crop being planted out here was clay rooftops.”

Winery owners feared housing developments would overrun the wineries and that the wine country would succumb to development pressures. This is obviously not a favorable situation for winery-owning capitalists who often have millions of dollars invested in their winery estates. Ensuring that wine country remained “authentic” and marketable as a wine tourism destination was the number one concern for the winery-owning class. Without proper protections and restrictions the wine country could become victim to suburban sprawl, with housing tracts choking out vineyards and wineries. The fact that a pro-business, anti-big government Republican Supervisor would promote a land use plan that uses the state to regulate and promote economic growth is further evidence of the neoliberal slant of the Wine Country Community Plan.

The equestrian community also had fears that as residential developments expanded their equestrian operations would become “incompatible” and that over time they would be forced out. It was these fears about residential over development and the winery-owning capitalist class’s
desire to preserve their investments that created the impetus for the Wine Country Community Plan.

Other factors leading to what is widely referred to as “Supervisor Stone’s vision” related to the long and arduous permitting process wineries had to go through before they could build and become operational. It could take up to three years and hundreds of thousands of dollars in “soft costs” before a developer could even break ground. “Soft costs” include things like application fees, plot plan fees, and associated costs required to secure building permits, etc. This lengthy process prohibited extremely rapid development, and after consultation with winery owners, Supervisor Stone determined the process needed to be streamlined in order to encourage the kind of development he envisioned. Additionally, one contact informed me that it was only after Supervisor Stone visited the wine regions of Napa and Sonoma in northern California that he envisioned turning the Temecula Valley into a similar, world-class wine tourism destination.

**Tourism and “A world-class destination”: In Napa’s Shadow**

Tourism is one of the main drivers of Temecula’s economic engine, and is an important aspect of Riverside County’s economy as a whole. Tourism in California is a multi-billion dollar a year industry and wine tourists in California alone spent $2.1billion dollars in 2010 according to the Wine Institute (Yelvington et al. 2012). The Temecula Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau has a budget of $1.4million, and the nearby Pechanga Casino spends nearly U.S. $20million per year promoting itself and the Temecula area (Dean Runyan Associates 2007:34). Wine tourism is just one part of the tourism complex in the Temecula Valley. In addition to wine country and the popular Pechanga Casino, Temecula is famous for its Old Town Temecula district, featuring rustic storefronts, exotic cuisine, bars and nightclubs. In total, tourists and
visitors spend about $625 million in the Temecula Valley every year (Dean Runyan Associates 2013).

Tourism contributes to the Temecula economy in a number of ways. There is direct spending related to tourism, such as money spent on hotels and winery tours, the money tourists spend in the tasting rooms and the restaurants both in wine country and in the city of Temecula. Additionally, due to a business improvement district that was set up by the Tourism Bureau, every room in local hotels is taxed an additional 2 percent, which is then used to further market and develop local tourism. Wine country sees over half a million tourists each year. But the money tourists spend does not stay where it was spent. Hotels pay their employees and staff members, who then spend money at local shops and restaurants. Restaurants and business buy products from each other to sell to tourists, and the revenue continues to circulate within the local economy and beyond.

As the Temecula Valley wine country has grown over the years, so has the number of tourists who visit it (Miller 2012). However, as the wine country matures a clear question has arisen for wine makers and winery owners. What kind of a wine tourism destination do they want to be? As Yelvington et al. state, “Critics say that Temecula Valley wineries will have to choose between being known for producing quality wines or being known as a party destination” (2012:51). Currently, Temecula wines are not generally considered to be high caliber. There is great variation between the best wines being produced and the worst. The Temecula Valley is home to one winery in particular, South Coast Winery, that has received exceptional awards, including three non-consecutive Golden Bear Awards, awarded to California’s best winery (see Figure 4). Several wineries regularly wine awards in competitions, but there is a general consensus that Temecula does not yet produce “world-class” wines.
Wine makers and others draw a sharp contrast between the Temecula Valley and Napa. The Temecula Valley has a reputation for being a “social wine country.” According to wine pourer and tasting room manager Lindy Finley, young urbanites flock to its wineries on the weekends to enjoy what one pourer described as “user friendly” wines. “User friendly” wines are easily drinkable varieties that offer new wine drinkers sweet, sometimes bubbly characteristics. These wines are typically ready to drink just a few months after bottling and do not tend to have complex flavor profiles or especially dry notes. Temecula wineries have a laid back, casual feel to them. Tourists are encouraged to select an average of five wines from tasting menus to suit their personal tastes. Some large wineries have as many as 30 wines to choose from, while smaller boutique wineries often have only six or seven.

While many wine pourers are exceptionally knowledgeable and eager to talk about their wines, most are more than happy to simply tell the tourists the name of the wine and give them three or four adjectives (e.g. “fruit-forward with plum”; “light and grassy”) and leave it at that. This is in stark relief compared to what many people describe as an intimidating tasting experience in Napa. In Napa you are more likely be told what you will be tasting instead of being asked what you would like, and there is a more educational slant to the tasting experience. The impetus comes from the pourer in Napa, compared to the tourist in Temecula. In Napa the pourers are more likely to try and teach a customer how to identify different qualities in the wine, while in Temecula the consumers are often asked whether or not they liked the wine.

Temecula tends to get young consumers as well as old. People are there for the enjoyment of wine and the rural aesthetic of the vineyards rather than to receive a wine tasting education. The Napa Valley AVA is much bigger than Temecula, in terms of the number of wineries, the volume they produce and acreage under cultivation. Napa also has an
internationally renowned reputation for producing high quality wine. Temecula on the other hand has a reputation for birthday parties, weddings and bachelorette parties. These differences are due in part to the different codes and zoning laws that have been enacted in Napa and Temecula, which will be discussed at length in Chapter Four.

![One of the Temecula Valley’s most popular wineries](image)

Figure 4: One of the Temecula Valley’s most popular wineries (Photo by author)

**Stakeholders and Contestations of Development**

The Wine Country Community Plan is intended to protect the wine tourism complex, bolster the local economy and increase tourism through zoning laws that encourage the planting of grapes and production of wine. It is also a stated goal that the Wine Country Community Plan preserves the rural nature of the wine country region, something residents and tourists alike place great value in.
However, there are many stakeholding groups with vested interests in the future of wine country, and they often do not see eye to eye. Chapter Four contains a detailed discussion of each stakeholding group, its interests, motives and role in the policy making process. At this time it is merely useful to state that many residents contest the county’s plan on the grounds that it will bring destructive over-development to the region. While some winery owners are supportive of the planned expansion of wine country, others feel it will result in a “phony wine country” that fails to produce high quality wines and lacks culturally constructed “authenticity”. The county fears that if nothing is done and no changes are made, everyone’s worst fears will come true. County officials fear that housing developments will over run the wineries and that the wine country will disappear, along with the tourists. Without tourism revenue jobs will disappear and unemployment will creep higher and higher. In Riverside County unemployment was 12.5 percent in December of 2011, compared with an average 8.3 percent in the United States during the same time period (State of California 2012). Only about 1,000 individuals were employed by businesses in wine country in 2012, so while the additional jobs the Plan could bring are needed, it is unlikely to have the impact that Supervisor Stone has suggested.

**Issues of Land and Water**

There are many logistical issues with the Wine Country Community Plan pertaining to the amount of water needed for growing, the amount of land available for cultivation, and the impacts of this development plan on the environment and the people who call this region home. The planned expansion increases the size of wine country from about 6,000 acres to approximately 18,000 and aims to increase the number of wineries from about 40 to 105
(socalwinecountry.com). However, there is uncertainty about the amount of water needed to sustain such development and the amount of land available.

It is significant that while the planned expansion adds some 12,000 acres to the wine country, there are doubts about whether or not there will be enough viable land for the planting of vineyards. Vineyards are only possible in the Temecula Valley because a unique micro-climate and much of the most suitable land is already under cultivation. Every farmer, wine maker and winery owner I spoke to stated unequivocally that the Temecula Valley cannot grow enough grapes to support 105 medium sized wineries (producing 5,000-10,000 cases a year). There simply is not enough suitable land to grow enough grapes to produce that volume of wine. If 105 wineries do become established, it could result in a grape shortage that would necessitate vintners looking outside the Temecula Valley appellation for grapes. Additionally, the land is split into three different “districts” resulting in approximately 9,700 acres for wineries, 5,000 acres for residential developments, and 3,200 acres for equestrian uses. However, all of these uses will be allowed in all three districts to varying degrees.

Additionally, the Wine Country Community Plan projects a 38 percent increase in the amount of water needed in the Temecula Valley, all of which is slated to come from imported sources. Since Temecula is located in an arid region of southern California it imports water from two major sources: the Colorado River and the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta (Simms 2013). Policy makers assume that when they need this additional water they will be able to get it. However, California’s allotment of water from the Colorado River is dropping as Arizona’s increasing population is using more and more of its adjudicated share (Simms 2013). The Colorado River is not a source of high quality water, and has serious issues with salinity and high levels of Total Dissolved Solids (TDS). The Sacramento San Joaquin Delta is also experiencing
great strain, infestations by invasive species like Quagga Mussels, and saltwater intrusion due to overuse (Simms 2013). This at a time when California is experiencing its worst drought in decades. In 2013 the State Water Project had to shut off delivery of water to southern California for the first time in its 54-year history.

While Temecula sits atop a massive aquifer, local officials have so far resisted increasing the amount of water drawn annually, instead advocating for increasing imported water. Agriculture as well as residential developments place tremendous pressure on already strained water sources in arid regions like Temecula and as Zlohniski notes, can lead to over exploitation and saltwater intrusion (Zlohniski 2011: 571). While grapes are by no means the most water intensive crop, increased vineyards will require increased water consumption.

V. Conclusion

The history of viticulture and viniculture in the Temecula Valley is much longer and more complex than I can delineate in this thesis (see Yelvington et al. 2012; Simms 2013). However, an understanding of how wine production and tourism arose in this region in southern California can lead to a deeper understanding of the implications of the Wine Country Community Plan in the future. Exploring the dynamics of the policy making process can allow anthropologists to see past the rhetoric attached to a particular development project, and understand how state motivations are co-opted by individual economic interests to shape the form and direction of development efforts for an entire region. While much pro-development discourse touts neoliberal economic expansion plans as leading to progress, a stronger economy and more democratic society, an anthropological policy analysis can shed light on who actually benefits, and at whose expense.
The next chapter will describe the methods used to collect and analyze data throughout this research project. I will explore how anthropological theory and methodologies were used to understand the unfolding of the policy making process. I will also discuss the challenges I faced while conducting fieldwork in Temecula, California.
CHAPTER THREE:
ANTHROPOLOGICAL METHODOLOGIES

I. Methods Overview

The methodology used throughout the course of this research project came from the “ethnographer’s toolkit” and represented an anthropologically robust and systematic format of data collection and analysis (Schensul and Lecompte 2013). Before entering the field I engaged in detailed documentary analysis and archival research. During my fieldwork I engaged in 1) archival research, 2) key informant interviews, and 3) participant-observation ethnography.

I also conducted preliminary research in the city of Temecula in January 2013 with Dr. Kevin Yelvington, Elizabeth Murray, MA, and Dr. Jason Simms. The research team conducted interviews with several key stakeholders to illuminate which issues on the ground were the most pressing, and to find out what the most important issues were the most important to stakeholders. Interviews were conducted with a variety of stakeholders including residents, winery owners, vineyard workers, winery employees, and engineers with the water authority and water management personnel. This thesis is part of a collaborative, National Science Foundation funded research project. The preliminary research I conducted in conjunction with the research team allowed me to learn from my colleagues, and provided me with excellent preparation for my solo fieldwork experience.
Archival research has been conducted since the fall of 2012. Documents regarding the Wine Country Community Plan were collected and analyzed. There were troves of online data that were freely available to the public due to the nature of this public policy. Therefore it was possible to determine approximately when discussions of this Plan began and who was involved. Below I will provide a detailed discussion of my methodologies, give examples of the kinds of data I collected, and discuss some of the methodological challenges I faced during this research.

II. Archival Research

Archival research was conducted from the fall of 2012 and continued throughout the duration of the project, until February, 2014. Due to the in situ nature of this project, new developments were occurring almost constantly. As of the writing of this thesis the Riverside County Board of Supervisors held a vote to approve the Wine Country Community Plan on March 11th, 2014. However, the plan had not yet been officially adopted and implemented.

