



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Planning, Building and Environmental Services

Planning Commission Mtg.

OCT 07 2015

Agenda Item # 10B

1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
www.co.napa.ca.us

Main: (707) 253-4417
Fax: (707) 253-4336

David Morrison
Director

MEMORANDUM

To:	Napa County Planning Commission	From:	David Morrison, Director
Date:	October 7, 2015	Re:	Total Permitted Wine and Grape Production Analysis

At the May 22, 2015, APAC meeting, the Committee directed staff to review and where appropriate revise the table provided regarding analysis of the 75 percent rule, during the March 10, 2015, workshop on the cumulative impacts of new development. The results have been updated and are provided below.

As noted previously on several occasions, only 20% of all permitted production is required to comply with the 75% rule. If all wineries subject to the 75% rule utilized 100% of their permitted production, it would require about 18 million gallons of Napa sourced wine. The 18 million gallons equals about 64% of total County wine grape production. (For 2014, a total of 47,720,805