Information about policy-making processes, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board was gathered and analyzed. This information was obtained online in the form of meeting minutes, agendas and video recorded meetings. All of this information was freely available to the public on official websites, however, information was frequently changed or removed. Additionally, information about the Wine Country Community Plan, its creation, augmentation and planned implementation was gathered, recorded and analyzed. This information came from the plan’s website, socalwinecountryplan.org, and was augmented by data gathered in key informant interviews. Information about three opposition groups, Protect Wine Country, Save Temecula
Wine Country, and Wine Country Freedom was collected and analyzed. Each of these groups had a website and at least one has a newsletter which served as data.

The most important findings from the archival research spoke to the nature of the policy making process and the key stakeholders involved. Through an in-depth examination of policy related documents it was possible to delineate a clear picture of the history of the Wine Country Community Plan and its trajectory as it went from an idea to the actual policy documents which could implement the planned changes. I was also able to access the actual policy documents, including General Plan Amendment 1077, zoning ordinance amendment No. 348.4729 and Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) No. 524.

General Plan Amendment 1077 was an amendment to the existing General Plan in the Southwest Policy Area of Riverside County, California (socalwinecoutryplan.org). It defined the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area and expanded it from around 7,000 acres to just over 18,000 acres. Ordinance 348.4729 was a zoning ordinance that defined what was allowed within the policy area. It contained definition for key terms (e.g. “cottage industry”; “production winery”) and set forth development standards (socalwinecoutryplan.org). PEIR 524 was a report prepared by an environmental assessment firm used to identify any environmentally or socially constrained issues/areas within the policy area (socalwinecoutryplan.org). Through a detailed analysis of these documents I gleaned invaluable information about the Wine Country Community Plan that I could not have gotten any other way.

III. Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews were a critically important part of this research project. Certain individuals in the community, including wine makers, pioneering viticulturists, resident group
leaders, and county officials had a greater depth of knowledge about significant issues than others (Schensul and LeCompte 2013: 39-44). During my fieldwork I conducted twelve formal interviews. I interviewed key policy making officials, including the director of the Transportation and Land Management Agency and the project director for the Wine Country Community Plan. From those interviews I gained a great deal of insight into how the policy making process works and what the county’s goals and perspectives were regarding the Plan. Each policy making official I contacted responded promptly and accepted my invitation to be interviewed. Often, policy making interviewees were happy to discuss the Plan and were proud of the changes they felt it represented.

I also conducted formal interviews with seven residents and resident representatives, each lasting an average of one hour, though several lasted much longer. The data collected during those interviews illuminated core resident/homeowner concerns pertaining to the Wine Country Community Plan, and development in general. I spoke with long terms residents as well as recent migrants to the Temecula Valley wine country in order to get a well-rounded understanding of residents’ concerns and their involvement in the policy making process.

It was incredibly important for me to interview winery owners and wine makers. I was able to interview several members of the winery industry, including two prominent winery owners in the Temecula Valley. I spoke with one man who owns one of the largest wineries in the Temecula Valley, Bill Wilson. I also interviewed smaller winery owners in order to get as many perspectives as possible. While most winery owners were eager to speak to me about their experiences and perspectives, there were some reservations and questions about the project I was undertaking. I was able to allay those concerns by being open, honest and forthright about my work and my interests.
Additionally, I interviewed a code enforcement officer, a tourism representative, and a local historian. I also conducted numerous informal interviews with wine tourists, tasting room staff, wine pourers, residents as well as pioneering vineyard and winery owners in the Temecula Valley. Additionally, I interviewed members of the equestrian community about their involvement with the Wine Country Community Plan and the place of “horse country” and the equestrian lifestyle within wine country. Individuals were selected through snowball sampling and personal referrals. Initial contact was made through email using IRB approved materials and informed consent was gained before interviews were conducted.

These interviews were recorded with the permission of my informants, and were transcribed in full, coded and analyzed. The resulting 200 pages of transcripts provided an invaluable resource on countless topics pertaining to the Wine Country Community Plan and life in the Temecula Valley. These data will be discussed at length in Chapter Four.

IV. Participant Observation

Participant observation took place in Temecula, California, throughout the course of my fieldwork. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the situation on the ground I engaged in participant observation and made detailed recordings of my findings in several ways. I participated as a wine tourist, attended local meetings, and engaged with tourists, residents and policy makers in a variety of contexts.

Fieldnotes were taken throughout participant observation and were typed and formatted regularly. I kept 1) an activities log of planned and executed activities, 2) a field book for “jottings” in the field 3) a field diary 4) a collection of formal, typed fieldnotes and 5) field reports. The activities log was very useful, as it provided with a calendar for my day-to-day
activities, as well as a system for ensuring my research stayed on track. I was able to easily track
my progress and constantly referred back to my research questions to ensure the data I was
collecting was appropriate.

As an ethnographer in the field it was critically important for me to have a small field
book on hand at all times. In the course of fieldwork unexpected, unplanned conversations and
informal interviews arose frequently. It was important for me to always be prepared to take full
advantage of those opportunities. A small field book allowed me to take notes somewhat
inconspicuously. I was always clear about the research I was conducting, and in many cases I
was able to get important information and record it accurately without having to conduct a
formal, tape-recorded interview. A field diary was also kept throughout the course of fieldwork.

Formal fieldnotes were typed and formatted regularly and provide an important record of
my findings. My fieldnotes contain information on the city of Temecula, its history and the wine
country. There is also detailed information about the various wineries in the Temecula Valley as
well as notes my participant observation as a wine tourist. In addition, I recorded information
about the policy making process in Riverside county. Finally, there is information about the
various resident groups and opposition groups and the standpoint of these groups in relation to
the Wine Country Community Plan.

During my fieldwork I volunteered at the biggest tourist and wine related event that
Temecula hosts, The Balloon and Wine Festival, held annually in the Temecula Valley. I
volunteered as a wine pourer, interacted with consumers and tourists, and got a first-hand look at
how the event was operated and promoted. This allowed me to see things from an insider’s
perspective. I also went on several winery tours at numerous wineries in the Temecula Valley.
This allowed me to get first-hand experience with other wine tourists, participate as a tourist and learn about the wine making process.

I recorded detailed information about the Riverside County Planning Commission and their public hearings with regards to the Wine Country Community Plan. During these public hearings the issue of churches and schools in wine country became a hot topic. As will be discussed at length in the next chapter, due to zoning laws there was only one church allowed in wine country. However, that church, Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship, wanted to change existing zoning laws to allow for more churches, and to expand and build a school and amphitheater. I attended two services at the Cavalry Chapel Bible Fellowship and attempted to contact their leadership or representatives through email and phone calls, but was never able to make contact or speak with anyone.

During my fieldwork I attended an Economic Development Forum as a personal guest of Supervisor Jeff Stone. During the forum Supervisor Stone gave a speech about the county’s development and its plans for the future, including the Wine Country Community Plan. This event proved to be very important as it allowed me to interact with policy makers. I was able to network and set up interviews with two policy makers as a result. Finally, I attended an event called “Temecula Wine History” during my fieldwork. This event was hosted at the Temecula Public Library and a member of the Temecula Museum, who is a local historian, conducted the presentation.

All of these data were recorded in detailed fieldnotes and a field journal. A set of formal notes was kept throughout the fieldwork process. Field reports were also generated weekly, and every month a detailed report was written and sent to the principal investigator, Dr. Kevin
Yelvington. Participant observation took place throughout fieldwork, but primarily served to provide general information and data for this project (Schensul and LeCompte 2013: 83-89).

V. Challenges

There were numerous methodological challenges I faced during the course of this fieldwork. The most important to note has to do with what Laura Nader refers to as “studying up” (Nader 1972). Nader encouraged “studying major institutions and organizations that affect everyday lives” as a way to balance out anthropology’s long standing focus on the most powerless members of societies (Nader 1972: 286). However, gaining access to these grand institutions and the people who make them up is not an easy task. As I learned first-hand, many barriers exist blocking not only the anthropologist and researcher, but also every day citizens. As Nader discusses, relatively few people can act as informants from within these organizations (1972). Additionally, some of these agencies do not permit open access and their organization and their structure can be deeply mystified. This holds true for the policy making process at virtually every scale. The higher scale you are studying, the more mystified and opaque things become. At the local/city level things were clearer than at the county or state level.

I was very fortunate in that my research dealt with a public policy, which demanded open public access, public participation, and relatively easy access to people in key policy making position. The county staff members I contacted were all very receptive to the research I was undertaking. Once I explained my research and my interest in interviewing them, everyone in the policy making arena I requested an interview from was willing to meet with me and allow me to record our conversation. However, this is not always the case, and for numerous reasons, including the on-going nature of the overall research project, my task was made easier.
Another challenge during any anthropological research project, or indeed any research involving human informants, is the issue of dishonest or misinformed contacts. This is something that anthropologists are not alone in encountering in the field. During my fieldwork I had many informants and contacts who had varying degrees of knowledge and involvement in the policy making process. Several of my interviews were simply about peoples’ attitudes towards the planned expansion and their experiences navigating the policy making process. In those interviews, it did not matter if someone misspoke about an aspect of the plan or stated an incorrect date or figure.

However, I also had meetings with planning officials and county staff members whose job it was to know the details of the planned expansion. During one interview in particular, my contact repeatedly gave me incorrect numbers, dates and figures regarding the contents of the Wine Country Community Plan. I was only aware of these discrepancies due to my in-depth archival research, from which I had gleaned many of the details of the plan. Since I was aware of the correct data, this official’s inaccurate information did not become an issue. During the interviews I tactfully tried to correct my informant, but felt that maintaining a good relationship was more important than correcting his errors. However, if the planning documents were not available to the public, or I had not been able to access them, it would have been very problematic for me to be given incorrect information by someone who was charged with being informed about such matters.

The final methodological challenge I will address has to do with my attempts to contact Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship. I was seeking their perspective since I want to ensure a robust and systematic analysis, and the church had become an important force late in the policy making process, to the point of putting the entire Plan in question. However, I was not able to gain access
to this group in any way. I emailed, called, attended services, and contacted their lawyers, but to no avail.

VI. Conclusion

An important factor to consider in any applied anthropological work is the role of the researcher and the research subjects. While the research should be an “expert” in many ways, we must also understand that our research participants are experts in other ways. Balancing research objectives and weighing them against the goals of community members can be a daunting task in any social science research. The following sentiment resonates with my research experience: “Sometimes the role of a scholar is not to answer questions but to ask them” (Unterberger 2009: 10). As an ethnographer one of my main roles was simply to ask my contacts questions and then let them speak. At times my informants would tell me things I knew to be untrue, but even in those moments I was learning from them. My primary role was as a researcher and mediator (Everett 2011: 10). It was only through my archival research that I knew when people were inventing their own versions of history, and by carefully navigating those situations I was able to preserve the integrity of my work as well as my relationship with my informants.

The methodology used for data collection and analysis in this study represents traditional anthropological methods. There is a concerted focus on understanding the situation from the local’s perspective. There is also awareness that different stakeholders often have vastly different perspectives and viewpoints. Understanding how individuals and groups relate to each other and the policy making process in general is pivotal to this study. By using archival research, key informant interviews and participant observation I was able to gather a wealth of data about the Wine Country Community Plan and key stakeholders.
CHAPTER FOUR:
“YOU CAN’T FAKE IT”: AUTHENTICITY, CONFLICT, AND DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA’S WINE COUNTRY

I. Introduction to Data and Analysis

Using the methods described above I was able to collect a great deal of data during my fieldwork. In addition to numerous public policy related documents I was able to gather using archival research, I also recorded, transcribed and coded over 200 pages of key informant interviews and took extensive fieldnotes. In order to make sense of this massive amount of qualitative data I applied my theoretical framework in a systematic format. My theoretical framework centers on the notion that citizens are not well informed about the workings of the policy making process and are often incapable of impacting policy formation for a variety of reasons. I claim that those who will be most directly impacted will be the most involved, but that without social solidarity little will be accomplished. Policy making in its current form is a manifestation of the neoliberal state and works to further specifically neoliberal capitalist goals and will benefit those in positions of power. I also feel the concept of “stakeholders” serves to create conflict and false divisions among people who all want basically the same thing.

In order to elucidate my findings, I will begin with a history of planning and development in the Temecula Valley, moving from the Kaiser master plan of the 1960s up to the present Wine
Country Community Plan of 2013. I will provide a detailed discussion of the Plan including its creation, components and contestations.

I will also address various stakeholders and stakeholding groups I encountered during my field research. While I have mentioned these stakeholders previously it is vital to get a clear understanding of who is involved in this process and what their divergent interests are. During this discussion I will draw out the complexities of using “stakeholders” as units of analysis and difficulties of delineating who exactly belongs to the groups in question. While many things distinguished the members of stakeholding groups, there was one constant. Everyone agreed that to be successful as a wine tourism destination, the Temecula Valley needed to produce the highest quality wine possible. As the quote at the beginning of this chapter indicates, you cannot fake quality or authenticity.

II. The Wine Country Community Plan

History of Planning in the Temecula Valley

The Temecula Valley was occupied intermittently long before California gained statehood, first by Native Americans, then by Spanish missions. However, our discussion of planning and development begins in 1964 when the Kaiser Land Development Company (Kaiser) purchased a total of 97,500 acres in what would become Rancho California (Simms 2013). Kaiser quickly began plans to develop this land for residential, agricultural and industrial uses. According to Simms (2013) a master plan for the community was created in an effort to attract industry, as well as residents to what was a very rural region at that time. Advertising efforts were launched, such as an ad in the Wall Street Journal titled “Rancho California: A Nice Place to Take Your Vocation.” These efforts proved to be successful and the population of the
Temecula Valley began to grow. In the early 1980s, the I-15 freeway was constructed adjacent to the city of Temecula (incorporated in 1989) and the area boomed as residential developments sprung up to house southern California’s growing suburbanized population (Yelvington et al. 2014, in press).

Kaiser saw the viticultural potential of the area early on, and hired Richard “Dick” Break, a farm manager with extensive experience growing grapes, to plant test plots in vines, as well as a variety of other crops. It quickly became clear that grapes and citrus were ideally suited for the Temecula Valley’s micro-climate and soil (Simms 2013).

In 2003 the County of Riverside created the Southwest Policy Area (SWAP), an area totaling 182,854 acres including the Temecula Valley’s wine country (http://www.rctlma.org). Under its land use designations, the SWAP identified rural, agricultural, and community development guidelines, setting aside the majority of this land for rural residential purposes (http://www.rctlma.org). With regards to the Temecula Valley’s wine country, the SWAP had this to say:

“The wine producing area of Temecula Valley is located east of the City of Temecula, extending westward along Rancho California Road. This area features beautiful vineyards and gracious wineries scattered among rolling hills and spreading oaks. The wineries, which offer tours and wine tasting, are an attraction for tourists as well as an economic powerhouse for western Riverside County. This rural area also includes citrus groves and a scattering of residential and equestrian estates.”

Wine country was understood as an important economic engine for Riverside County. However, this plan and policy area built upon the already established Citrus/Vineyard area (C/V).

The C/V zone was created in 1994 and applied to lands located east of the city of Temecula in area that “has been established as a distinct area to ensure the continuation of the rural lifestyle and wine production in southwestern Riverside County” (http://www.rctlma.org).
Its purpose was to encourage the development of a winery region that would provide revenue to the county. The policy goes on to explain, “The Citrus/Vineyard policies also protect against the location of uses incompatible with agricultural uses and which could lead to conflicts with adjacent uses.” The SWAP was intended to promote the C/V zone and among other things, reinforce wine country’s unique, rural, agricultural character.

Prior to the national housing crisis of 2008, and the international economic downturn that followed (see Reich 2010) the housing market in Riverside County was experiencing a boom. Supervisor Stone, along with the winery-owning capitalist class, saw housing developments and vast residential tracts as threats to wine country. There was a desire to maintain a rural ambiance in wine country that many stakeholders felt was incompatible with residential developments. This rural ambiance was considered vital to the success and marketability of wine country. To be seen as an authentic wine production and tourism region, the Temecula Valley had to conform to normative expectations about the look and feel of “wine country.” As winery owner Bill Wilson was recently quoted as saying, “It has to be authentic. You can’t fake it” (Downey 2014).

This fear of residential developments, mainly held by winery-owners, created the impetus for what would become the Wine Country Community Plan. The following timeline demonstrates the policy making process. Further below, I will discuss how this process worked to unite some stakeholders, and how various groups and individuals went about negotiating the process.

**Timeline**

In 2008 Supervisor Stone shared his “vision” for the potential of wine country with the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association. As part of this vision, Supervisor Stone attested that
he saw the Temecula Valley’s wine country swelling to contain over 120 wineries and expanding to encompass almost 19,000 acres of land. After Stone unveiled this vision, the Board of Supervisors then directed county staff to begin crafting the Plan. In 2009 funding for the creation of the Plan was identified. Winegrowers pledged $100,000 to fund a feasibility study, and the county pledged an additional $50,000 (Rowe 2009). As Yelvington et al. (2014) discuss, by 2010 developer fees, diverted county funds and private sector contributions had netted $500,000 to pay for an environmental study, traffic study and other planning costs. The single greatest cost associated with the Plan was a $229,346 contract awarded by the Board of Supervisors to RBF Consulting, a Temecula-based environmental firm, to conduct the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (Downey 2011).

In July of 2009, the Wine Country Community Plan Ad Hoc Advisory Committee (Ad Hoc) was created to provide recommendations to the county. Supervisor Stone selected its initial members, all four of whom were major developers and winery owners who were tasked to work in concert with county staff. Winery owner and then president of the Winegrowers Association, Bill Wilson, was selected to chair the Ad Hoc committee (Dillon-Sumner interview with Bill Wilson at Wilson Creek Winery, 07/02/2013).

In September 2009, town hall meetings regarding the Wine Country Community Plan began. After learning about the Plan the equestrian community formed its own advisory committee, members of which were subsequently added to the existing Ad Hoc committee in December 2009. In January 2010, the Ad Hoc committee begins holding monthly meetings that were open to the public.

In July 2010, residential representatives were added to the Ad Hoc committee. This came after residents claimed they were being blocked from providing their input on the proposed
changes. The two people originally selected by Supervisor Stone’s staff to represent homeowners caused a stir after it was revealed they actually had vested financial interests in the wineries. Three more people were selected as homeowner representatives to correct this setback.

Throughout 2010, the county hosted public hearings, town hall meetings and outreach events in Riverside and Temecula regarding the Wine Country Community Plan. In January 2011 the county initiated the process of retaining an environmental consultant to assist with the preparation of the Program level Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).

The Ad Hoc advisory committee, eventually swelling to nineteen members from the original four, drafted its recommendations in a consensus paper in September 2011. While the Ad Hoc committee was in session it dealt with countless issues, including noise and traffic to grape cultivation and wine production. Questions about the incorporation of equestrian activities into wine tourism, residential concerns about over development, and environmental issues were all brought up. Twenty-five issues were addressed in the committee’s consensus paper, of which eleven were recommended unanimously. The first issue discussed related to expanding wine country beyond its existing boundaries. The Ad Hoc’s nineteen members supported this issue unanimously. It was also recommended that existing uses not conforming to the Plan’s standards be allowed to continue existing using their current zoning, which was also supported by the committee. However, not all issues were widely supported. For example, the question of whether or not to allow golf courses, something that developers had pushed for, caused disagreement. As the consensus paper states, “General support from the committee; however, a couple residential representatives were concerned about water usage of this use.” (socalwinecountryplan.org). As this brief discussion shows, while most people supported the idea of a development and
expansion plan, when the details began to emerge conflicts quickly arose between those seeking commercial development and those desiring to maintain the region’s rural character.

In 2012 the Transportation and Land Management Agency (the department in charge of the planning department) created the three main components of the Plan from recommendations generated by the Ad Hoc committee. 1) General plan amendment GPA No. 1077, 2) Zoning ordinance amendment No. 348.4729 and 3) the Program EIR No. 524. The nature and content of these documents will be discussed further below.

During 2012 the Riverside County Planning Commission held a series of public hearings regarding the Wine Country Community Plan. At these hearings an issue arose that had not been considered by the Ad Hoc committee: that of allowing churches and schools in wine country. This issue had not been addressed because, as numerous committee members told me, these uses were simply not allowed under the C/V zone. They represented uses incompatible with an agricultural zone, and as such were not considered appropriate for a plan claiming to preserve the agricultural nature of the region (Dillon-Sumner interview with Cathy Ashford (pseudonym), at the Temecula Valley Convention and Visitors’ Bureau, 06/27/2013).

However, as will be discussed below, members of wine country’s only church, Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship, felt the existing ban on schools and houses of worship was unconstitutional and violated their right to religious freedom. This church was established in 1999, and immediately after the county instituted a ban on houses of worship in the C/V zone. This zone accounted for less than 1 percent of the land in Riverside County. Calvary Chapel was seeking approval to expand its facilities and construct a private school, and current zoning laws disallowed them from doing so. By the end of the Planning Commission hearing series,
thousands of letters in support of churches in wine country were sent to the Planning Department, along with thousands against changing the rules to allow more churches.

On December 19th, 2012 the Planning Commission reached a consensus. After several months and numerous hearings, the Planning Commission recommended expanding wine country to include almost 19,000 acres, increasing the minimum plot size for winery facilities, and creating a “doughnut hole” to spot zone Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship out of the Plan and allow it to seek approval to expand and build a school on its own.

The Planning Commission submitted its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors held its first public hearing on the plan in September of 2013. On December 3rd, 2013, the Board of Supervisors tentatively passed the Wine Country Community Plan. Issues with the Plan, contestations and revisions by policy makers will be discussed below.

Contents of the Wine Country Community Plan


GPA 1077 is an amendment to the existing General Plan in the Southwest Policy Area of Riverside County, California. Proposed Southwest Area Plan GPA No. 1077 defines the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area. It expands the wine country from about 7,000 acres to 18,990 acres. It defines the districts within the policy area (winery, residential and equestrian districts). It also eliminates the former Citrus/Vineyard and Valle de los Caballos policy areas. In
addition, GPA 1077 contains language about requiring wineries to plant 75 percent of their land in grape vines, as well as using 75 percent locally-grown grapes in their wine.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 348.4729 is a zoning ordinance that defines what is allowed within the policy area. It contains an explanation of the intent of the plan as well as definitions of key terms (e.g. winery, special occasion facility, cottage industry, etc.). For example, an “incidental commercial use” is defined as “A commercial use that is directly related and secondary to the principal agricultural or equestrian use located on the same parcel or project site” (socalwinecountryplan.org). This includes things like tasting rooms for wineries. This zoning ordinance also lists the authorized uses, conditionally permitted uses with a plot plan, conditionally permitted uses with a conditional use permit for each of the three districts in the winery zone. For example, a single family dwelling was an “allowed use” in the Winery Zone, but a hotel and resort would require conditional use permits, in conjunction with a winery, an established vineyard on site and a minimum parcel size of 40 acres (socalwinecountryplan.org). Finally, this document laid out development standards for developers to follow, including design motifs and signage.

Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) No. 524 identifies any environmentally and socially constrained areas and issues within the policy area. The PEIR contains a summary of the environmental analysis and mitigation measures. It also contains a discussion of several elements analyzed by the PEIR firm including air and water quality, sound and noise issues, and much more. All sensitive issues identified by the PEIR were matched with mitigation measures deemed appropriate by the PEIR firm. For example, the PEIR found that noise pollution was a potentially problematic issue. In order to mitigate this problem the PEIR found it suitable to “restrict” wineries from playing amplified music outdoors between the hours of 10pm and 8am.
That effectively means wineries are allowed to play amplified music between 8am and 10pm seven days a week, something residents feel completely violates their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their property.

III. Stakeholders

There are numerous groups of stakeholders and impacted individuals at my field site. It is important to note that even if I refer to a group of individuals (e.g. “residents”) I am not making the assumption that these are bounded groups or that all members of that group have the exact same perspectives and interests. Indeed all groups of individuals are just that: groups of individuals with their own life experiences, perspectives on the political and policy making process and their own complex and often ambivalent interests. If the concept of “stakeholders” is so restricting and inaccurate, one might ask why it has become so prolific. I am critical of the notion of bounded, monolithic groups of “stakeholders” for one main reason. It was the state that created these categories, each with distinct criteria for appropriately interacting with the policy making process. The idea of stakeholders flattens social hierarchies and simplifies things for the state. While these identities did exist before the Plan, the state provided the definition for each category and compelled citizens to enter into dialog as members of only one group, despite the fact that this did not represent people’s realities on the ground. Categories such as “resident” and “equestrian” became the classifications under which the individual stakeholders could interact with the state. People’s ability to speak about the Plan and make claims was impacted by the category to which they were circumscribed. This had the effect of rendering many individuals silent because they were not able to speak as a member of an identified stakeholding group. It
also ensured that people would approach policy makers on pre-determined terms and limited the kinds of claims people were able to articulate.

However, keeping that in mind, it is still useful to discuss them as stakeholding groups, because individuals within a certain group are likely to be similarly impacted by the proposed policy. Residents will likely be impacted in a similar way by increased tourism and an expanded wine country, just like equestrians will be similarly impacted by county’s decision regarding their land use and zoning. However, as mentioned, these are not monolithic groups and many individuals were members of more than one group, such as residents who owned wineries. There was also a great degree of personal variation, and political power was by no means equitably distributed among all groups and individuals.

My archival data and key informant interviews suggest that the process of policy-making was anything but neutral and value free. In my study site certain groups and individuals were very successful at getting their concerns vetted to people in positions of power and having their ideas incorporated into the policy plan. Other peoples’ efforts to participate in the process were frustrated in a myriad of ways.

The plan went before the Board of Supervisors on March 11, 2014, and was passed unanimously after hours of public comment. Below I will outline the various stakeholding groups and explain their role within the policy making process. As will become clear, not every person or group had an equal voice when it came to making key policy decisions about the future of wine country. The debate that emerged through public discourse centered around the tension between expanding wine country and fostering commercial development on the one hand, and preserving a rural aesthetic and residents’ quality of life on the other hand.
The County

As a group, city and county officials were perhaps the most visible and most readily linked to the policy making process of all my stakeholders. By “the county” I am referring to people who had been elected or appointed to serve in professional roles within the policy making process. This includes the Riverside Board of Supervisors, the County Executive Officer, members of the Planning Commission and Transportation and Land Management Agency staff members as well as code enforcement officers. For the purposes of this project I conducted key informant interviews with the Assistant County Executive Officer, the head of the Transportation and Land Management Agency (who was also the project manager for the Wine Country Community Plan) and the code enforcement officer responsible for the wine country region.

These individuals occupy a unique position with regards to the policy making process. Many of them, such as the County Supervisors and Planning Commissioners, were in positions of considerable power. However, as I will demonstrate below, my field work echoes Wedel et al.’s (2005) discussion of the policy making process. While there were individuals in positions of power who were officially responsible for the creation of public policies, this process was very complex and iterative. The policy in question was crafted over the course of five years and it had dozens of co-authors. Furthermore, according to Assistant Riverside County Executive Officer George Johnson, the creation of a land use document such as the Wine Country Community Plan is invariably going to draw disputes due to the fact that “People very protective of their rights and uses as a land owner” (Dillon.Sumner interview with George Johnson in Riverside, California, 06/13/2013).

The main roles of the county in this process can be understood as threefold: 1) development, research and creation of official policy documents 2) outreach to inform the
community and seek input, and 3) facilitation and mediation between conflicting interests. The first two were more official roles and the last was a less official role.

These policy makers acted as representatives for the state. Their power was derived from their position in the policy making process. To understand their motivations, we must explore the motivations of the neoliberal state. The policy making process represents what Foucault called a “political ritual” (Foucault 1977). Political rituals are “ceremonies by which power is manifested” and the policy making process certainly represents such an event (Foucault 1977:47). Policy makers were motivated by a distinctly neoliberal understanding of economies and social development (see Harvey 2005). Within this market-based logic, desire to expand business and industry does not simply translate into a stronger economy, but is implicitly understood as part of capitalism and democracy, which become conflated despite their incompatibility. As this study shows, capitalism does not foster an equitable democratic process. Instead, certain stakeholders (in this case a wealthy, winery-owing class) are privileged, their needs taken more seriously, their wishes and perspectives forming the foundation on which all other stakeholders must grapple to make legitimate claims.

In 2008 Riverside County Supervisor Jeff Stone met with the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association to discuss his “vision” for the future of wine country. During that meeting Supervisor Stone, a Supervisor representing the Third District, which included the Temecula area, spoke to vintners and winery owners about the potential for the Temecula Valley to become a world-class wine tourism destination, one to rival Napa and Sonoma. To this end Supervisor Stone initiated what would become the Wine Country Community Plan: a community plan, general plan amendment and environmental impact report and related policy documents which govern what are allowable uses of the land in wine country. The goals of the plan were to
more than double the number of wineries, encourage the production of high quality grapes and wines, and to maintain the rural lifestyle residents enjoy. According to a key policy making official, Assistant County Executive Officer George Johnson:

“The wine country had kind of hit a critical mass. He (Supervisor Stone) just saw how the wine country had grown up over time, gotten to this point and he wanted to make sure that we would not only protect and preserve what was currently in the Temecula Valley wine country, but we would also expand and grow the wine country to try to maximize the potential for viticulture purposes, to become a resort destination.”

Many county officials and policy makers explicitly stated the threat from residential developments, seeing housing developments as a major threat to the agricultural land required for viticulture. In order to develop the planning documents, Supervisor Stone organized an Ad Hoc Advisory committee of winery owners, developers and appointed county staff members to form “a public-private partnership with the county.” The original intent of the plan, as explained Ad Hoc committee chairman Bill Wilson, was to change the rules for establishing a winery in order to streamline the process and encourage investment and the creation of new wineries and resorts. The intent was to spur development by re-regulating the wine tourism industry and protecting the winery-owning capitalists from residential developments. The Wine Country Community Plan would be paid for by public funds, and would ideally serve to create a blueprint for investors regarding allowable operations in the wine country.

Importantly, the final documents for the Wine Country Community Plan had to be crafted to gain widespread popular support. While it was technically up to the County Supervisors with as little as a 3-2 vote in favor to pass, the public was able to contest policies they disapproved of in a number of ways. Supervisors making unpopular decisions could face not being re-elected. Private individuals and impacted groups were also able to bring legal challenges and sue the
county over decisions they thought were illegal. This was something that had already happened with regards to the Wine Country Community Plan, and other ordinances.

Therefore, if a measure was to pass and be implemented it was important that it gain public support. However, this massive community Plan had the potential to impact many stakeholders in a variety of ways, so pleasing everyone represented an impossible task. While discussing the difficulties of outreach and bringing disparate interest groups together, Assistant County Executive Officer George Johnson stated, “Some are going to think we’ve done a good job and have incorporated their recommendations and desires. Others are going to probably be not as favorable to some of the things that are going to be recommended.”

An important role of the county in this process was to host informational meetings and outreach events to inform the public about the plan and the impacts it could have on their way of life. As I will discuss in greater detail below, some residents were not satisfied with simply being told what was going to happen to them. Once certain residents learned about Supervisor Stone’s Ad Hoc committee they petitioned to be added to the committee, according to a resident representative on the committee, Sandy Mullens. While resident representatives were brought in to provide feedback, “There are some members of the residential community who believe that because they got brought in later they didn’t have as much influence or opportunity to provide input and have their concerns adequately addressed.” An important part of this research project has been determining which individuals and groups had the greatest impact on the policy making process, and from this discussion it is clear that county officials, both elected and unelected, had a substantial impact on the policy making process. They were the ones who set the agenda, framed the fundamental issues, proposed solutions and created the actual policy documents. They were also the ones who informed the community about the process and the planned
changes and determine which individuals had insights worth listening to. The county also served a subjective middleman between various stakeholding groups.

However, they were not the only ones calling the shots. Below I will show how a class of wealthy, powerful landowners and businessmen were able to successfully navigate the policy making process and get their vision for the future of wine country incorporated into the foundations of the Wine Country Community Plan. I will then go on to compare their involvement with attempts by residents and the equestrian community to impact the policy making process in ways that are meaningful to the individuals comprising each group.

**Winery Owners**

It is difficult to talk about “winery owners” as a group of stakeholders for a number of reasons. First of all, in the Temecula Valley, there is a great diversity with regards to the size of wineries in terms of acreage planted in grapes, the amount of wine produced annually and the number of tourists who visit every year. According to numerous vintners, some large wineries produce over 50,000 cases of wine or champagne every year and can see 1,000 wine tasters on a single weekend day; while smaller, often family operated wineries produce less than 1,000 cases annually. The largest wineries in the Temecula Valley sit on hundreds of acres of vineyards, but a typical winery occupies about fifteen to twenty acres. Some wineries are family owned and operated. Others may be owned by several entrepreneurs, or may simply be owned by a large corporation with holdings throughout California. However, typically, wineries are owned by a single family and are often labors of love in addition to being financial investments.

Members of this group were heavily involved in the writing of the Wine Country Community Plan. However, winery owners were a divided group. Some factions wanted to be a
social wine country, while others wanted to make high quality wine for serious consumers. The Winegrowers Association, the formal association of winegrowers, winery owners and winemakers in the Temecula Valley, was also divided over the Plan. As Peggy Evans, executive director of the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association, stated at a Riverside County Planning Commission hearing held on August 22nd of 2012,

“As a group [we] support the spirit of the 2020 Plan but we do feel it has lost its sight from the original stated intent which is the preservation of vineyard lands and the creation and maintenance of an environment that encourages the development of world-class wineries” and went on to state, “There are currently 1,500 acres planted and the remaining plantable acreage, at best, would allow for an additional 1,000 acres. There’s just not enough grapes in the valley today to sustain the existing 40 or so wineries that need to make Temecula wine and certainly not enough to allow for any kind of growth.”

Evans went on to encourage the Planning Commission to adopt a plan similar to Napa Valley’s, which she claimed enforced strict zoning laws that enforced the “right to farm.” Even though “winery owners” as a group were not monolithic or homogenous it is still useful to discuss them as a group due to how they were impacted by these policies.

Overall, the vintner community in the Temecula Valley was generally supportive of the Wine Country Community Plan. This is unsurprising given the Plan’s emphasis on using state funds and regulatory power to protect the wine tourism complex. From the beginning, the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association was informed about the county’s intentions, and was considered important partners in the creation of this Plan. This is in sharp contrast to the residential community, which was largely unaware of the plan for the first several years. Additionally, the county approached four of the largest winery owners and developers in wine country to form a “public-private partnership” with the county in order to draft specific recommendations with regards to the content of the plan. This is also in contrast to the treatment
residents received, which will be discussed further below. However, within the winery-owning

class there are factions based on size that tend to differentiate them on the Plan.

Under the Wine Country Community Plan, wineries that were established and properly

permitted before the implementation of the Plan would be “grandfathered in” and allowed to

continue their operations under the rules of the Citrus/Vineyard (C/V) zone. However, investors

seeking to establish new wineries in the Temecula Valley would have to do so under the

guidelines set forth in the Wine Country Community Plan.

The most substantive difference between the C/V zone and the proposed Winery zone has
to do with plot size. Basically, new wineries would have to be located on larger plot sizes than

were previously permitted. There would be a 20-acre minimum for these facilities in the new

winery district as opposed to the 10-acre minimum under the C/V zone

(socalwinecountyplan.com). The Plan also contained planting and open space requirements

mandating at least 75 percent of acreage be planted in vineyards for wineries, or left open. This

was intended to preserve the rural character of the wine country and reinforce the centrality of

viticulture to the region’s identity.

However, these changes would not impact all wineries equally. The mandate to plant 75

percent of any given plot in vines would be more challenging for small wineries, which would be

left with a very small area available for development. If a developer owned 100 acres, he or she

would be compelled to plant 75 acres in grapes and would be able to use the other 25 acres to

develop tasting rooms, gift shops, restaurants, hotels and more. If he or she owned 15 acres, then

11.25 acres would have to be planted in vines, leaving just 3.75 acres available for the

development of buildings and ancillary operations including crushing and bottling facilities. The

Plan also set forth definitions for different kinds of winery facilities, which included production
wineries that serve primarily as crushing, barreling and bottling facilities. Commercial establishments include production facilities, but they may also have tasting rooms, restaurants and special occasion facilities and must be located on larger plots than purely production wineries (socalwinecountryplan.org).

Winery owners’ concerns and tourism generation were certainly the central focus of the Wine Country Community Plan from its inception. However, as time went on more stakeholders became involved in important ways. As one person told me, “Initially I think it was driven just by wine, you know? The wine vision. But as time went on we became more sensitive and aware of those other community concerns.” Below I will discuss some of those “other community concerns” in detail.

Residents

Wine country residents formed another integral group in the policy making process. To belong to this group an individual had to live within what was generally agreed upon as the wine country; namely the unincorporated land of Riverside County just outside Temecula city limits. While residents formed an interest group by virtue of their shared position, in practice they did not unite or unify around their common interests. This was due in part to the diversity of the residential population with regards to their relationship to the wine country, and their divergent interests and perspectives. However, as mentioned above, the concept of “stakeholders” was not conducive to individuals approaching the county in all the complexity that characterized their situation. Instead, people were compelled to attach a single pre-made label to themselves in their interactions with policy makers. This not only obfuscated the reality of the situation, but made it impossible for people to make effective claims within the policy making process.
Residents form what was perhaps the most diverse group. Some residents were long time wine country dwellers, having moved there when it was still quite rural and sparsely populated. Others were more recent migrants who do not remember a time before wineries and vineyards dominated the landscape. Similarly, there was a great diversity with regards to residents’ entanglement with winery operations. Some residents were purely “homeowners” with no financial or social ties to the wine industry; others were winery owners, loyal patrons, business partners, close friends and everything in between. This makes the concept of “residents” as a bounded group of stakeholders useless to those individuals, while serving to make things easier for the county.

Due to this great diversity, and other factors which will be addressed below, residents were not willing or able to organize and mobilize around the two issues that they all felt strongly about: noise and traffic. These issues were often understood as symptoms of and precursors to the urbanization of their rural way of life. Homeowners as a group were typically focused on how the plan would impact their private property and their personal way of life. As a result, they were not able to articulate sentiments of social solidarity or unity, even though the exact same issue often impacted them. Issues impacting homeowners were discussed in a very individualistic manner and there were a lot of “not in my backyard” sentiments. Some residents were very vocal and involved in the policy making process, but as a group they were very divided, with people wanting a lot of different things. As will be demonstrated below, this is in stark contrast to some other groups that were able to unify and speak with a single voice.

Many of the residents interviewed for this research project voiced strong reservations about the Wine Country Community Plan. It is important to note that nearly everyone stated that they supported the idea of a land use plan that would foster development and preserve their rural
paradise. However, they often did not see the Wine Country Community Plan as adequately addressing their concerns and fears with regards to overdevelopment. Typically, residents stated that they felt left out of the policy making process. They felt like their voices had been heard but their wishes ignored. While the county conducted numerous outreach meetings, their format was more pedagogical than collaborative, much to the dismay of residents. Several residents stated that their way of life was being so degraded by commercial developments, noise from neighboring wineries and increased traffic that they planned to sell their homes and move away from wine country. Many residents expressed sadness at their treatment throughout the policy making process. “It doesn’t have to be this way. We can all live together if it’s done right.”

However, lacking the ability to organize, and with many residents patently unaware of the impending changes, homeowners in wine country often felt as though they had been left out of a process that was meant to protect them. One residential representative on the Ad Hoc committee told me that countless residents in wine country are totally unaware of the planned changes and had not heard a word about the plan from the county. One contact I interviewed told me about her efforts to raise awareness among residents. “We had to drive around and pin flyers on fences and hand them out to people” (Dillon-Summer interview with Emily Dowdy (pseudonym) 07/17/2013). The county was supposed to be responsible for raising awareness and seeking input from the community, but some residents felt that outreach efforts were so lacking that they had no choice but to alert residents themselves.

It is surprising that residents failed to unite since nearly all of their major concerns stemmed from just two issues: noise and traffic. Residents frequently spoke about how their quality of life suffered in recent years as they were bombarded with noise pollution from neighboring wineries. As one longtime resident, Sandy Mullens explained, “I can hear at least
three bands on a Friday night.” This noise pollution was caused by what many people discussed as “incompatible uses” e.g. having commercial winery facilities next door to residential areas.

Residents were also concerned about increased traffic on their winding rural roads. In an attempt to keep the wine country’s rural feel Supervisor Stone demanded that all roads remain at their current two-lane size. However, the formula of increased traffic caused by increased tourism combined with alcohol left many residents fearful. “They don’t do designated driver programs or sobriety checks and some wineries are better than others about not serving intoxicated people.” Weekend traffic is already quite bad, and the situation will only worsen as more and more people drive in from San Diego and Los Angeles to enjoy Temecula’s wine country.

While residents as a group did not unify around these issues there was one group of residents that did become organized. “Save Temecula Wine Country” (Save) was an informal group of residents organized in response to the Plan. This group had about a dozen members, with membership often shifting due to people’s other commitments. Save represented the only purely homeowner organized group to voice concerns about the Plan. The main issues Save’s members were concerned with included “urbanization” which they believed would inevitably result if the Plan was implemented. Symptoms of this urbanization included traffic and noise pollution, which Save’s members already felt infringed upon their rural way of life (see Figure 5).

There was also another group called “Protect Wine Country” made up of winery owners, businesses, and residents. This group was concerned about the potential negative impact of “incompatible uses” on wine country. The primary fear this group was concerned with had to do
with churches and schools and the inclusion of these institutions in the Plan. This will be discussed further below.

Figure 5: The view of horse country (Photo by author)

**Equestrians**

While horses might not be the first thing most people think of when they hear the words “wine country” equestrians and the equestrian sport have a very rich history in the Temecula Valley. In fact, equestrian operations were established long before the current wine tourism industry in the Temecula Valley. Equestrians were the first people to make commercial use out of what would become the wine country, or what they refer to as Wine and Horse Country. Since before the Kaiser developments of the 1960s, equestrians have been breeding, training, and
racing horses and competing in the equestrian sport on an international level. In fact, numerous equestrian enthusiasts liked to say that Temecula’s equestrian community had more international recognition than any of its wineries. There were numerous equestrian operations in “wine and horse country” and there was no doubt that they contributed to the rustic aesthetic and rural lifestyle enjoyed by residents and tourists alike.

The Wine Country Community Plan includes land in the Valle de los Caballos policy area, similar to the C/V zone. Once the equestrian community learned about Supervisor Stone’s Ad Hoc committee and the plan to rezone their land for tourism and hospitality related uses, there was an immediate response. The equestrian community rapidly organized and formed its own committee to provide recommendations to the county. That committee was quickly co-opted and incorporated into the existing Ad Hoc committee, which at that point was made up exclusively of vintners and developers. The equestrian community was able to come together quickly over their common interests, mainly the preservation of a unique horse country within wine country.

“I understand this place has to be developed, I understand everyone has to live somewhere, I get it. But this area really is, to remove the equestrian zone or the wine zone from this region would be like taking the diamond out of the center of someone’s wedding ring and saying “oh you aren’t missing anything” and now you’re just there with a bunch of metal. I swear to god, this is the jewel of the area. We have so many cool spots to go in Temecula, if you remove that it just becomes anywhere USA.”

This ability to unite under a common goal was not unique to the equestrian community, but could be understood in sharp contrast to the residents’ inability to organize. The equestrian community had several features that made this possible. First of all, they were already a united community before the Wine Country Community Plan was initiated. As a relatively small community most members knew each other personally and shared a common interest in
preserving their community and equestrian way of life. Most members of this community had similar things to gain from the Plan, as well as mutual goals.

Some of their interests included gaining recognition and commercial zoning for their land and operations. Their goals included securing legitimacy and protection from housing development and wineries and the creation of a trails network in wine country. The equestrian community was able to unite around these common interests. Importantly, there was also a strong central leadership within the equestrian community that took charge and framed the issues others rallied around. Their ability to speak with a unified voice and organize their members common interests proved to be pivotal to gaining access to the policy making process.

However, late in the process things became more difficult for the equestrians. A trails network had been mapped out and was initially slated to be included in the Plan. This represented the culmination of years of work on the part of equestrians. However, backlash from residents leery of allowing equestrian easements across their property resulted in Supervisor Stone pulling his recommendation for the trails network at the December, 3, 2013 Board of Supervisors meeting. At the time of this writing it was unclear as to whether or not the trails network would be implemented at a later time, or if it would be abandoned altogether.

**Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship**

One interest group that was not named in the planning documents was the only church in wine country, Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship (Calvary). Pastor Van Wick established Calvary in the Temecula Valley’s wine country in 1999. This was just before the county passed an ordinance banning houses of worship in wine country. Calvary became heavily involved in contesting the Wine Country Community Plan late in the process.
The goals of the church included changing the existing laws to allow for more churches and for Calvary to expand. Calvary had attempted to gain permits to expand, build a massive amphitheater and construct a private school for years, but was barred from doing so by the ban on houses of worship. At Planning Commission meetings in 2012, hundreds of church members flooded the public hearing portion of the meeting. At one Planning Commission meeting held in July of 2012 a member Calvary Chapel made the following public statement:

“I came here because I stand opposed to this proposed plan mainly because it denies us our first amendment rights, our religious liberties and freedoms. It’s a proposed plan for a community. I do live in wine country and I love it so much. I do attend Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship and we are a big part of the community. To deny us our rights, our constitutional rights, to be where we’re at, to grow, to expand, the same way you’re allowing the wineries is unethical and it’s unconstitutional. There is a vast, but silent majority that will not tolerate it.”

The history of the conflict between Calvary and select winery-owners goes back many years, and a brief discussion is merited here. After Calvary became established in 1999, the county sought to enforce the 75 percent planting requirement and compel Calvary to plant vines on its land. However, the church refused, saying it did not want to support the consumption of alcohol. As a compromise, and as part of allowing the church to operate on agriculturally zoned land, Calvary agreed to plant 48 percent of its land in Christmas trees. However, a conflict arose as it quickly became clear that Calvary had no intention on harvesting the trees as an agricultural crop. While some people assumed Calvary intended to harvest the trees in order to avoid planting grapes, Calvary insisted that nowhere in its dealings with the county had it agreed to actually harvest and sell the Christmas trees. This was the beginning of a conflict between Calvary and the winery-owners, many of whom saw the church as incompatible with the rural, agricultural nature of wine country.
In 2010 Calvary announced its plans to expand its facilities to include a massive amphitheater and a private school. The history of the events that followed is simply beyond the scope of this thesis, but a brief exploration will serve to illuminate how Calvary’s plans became intertwined with the Wine Country Community Plan. After announcing its plans to expand Calvary was met with resistance, both from its neighbors and from the county. As an “existing non-permitted use” Calvary existed in a state of limbo. It was allowed to exist since it was established before the ban on houses of worship was enacted, but it was not allowed to expand since the building of churches was not allowed. Feeling this to be an unfair arrangement, Calvary hired attorney Robert Tyler of Advocates for Faith and Freedom, a well-known conservative Christian law firm advocating for incorporating certain religious beliefs into United States law. After several failed attempts to gain approval for the expansion plans, Calvary’s Pastor Van Wick decided to encourage his parishioners to push for the ban on churches and schools to be removed from the Wine Country Community Plan. This caused a great deal of backlash, especially from neighboring wineries that felt their businesses would be in jeopardy if a school were constructed next door. As a result Protect Wine Country was formed with the goal of “Protecting Temecula Wine Country from incompatible uses in order to preserve the wine making and rural atmosphere of this important region” (http://www.protectwinecountry.com).

Calvary supports flooded Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings and vocally petitioned for the ban on churches to be lifted and for Calvary to be granted permission to move forward with its expansion plans. After countless hours of testimony it was finally decided that schools and churches would continue to be banned in wine country. However, Calvary Chapel would be partitioned off into its own “doughnut hole” where the rules and laws enforced throughout wine country would not apply. This spot zoning, which many stakeholders
claim to be blatantly illegal, paves a way for Calvary to expand its facilities. However, it is likely that at least one group will bring a legal challenge against the county and request this spot “doughnut” zoning to be erased.

This entire process was incredibly political and caused a great deal of strife, so much so that at one point the entire Wine Country Community Plan was put on hold and county staff was directed to go back and consider including churches and schools. Supervisor Stone was a vocal supporter of Calvary. Temecula city mayor Mike Naggar was also a supporter of the church and served as Calvary’s lead consultant throughout this process. Ben Drake, a fifth generation farmer and vineyard manager, vocally opposed the inclusion of schools in the Plan. He stated that due to state and federal regulations, he would be prohibited from spraying pesticides on vineyards he manages that were within a quarter mile of the school, and that number could change at any time due to legislation passed far from Temecula (Riverside County Planning Commission meeting, 2012). In the 1990s Pierce’s Disease, carried by an insect called the Glassy-Winged Sharpshooter, decimated Temecula’s vines. What had been 3,500 acres of vines shrived to just 1,000 acres, and as of 2014 had recovered to about 1,500 acres (Downey 2014). Fears of a possible resurgence of the devastating Pierce’s Disease were frequently voiced by winery and vineyard owners.

IV. Revisions and Approval of the Plan

Throughout the planning process, there were many concerns stakeholders wanted addressed. I will briefly discuss three of the most salient themes that emerged, discuss how stakeholders petitioned for change, and explore how policy makers eventually revised the Plan to address certain concerns. These three issues represented problems for which a compromise
amenable to all stakeholders was not thought to be possible. As a result, policy makers had to decide whose perspectives were more important.

The first problem, which was creating conflict long before the Plan was initiated, related to noise. As discussed above, residents wanted the wineries to reduce the amount and volume of noise they produced so residents could more fully enjoy the peaceful, rural nature of their property (see Figure 6). However, wineries often hosted entertainment events that featured loud, amplified sound, including weddings and music concerts. After a great deal of debate and public testimony policy makers made what they felt to be a fair compromise. The PEIR stated that noise between the hours of 10pm and 8am was problematic, so wineries would be restricted only using amplified sound between 8am and 10pm. This comprise thrilled most winery-owners, since those were the hours they typically wanted to use amplified sound. Residents, on the other hand, felt this was blatant violation of their rights. As resident Sandy Mullens, a professional who had lived in a wine country neighborhood with her husband for many years stated, “When I heard that’s what they were doing I couldn’t believe it. “Are you kidding me?” They should be ashamed of themselves.” In this case it is clear that policy makers came down on the side of the wine-capitalists.

Another conflict that caused an insolvable problem between stakeholders had to do with a trails network. The equestrian community had strongly and vocally advocated for a integrated trails network in wine country, something the county had asked them to work on for years. For the majority of the planning process it seemed as though equestrians were going to have their way and get the trails network incorporated into the Plan, along with legal easements on residential properties to provide legal protection from liability. However, at a Board of Supervisors meeting in 2013, several residents complained vociferously about the easements to
the point that Supervisor Stone finally advocated for removing the trails network from the Plan.
In this instance we can see that the wishes of the residents outweighed those of the equestrian
community in the eyes of policy makers.

The final topic I will discuss has to do with churches in wine country. As discussed
above, Calvary made it known that it would not hesitate to bring legal action against the county
if it was not allowed in the Plan, and if churches and schools were not also incorporated.
However, Protect Wine Country had already filed suit and won against the county, and made it
equally clear that if churches and schools were permitted it would sue the county. At a Planning
Commission hearing held on August 22nd, 2012, Planning Commissioner John Snell told Pastor
Van Wick that the stack of speaking slips for church-supporters was so large that they were not
going to be able to get any business done if they all spoke. Van Wick stated that they were not
trying to challenge the plan, “we’re asking to be part of it.” The Planning Commission finally
advocated for continuing the ban on churches and schools, a victory for the vintners, but creating
a “doughnut hole” for Calvary to potentially expand. It is yet to be seen what legal challenges
will ensue.

On December 3rd, 2013 the Board of Supervisors voted to tentatively approve the Wine
Country Community Plan. The Plan went back before the Board of Supervisors on March 11th,
2014 and was reviewed and fully approved.
V. Conclusion

The Wine Country Community Plan was intended to do a number of things. Its aim since its inception was to promote wine tourism and encourage the development of new winery establishments in the Temecula Valley’s wine country. The idea behind the Plan can be summed with the phrase “preservation through development.” However, many stakeholders contested the Plan on the grounds that it was encouraging growth at the expense of quality of life. Residents felt that their concerns were important when weighed against the interests of the winery-owning class. Wineries saw churches and schools as threats to their businesses. Equestrians saw housing developments as a hazard to their commercial development.
One thing everyone seemed to agree on, possibly the only thing, was that growing grapes and making high quality wine was vital to the region’s economic and cultural survival. In the Temecula Valley, wine making is seen as an art and a science. It is a craft that anyone can participate in given grapes, yeast and time. However, to make high quality wine takes a great wine maker and exceptional grapes. The social prestige ascribed to those who make great wine is palpable, with vineyards and wineries often being passed down through the generations. However, wine making is not just a passion or hobby, but a business and industry contributing millions of dollars annually to the regional economy. To draw in tourists the Temecula Valley’s wine country had to be able to offer high quality wine in an “authentic” environment. This meant catering to tourists’ desires and expectations about wine country and the wine tourism experience.

As Lyon and Wells discuss, “The encounters between host and guest are mostly transitory, nonrepetitive and asymmetrical” (2012: 9). This was certainly the case in the Temecula Valley, where wine tourists would often travel in from outside the region, spend a few hours at tasting rooms, and then return to their places of origin. Wine tasters would line the bar at wineries, joking with wine pourers and engaging with their fellow tourists. Pictures would be taken; birthdays and weddings toasted. Time would flow quickly as tourists enjoyed a few wine tastes, and then they would shuttled off to the next winery to do it all again. However, the fact that encounters were almost invariably short and fleeting is not to say that the experiences shared between tourists and hosts were not meaningful. In wine country we can catch a glimpse on the local scale of processes that occur globally. Tourism represents perhaps the largest movement of goods, services and people in history (Lyon and Wells 2012) and in the Temecula Valley discussions of tourism have a sense of urgency that demonstrates its importance and centrality.
CHAPTER FIVE:
THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. Theoretical Contributions: Trends and Recurring Themes

My data suggest that the policy making process is not a neutral or value free enterprise. My findings echo what Wedel et al. (2005) discuss as a highly mystified process in which complex assemblages of government officials and private interests craft policies. In the Temecula Valley, many stakeholders, including homeowners, tried and failed repeatedly to access policy makers and the policy making process. At the same time, other stakeholders, such as the winery-owning capitalist class and Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship, were given shortcuts and personal favors which made their attempts to impact the process much more effective. My data also support Shore and Wright’s claim that many people are patently unaware of how the policy making process unfolds or how they can impact it (Shore and Wright 1997). As the example of one homeowner who drove around and pinned informational flyers to people’s doors clearly demonstrated, this was not a totally transparent process.

Public Policy

Several salient themes emerged throughout the course of my research. Importantly, these themes resonate with much of the scholarly literature on the anthropology of public policy. The
mystification of the policy making process, the obscure realm of bureaucracy, the “productive and performative” nature of policy documents and the primacy of language and discourse in the creation of policies recurred time and again. All of these are areas in which this work contributes to anthropological theory.

As many of my informants and contacts discussed, the policy making process in Riverside County was at times deeply mystified. This resonates with Shore and Wright’s (1997) discussion of the policy making process “as a mechanism for disguising the identity of decision makers” (11). However, this process was not obscured in the same way to all citizens and concerned parties. Certain impacted individuals faced countless barriers to getting their voices heard by policy makers (e.g. confusing contact systems, secretarial barriers, unhelpful websites and pandering meetings/outreach events). On the other hand, some stakeholders were in very advantageous social/political positions. Through their elite association memberships, positions and social networks some stakeholders were able to quietly and easily navigate the policy making process. However, this bias was never explicitly stated. Instead, the process was professed to be an open, transparent and equitable one. This further reinforces Shore and Wright’s claim that, “Policies are the most obvious political phenomena, yet it is a feature of policies that their political nature is disguised by the objective, neutral, legal-rational idioms in which they are portrayed” (Shore and Wright 1997: 8). The Wine Country Community Plan was a political project initiated by the neoliberal state.

This mystification of the policy making process is a common theme both at the local level as my case study demonstrates, and at the national and global level. In fact, I would argue that the larger the scale of the policy in question the less impact “average citizens” could have. In federal government policies, massive lobbying groups and multinational corporations often have
a greater say than the collective American public. This can be understood anecdotally, such as the situation in which a majority of United States citizens support gun control reforms, but no policies are enacted due to a powerful, pro-gun lobby like the National Rifle Association (NRA). While people at the local level can devote countless hours to getting involved and informed and potentially making a small difference, at the national level the scale of the policy making machine is such that individual stakeholders have virtually no chance of impacting the policy making process in meaningful ways (Shore and Wright 1997).

I argue that this is due in part to the behemoth bureaucratic machine that has become established in federal United States government, down to state and county governance. Anthropologists have written relatively little on the subject of bureaucracy (see Hull 2012). While the impacts of the bureaucratic system are easy fare for anthropologists, they have seldom focused on the actual mechanisms or forms of bureaucracy (Hull 2012). In my evaluation the anthropology of policy would benefit from an exploration of the form policies take and the ways in which that form shifts in the face of contestation. The current study builds upon this gap in the literature by closely examining not just what the policy documents will do, but how they were created, what they say and the actual form they take. As my case study demonstrated, policy documents serve to solidify a particular vision for the future; in this case the winery owning class’s vision of Temecula as a world-class wine tourism destination. The policy was created through a collaborative effort, but clearly not all stakeholders were given equal weight. As Hull discusses, bureaucratic records “have often been overlooked as a problem in their own right because anthropologists produce and use documents in much the way their subjects of study do” (Hull 2012: 252). This study casts a critical gaze on the policy making process and its deep
entrenchment in a bureaucratic form that places its highest value and esteem on capitalist production and consumption.

**Policy and Discourse**

When discussing the creation and implementation of a public policy it is impossible to ignore the importance of language and discourse. This is especially true in the case of the Wine Country Community Plan. My findings echo Apthorpe’s claim that “the primary aim of policy language is to persuade rather than inform” (1997). Statements such as “preserving through expansion” and claims the Plan would “protect the area’s rural character through development” are nonsensical, circular logic. Rhetoric such as this panders to residents and citizens while taking no strategic or logistical measures to deliver on these vague promises.

In a very real way public policies are as “productive” as they are “performative”. As the authors state, “they create as well as reflect those worlds. From our perspective policies are not simply external, generalized or constraining forces, nor are they confined to texts. Rather, they are productive, performative and continually contested” (Shore and Wright 2011:1). Policies actually produce real changes to the worlds they are enacted in. As different stakeholders in the Temecula Valley jostled for linguistic and legislative footing, each was attempting to give credence to his or her vision for the future. In the Temecula Valley’s wine country, developers hoping to build resort style wineries as well as boutique cellars will have to play by new rules once the Wine Country Community Plan is approved and implemented. Of the many different visions for the future of wine country, only one will become a reality. Through the particulars of the public policy, the county and policy makers are hoping to bring about the changes they want to see.
The Neoliberal State

The current study contributes to the anthropological literature on neoliberal economics and the neoliberal state by showing how the policy making process acts as a political technology to further neoliberal goals. As Harvey discusses, “Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade” (2005:2). More specifically, neoliberalism means the financialization and commercialization of everything and the creation of markets where none had previously existed (Harvey 2005). In the case of the Wine Country Community Plan this also includes using public resources to fund projects in order to create a “good business climate” and provide necessary infrastructure for wine production and the wine tourism complex. As Harvey expertly states, “The state typically produces legislation and regulatory frameworks that advantage corporations” (Harvey 2005: 77). This can be seen in the Temecula Valley where Riverside County officials tentatively approved a plan to streamline the business permitting process and encourage commercial development and capital accumulation by a small, wealthy winery-owning class.

The current research project backs (Hilgers 2012) discussion of neoliberalism as “a political project that entails the reengineering of the state.” Far from a supposed “free market” turn in which the state and regulators are removed from the economic system, neoliberalism involves the careful repositioning of the state in such a way as to protect business and economic interests (Harvey 2005). In the Temecula Valley this takes shape in the Wine Country Community Plan. In this “public-private partnership” the state (e.g. county officials and policy
makers) partners with local developers and capitalists (e.g. winery owners) to re-write the law in a way that protects the wine industry from the encroachment of housing developments. This is a textbook example of “actually existing neoliberalism” (Wacquant 2012). In this situation, the state sided with the wealthy winery-owning class over others and aided in expanding that group’s capital accumulation through favorable zoning laws and ordinances and a publicly sponsored and funded expansion of developable lands. This study supports one of Stronza’s findings that a “problem anthropologists found with tourism-fueled development is that it often leads to increased wealth stratification in host communities” (Stronza 2001:269). The accumulation of capital in the hands of the winery-owning capitalist class is all but ensured by the Wine Country Community Plan.

Through my archival research and interviews I also gathered a great deal of data on the nature and form of the illusive, amorphous entity(ies) known as “the state.” My analyses support Kapferer (2008) and Herzfeld (2008) who see the state as “differentiated and contextually relative” (Kapferer 2008). The institutions of the state and mechanisms for involvement in the policy making process proved to be impenetrable by some while welcoming to others. As discussed above, some stakeholders were able to get their perspectives imbedded into the very foundations of the policy (e.g. expanding wine country, protecting viticulture at the expense of housing, etc). Others, however, had their concerns flouted and their perspectives overlooked at every step in the process. The result was a plan designed for, and in a very real way designed by, the winery-owning class to ensure its continued growth and prosperity.
**Wine Tourism**

The current study also lends theoretical contributions to tourism studies. As Stronza discusses, tourism is an ideal foci for anthropological inquiry (2001). Tourism as a global industry is incredibly significant, generating some U.S. $852 billion in receipts in 2009 alone (Lyon and Wells 2012). Tourists travel to the Temecula Valley to seek out fine wines, but perhaps more importantly, they seek a personal connection with and experience of the romance associated with notions of “wine country.” As numerous wine pourers told me, it is incredibly important for them to make a personal connection with wine tourists in order to cater to their needs. Lyon and Wells discuss the importance of understanding a tourist’s needs by saying, “their success is predicted upon their abilities to attune themselves to tourists’ desires to have unique and personal encounters rather than just generic commercial transactions” (2012: 91). This speaks to the idea of “authenticity” with regards to wine country. Tourists desire an “authentic” experience and seek out this culturally constructed, constantly shifting notion.

As a relatively new, smaller-scale wine tourism region, the Temecula Valley must fight an uphill battle against its world-renowned northern neighbors. With an event like the 1976 Paris competition unlikely to occur, Temecula wine makers must continue to produce better, more unique, and pleasing wines for consumers and critiques alike. Only time will tell if Temecula’s “consumer friendly” wines will bring world-class status, or if a wine renaissance is necessary to win critical acclaim.

**Power, Solidarity and Discourse**

Lastly, this study is built upon ethnography, participant observation, and deep involvement with the local community as anthropological methods. As my data clearly show,
individuals in the community were willing to fight to protect their individual property rights and way of life. However, for a variety of reasons discussed in the previous chapter, residents were not willing or able to come together and form highly organized groups in opposition to the Wine Country Community Plan.

While nearly all residents voiced identical concerns regarding the planned expansion, at Planning Department meetings, etc. individuals simply got up, walked to the microphone, spoke about their concern for the allotted three minutes, and were told “thank you for your opinion, have a seat.” This is in sharp relief when compared to the equestrians who showed up in matching shirts, or the church who bused people in. Individuals in these groups spoke about their own personal concerns, but they also used the word “we”. As Pastor Van Wick succinctly, “We’re not challenging the plan. We’re asking to be part of it.” The importance of group/class consciousness, the knowledge that a policy discussion will impact everyone in the same class in a similar way, cannot be overstated here. This is one of the gaps I see in the anthropology of policy literature, and one my theoretical contributions. While this simple lexical item was surely not the reason one group was successful and the other not, it speaks to the importance of group solidarity and speaking with a collective, unified voice. I can be silenced. We cannot.

II. Critiques of the Wine Country Community Plan

I have numerous critiques regarding the Wine Country Community Plan. Some of the themes discussed in this section, such as my environmental concerns, relate to logistical issues that will be faced as the Plan is implemented over the next several years. Others have to do with conflicting values that have already come to a head and continue to plague development efforts.
Environmental Concerns

Environmental concerns, specifically relating to water, were voiced by many people throughout the policy making process. From residents to environmental advocates, policy makers were made aware that increasing the demand for water in the Temecula Valley could be a problematic issue (see Simms 2013 for a detailed discussion of this topic). It is worth noting that the Plan was passed in the middle of one of the worst droughts in California history. For the first time in 54 years the water authority halted delivery to southern California. In January 2013, the state-wide water subsidy which provided agricultural water at discounted rate expired and farmers began to pay the full residential fee for watering their crops. Water agencies assured policy makers of the needed water supply, but it is unclear as to where the water will come from to satisfy the increased demand. The Plan purports to be de-intensifying development and land use, but its emphasis on encouraging large scale, resort style wineries shows that simply is not the case.

Labor

Another pivotal issue, one that went almost totally ignored throughout the planning process, has to do with the farm laborers who work the vineyards, tend to and harvest the grapes. These laborers represent a silent and mostly invisible group (see Figure 7). This group has been left out of the planning process and concerns about the impact this plan could have on laborers was only brought up once at one Planning Commission meeting, and were quickly brushed aside. If the Plan is enacted there will also be a need for low-wage laborers to operate hotels, work in restaurants and provide other service-oriented labor. In 2012 there were approximately 1,000
employees in wine country, and 5,500 tourism and hospitality related workers. These are mostly low-paying jobs and adding more of them will not likely provide the economic boost that Supervisor Stone envisions.

Figure 7: A laborer tends to newly planted vines in the Temecula Valley (Photo by author)

“Taste of Place”

Tourists form another group that was not acknowledged in the policy documents. While tourists’ interests were not explicitly considered in the Wine Country Community Plan it was their tourism dollars that created the impetus for the new land use plan in the first place. Tourists are a silent, yet very important group. One contradiction in the Plan has to do with maintaining the rural aesthetic that makes Temecula marketable and consumable as a wine tourism destination. By building out the area, it will be less attractive for the very reason it is attractive
now. It will become what many people referred to as a “Disneyland in wine country.” The Temecula Valley’s wine country serves as a semi-rural oasis for urban dwellers; a place to escape the fast pace and noise of the cities that neighbor it. If Temecula becomes too development and commercialized it will lose this all-important rural aesthetic, making it “anywhere USA.”

**Code Enforcement**

My final critique of the Wine Country Community Plan has less to do with the policy itself and more to do with how that policy is played out on the ground. How laws and codes are enforced in wine country is even more significant than the letter of the law. One of the most important findings of my research has to do with the way land use rules are actually enforced on the ground. While a certain zoning ordinance may state that music has to be turned off at a certain time or that permits must be filed before buildings can be occupied, in my field site code enforcement officers are given a great deal of discretion. This has resulted in a “ask for forgiveness, don’t ask for permission” atmosphere.

Noise pollution from wineries is one of the main issues residents have. However, resolving this issue is not just a matter of getting reasonable restrictions into the Wine Country Community Plan. Those restrictions must be followed and if they are not, it is up to code enforcement to address the problem. Code enforcement officers would much rather get “voluntary compliance” and are hesitant to actually shut down violating operations. This shows the county’s business-centric approach to code enforcement as residents are essentially left out.

Another main responsibility for code enforcement involves making sure that buildings are properly permitted. In order to establish a winery, plot plans must be filed, fees paid, and
conditional use permits requested. However, many wineries forgo this process entirely, simply constructing their buildings as they please. While conducting my fieldwork I was given a tour of one winery in particular that had recently expanded and constructed a new tasting room. I was told glibly not to post photos of the building to the Internet, since the winery was not “technically” supposed to be occupying it yet. At another winery I was given a tour of the grounds and shown a new building that would serve as a “shortage facility” by name, but was actually a full tasting room. This type of “ask for forgiveness, not permission” attitude is pervasive among developers, and their gentle coddling treatment by code enforcement will not foster change. While these buildings were technically illegal and should not have been occupied, winery-owners, residents and code enforcement alike know where the county’s loyalties lie. It became clear that it was more important to have wineries and tourists then to have permits.

Through my fieldwork, interviews and participant observation I was able to learn not only about the policy making process, but about how those policies are actually enforced on the ground in the real world. As one of my informants, a code enforcement officer, stated, “It’s one thing to have an ordinance. It’s another thing to enforce it.” This is incredibly important in the Temecula Valley, and speaks to broader patterns. As the above examples illustrate, the content of public policies only matters to the extent that words are translated into actions. Without proper enforcement, hard-fought policies become meaningless as they reinterpreted and enacted on the ground in unexpected ways.

**III. Applied Implications**

There are numerous applied implications from this study. First, my work speaks to the necessity of creating a more open, transparent policy making process. Providing citizens with
open access to relevant information is vital. While a great deal of information is freely available to the public, it is hidden in confusing websites and filled with impenetrable jargon. Making information easier to access and understand is incredibly important.

Second, this study demonstrates the need to incorporate more stakeholders, earlier in the process. This is an issue of access to policy makers and the process as a whole. Decision making processes should be transparent and understood by all.

Finally, it is pivotal that policy making officials seek more robust, scientific input about their policy plans. Conducting adequate research is essential to designing a policy capable of leading to a sustainable future. This includes things like solicitation of expert opinions from a variety of fields, systematic surveys, and a refined process for informing the community and seeking input about planned policy changes.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Research

The present study delineates the policy making process as it unfolded between 2008 and 2014 in Riverside County, California. However, it speaks to broader processes that take shape nationally and globally. From my findings I have four major conclusions and recommendations. First, the role of the neoliberal state and state actors needs to be careful considered in connection with any development or community plan. Close attention must be paid to its interests as well as the state’s position as a “stakeholder.” The interests of the state are often unstated and implicit and represent widely held ideologies, but nevertheless should be explicitly described and understood. Future research into the complex, fluid nature of the state is recommended.

Second, as I have previously discussed, the category of “stakeholder” should be challenged and reconsidered. Based on my ethnographic research, I question the notion of
“opposing” stakeholder groups (e.g. wineries versus residents), because in the end they all want fundamentally the same things. No group of “stakeholders” would be happy to see the Temecula Valley turn into the laughing stock of the winery world, filled with unruly, disrespectful, highly intoxicated, wine tourists drinking unpalatable wines. Nor would anyone be happy to see Temecula’s wine country disappear. While all stakeholding groups, just like all individuals, have different priorities, they had far more in common than one would assume from the heated debates that took place. No one wanted to see the worst case scenarios come true. I advocate for abandoning the “stakeholders” category, which tends to create tension and the appeal of the least common denominator. Instead, highlighting to commonalities of individuals’ interests and encouraging productive, equitable dialog about how to reach shared goals could bring about a more sustainable future. While I use the category of “stakeholders” throughout this thesis, I question its validity and appropriateness in policy making discourse. Further research in this area is recommended.

Ecotourism alternatives should be considered. Many consumers are beginning to place increased value in goods and services that are “green” or “sustainable” though definitions for those terms vary widely. Barber et al. (2010) note, “Ecotourism seeks to promote tourism and at the same time conserve the environment.” (148). It has been shown that people are willing to pay more products labeled “organic” and “fair trade” (Didier and Lucie 2008). Ecotourism is one alternative to boost the Temecula economy without expansion, while protecting the environment and rural aesthetic Temecula is known for. Marketing Temecula not only as a beautiful place to spend the day drinking wine, but as an environmentally responsible tourist destination could have the affect the Wine Country Community Plan is striving for: to make Temecula a world-class wine tourism destination. Although ecotourism carries its own challenges, such as
measuring impacts, defining sustainability, etc., future research into ecotourism alternatives is recommended.

Finally, if policies are to be crafted in a more equitable, representative fashion, the policy making process must be rendered more explicit and navigable. County officials should ensure that citizens are aware of planned policy changes, informed about the meaning and potential impacts of those policies. Planning should be a more collaborative, inclusive, iterative process. However, the more parties involved, the more time consuming the process, the longer the neoliberal state and its actors must wait to see the rewards for their efforts. Therefore, in order for these changes to be made, two major changes need to be made. First, citizens must recognize their common interests and work to create social solidarity. This involves people becoming more socially active and aware. Second, as Bramwell discusses, citizens must “build their own institutional capacities and self-confidence” (2004: 550). By speaking with a unified voice, residents and other “stakeholders” can potentially have a far greater impact on policies impacting their way of life than by simply speaking as individuals. This represents a drastic paradigm shift in my field site, where individualism is more salient. Future research into issues of community and solidarity are recommended. Demystifying the policy making process is not an easy task, but as this thesis demonstrates, an anthropological examination of public policy is essential for understanding how and why things unfold as they do, and what can be done to make meaningful changes.
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APPENDIX A:

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Dear Prospective Research Study Participant:

I am contacting you to request that you participate in a research study that will examine wine production, consumption, and wine tourism in and around the Temecula Valley, California. The official study title is: Cultivating Wine Country: An Applied Anthropology of Public Policy in Southern California (University of South Florida). The Principal Investigator is Laurel Dillon-Sumner, master’s student in the Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida (USF). I will be researching and conducting interviews in this community and invite you to participate. If you have any questions about your rights as a person who is taking part in a research study, I can provide you with that information. In addition, upon your request you will be provided with a copy of this form for your future reference.

Volunteers in this study will participate in an interview or focus group during the course of the research project from May 2013 until August 2013. The interviews and focus groups will be conducted at a location of convenience for the research subject(s). Questions will be in regards to the wine industry in Temecula in general, and will focus on the expansion/development plan known as The Wine Country Community Plan.

This study does not pose any foreseeable risks to you. If there are any questions you do not want to answer, simply state that you do not wish to answer that particular question. The benefits to you will be that in answering questions related to this study you will review your own thoughts and behaviors related to wine production and consumption and the tourism industry.

The privacy of all participants will be maintained at all times and records will be kept in a secure file. Authorized research personnel, and the USF Institutional Review Board (IRB), its staff, any other individuals acting on behalf of USF, and the Department of Health and Human Services, may inspect the records from this research project. The results of this study may be published. However, the data obtained from you will be combined with data from others in the project. Our intent is that the published results will not include your name or any other information that would personally identify you in any way. If you do volunteer personal information that you believe could identify you, we can remove it entirely or provide a pseudonym. Interviews and focus groups may be recorded with your expressed permission. However, these records will be for the use of the research study personnel only and, in accordance with USF IRB regulations, will be kept in a locked facility.

Your decision to participate in this research study is completely voluntary. You are free to participate in this study and to withdraw at any time. If you decide that you do not want to participate or choose to withdraw, there are no penalties or loss of benefits. An interview will take between 10 and 120 minutes, and interviewees may be asked to participate in follow-up interview.

Thank you very much for you attention and help. If you need additional information please contact:
Laurel Dillon-Sumner, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Ave. SOC 35, Tampa, FL 33620

(618) 319-0132 (phone)
Laurel2@mail.usf.edu (email)

Dr. Kevin A. Yelvington, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida 4202 E Fowler Ave. SOC 107 Tampa, FL 33620-8100

USA (813) 974-0582 (office/voicemail) (813) 974-2668 (FAX) yelvingt@usf.edu (e-mail)
USF IRB Office (813) 974-5638
IRB# 12402
APPENDIX B:

SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Sample questions for residents:
What do you know about the Wine Country Community Plan?
How do you feel about the Wine Country Community Plan?
Do you support some of or the entire expansion plan?
Are there any aspects of the plan that concern you?
Have you attempted to become involved in shaping the Wine Country Community Plan? In what ways? To what effect?

Sample questions for city planners/developers:
What do you know about the Wine Country Community Plan?
Do you support the development plan?
How do you think the plan will impact the region?
Do you think the plan is sustainable in the broadest sense of the word?

Sample questions for wine tourists:
What drew you to the Temecula Valley Wine Country?
What do you enjoy most about visiting the area?
What region are you traveling from?
Would you consider yourself a wine “connoisseur”?

Sample questions for winery operators:
What do you know about the Wine Country Community Plan?
Do you support or oppose the plan?
What are your specific reasons for supporting or opposing it?
How do you think the plan will impact your business if it is adopted?
APPENDIX C:

AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
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Jim Carter
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APPENDIX D:

EXISTING WINERIES IN THE TEMECULA VALLEY AS OF MARCH, 2014

1 Alex’s Red Barn Winery and Distillery Address: 39820 Calle Contento Owner: Alex Yakut Established: 2004

2 Baily Vineyard & Winery Address: 33440 La Serena Way Owner: Carol and Phil Baily Established: 1986

3 Belle Vista Winery & Vineyard Address: 41220 Calle Contento Owner: Imre and Gizella Cziraki Established: 2004

4 Bel Vino Winery Address: 33515 Rancho California Road Owner: Mike Janko Established: 1998

5 Brian Rose Winery Address: 41720 Calle Cabrillo Owner: Les and Dorian Linkogle Established: 2006

6 Callaway Vineyard Address: 32720 Rancho California Road Owner: Callaway Temecula, LLC Established: 1969

7 Chapin Family Vineyards Address: 36084 Summitville St. Owner: Steve Chapin Established: 2002

8 Churon Winery Address: 33233 Rancho California Road Owner: Ron Thomas Established: 2001

9 Cougar Vineyard & Winery Address: 39870 De Portola Road Owner: Rick and Jennifer Buffington Established: 2004

10 Curry Vineyards and Winery Address: 39850 Kapalua Way (tasting room in Old Town Temecula at 41946 5th St.) Owner: Charlie Curry Established: 2005

11 Danza del Sol Winery Address: 39050 De Portola Road Owner: Robert Olson Established: 1980

12 Doffo Vineyard & Winery Address: 36083 Summitville St. Owner: Marcelo Doffò Established: 1997

13 Europa Village Address: 33475 La Serena Way Owner: Europa Village, LLC Established: 2011

14 Falkner Winery Address: 40620 Calle Contento Owner: Falkner Winery, Inc.; Ray and Loretta Falkner Established: 2000 Production: 7,000 cases annually
15 Foot Path Winery Address: 36650 Glenoaks Road Owner: Christine and Deane Foote Established: 2005

16 Frangipani Estate Winery Address: 39750 De Portola Road Owner: Don and JoAnn Frangipani Established: 2003

17 Gershon Bachus Vineyards Address: 37750 De Portola Road Owner: Ken and Christina Falik Established: 2007

18 Hart Winery Address: 41300 Ave Biona Owner: Joe and Nancy Hart Established: 1980

19 Keyways Vineyard & Winery Address: 37338 De Portola Road Owner: Essence Group Established: 1989

20 Leoness Cellars Address: 38311 De Portola Road Owner: Mike Rennie and Gary Winder Established: 2003

21 Longshadow Ranch Vineyard & Winery Address: 39847 Calle Contento Owner: John and Susan Brodersen Established: 1999

22 Lorimar Vineyards & Winery Address: 39990 Anza Road Owner: Mark Manfield and Lawrie Lipton Established: 2010

23 Lumiere Winery Address: 39555 Calle Contento Owner: Andrew Kleiner Established: 2006


25 Maurice Car’rie Vineyard & Winery Address: 34225 Rancho California Road Owner: Budd and Maurine Van Roekel Established: 1986

26 Miramonte Winery Address: 33410 Rancho California Road Owner: Celebration Cellars, LLC. Established: 2001

27 Monte De Oro Winery Address: 35820 Rancho California Road Owner: OGB Partners, LLC Established: 2009

28 Mount Palomar Winery Address: 33820 Rancho California Road Owner: Louidar, LLC Established: 1969

29 Oak Mountain Winery Address: 36522 Via Verde Owner: Steve and Valerie Andrews Established: 2005

30 Palumbo Family Vineyards & Winery Address: 40150 Barksdale Circle Owner: Nicholas and Cindy Palumbo Established: 1998

31 Peltzer Family Vineyards Address: 33925 Calle Contento Owner: Charlie and Carrie Peltzer
Established: construction to begin this year, opening slated for 2015

32 Ponte Family Estate Winery Address: 35053 Rancho California Road Owner: Claudio Ponte and partners Established: 2003

33 Robert Renzoni Vineyards & Winery Address: 37350 De Portola Road Owner: Robert Renzoni Established: 2008

34 S C Cellars Vineyard & Winery Address: 40895 Bucharest Lane Owner: Scott and Colleen Kline Established: declined to state

35 South Coast Winery Resort & Spa Address: 34843 Rancho California Road Owner: Jim Carter Established: 2003

36 Temecula Hills Winery & Vineyard Address: 47200 De Portola Road Owner: Steve and Valerie Andrews Established: 2000

37 Thornton Winery Address: 32575 Rancho California Road Owner: John M. Thornton, Sally B. Thornton and Steve Thornton Established: 1981

38 Van Roekel Winery Address: 34567 Rancho California Road Owner: Budd and Maurice Van Roekel Established: 1989

39 Villa di Calabro Winery & Olive Oil Co. Address: 33490 Madera de Playa Owner: Mike and Mindy Calabro Established: 2009

40 Vindmia Vineyard & Estate Winery Address: 33133 Vista del Monte Owner: David and Gail Bradley Established: 2005

41 Wiens Family Cellars Address: 35055 Via Del Ponte Owner: George Wiens, Dave Wiens, Jeff Wiens and Doug Wiens Established: 2001

42 Wilson Creek Winery & Vineyard Address: 35960 Rancho California Road Owner: Gerald and Rosemary Wilson, and family Established: 1998
APPENDIX F:

MASTER’S THESIS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. Introduction

From May to August 2013, I conducted a research project in the Temecula Valley, California. My work can be understood as a policy analysis. I focused my research on a land use policy called the Wine Country Community Plan. The Temecula Valley is home to an emerging wine tourism destination. The Wine Country Community Plan was initiated to try to turn the Temecula Valley into a world-class wine tourism destination. Since 2008 Riverside County officials have been working with wine makers, residents, equestrians and others to create a plan that will increase the Temecula Valley’s reputation and boost the economy. Additionally, it is important that the plan preserve the region’s rural nature and rustic appeal, which are valued by residents and tourists alike.

My aim in this brief summary is to explain the history and the contents of the Wine Country Community Plan. I also intend to describe how different stakeholders went about negotiating the policy making process. By explaining how the policy making process works in Riverside County, it is my hope that citizens will be better equipped to make meaningful contributions to policy discussions.

II. Setting and Methods

The city of Temecula and the wine country that lies just outside city limits is approximately 60 miles north of San Diego and 90 miles south of Los Angeles. This puts the Temecula Valley within about a two-hour drive of about 25 million people. This is an ideal
location for a wine tourism destination. It is much more accessible for a weekend or day trip than Napa and Sonoma, both located in northern California.

Residents of the Temecula Valley talk about it as a rural paradise. Home to over 100,000 people and some 40 wineries this small city is surrounded by rolling hills and dry landscapes. Once you leave city limits and make your way into the wine country you can see bright green vineyards stretching into the distance. The Temecula Valley is also home to a thriving equestrian community and is world-renowned for the equestrian sport. Tourists and residents alike are able to sample Temecula Valley wines, made with locally grown grapes and often produced onsite. Leisure and trail rides are available for those interested in the equestrian sport, and many wineries host music and entertainment events.

During my time in Temecula I gathered a great deal of information about the wine country and the Wine Country Community Plan. First, I used archival research to find and analyze official documents regarding the creation and contents of the Wine Country Community Plan. Next, I contacted and interviewed numerous people to support what I learned through my archival research. I spoke with vintners, winery owners, residents, county officials, equestrians and tourism officials in order to get as many perspectives as possible. Last, I engaged in “participant observation.” This method allowed me to gain a first hand perspective on the Temecula Valley’s wine country. The research methods I employed allowed me to systematically gather detailed data, which will be discussed in the following sections.

III. Findings

The data that I gathered is qualitative in nature. This means it is concerned with quality, not quantity. My main concern with this research is to explore how local residents, business
owners and other stakeholders negotiate the policy making process. Many people are unaware of how policies that impact their lives are created, and it is my goal to see how the policy making process works in this case study.

There are numerous groups of stakeholders and impacted individuals at my field site. It is important to note that even if I refer to a group of individuals I am not making the assumption that all members of that group have the exact same perspectives or interests. However, keeping that in mind it is still useful to discuss them as groups. The three main groups of stakeholders that I will discuss are winery owners, equestrians, residents. When it comes to the Wine Country Community Plan there are some individuals and groups that have been more successful than others at negotiating the policy making process. Some people were very successful at getting their concerns heard by policy makers, while other people have been largely unsuccessful at getting their concerns addressed in meaningful ways.

While the Wine Country Community Plan is still in the process of implementation, the most current draft helps shed light on the question of who has been the most influential. The winery owners as a group have been very successful at getting their particular concerns incorporated into the Wine Country Community Plan. In 2009 a group of four winery owners began working with county staff to come up with recommendations for the plan. In the years since that first meeting of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, it has swelled to nineteen members. However, it was the winery owners who set the agenda and laid the initial groundwork for what the plan would do. Their goals were to open up more lands for vineyards and wineries, maintain the rural character of the region and to change the permitting process to be less restrictive. If we can take the most current draft of the Wine Country Community Plan as an indication, they have succeeded in all these goals. As a group the winery owners and vintners are well organized, even
if they are not always cohesive. They are also politically influential, well connected and relatively wealthy.

The equestrians as a group were fairly successful at getting their concerns incorporated into the Wine Country Community Plan. The equestrian community came onboard the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee in late 2009. The equestrian representatives were able to voice their concerns about over-development. They were also able to explain the need for a trials system recognized by the county. As of the latest planning documents it seems that there are also protections for the equestrian businesses, but that is still a point of debate. The equestrian community has several features that suggest why they have been fairly successful. First, they were highly organized and unified before this plan was even initiated. Since the equestrian community is relatively small, many of its members were already familiar with each other. Second, many of the members of the equestrian group have similar interests. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, once this group became aware of the county’s plan they were very proactive and formed their own committee to provide the county with their recommendations. As a result they seem to have been fairly successful at getting their concerns heard. However, since the Wine Country Plan has not yet been officially adopted it is too soon to say for sure.

Homeowners and residents in the wine country were generally unsuccessful at getting their concerns addressed by policy makers. The two main points of concern for most residents, traffic and noise, were not addressed in meaningful ways. Residents were not generally well organized or unified. This is not to say that there were not residents who were highly informed, proactive and organized, because there certainly were. What my data show is that residents as a group did not show high levels of unity and solidarity compared to other groups.
IV. Conclusions

While many people are unaware of how the policy making process works, there are certainly groups and individuals who are very successful at navigating it. As my study shows people and groups with lots of money and political connections are very successful at getting policy created which benefit them. Lacking money and political connections, social solidarity and a unified voice are the most important traits of successful groups.

As I continue this project I will be exploring something that is perhaps even more important than the policy documents themselves. Through my fieldwork, interviews and participant observation I was able to learn not only about the policy making process, but about how those policies are actually enforced on the ground in the real world. It is one thing to have a code or law; it is another thing to enforce it.
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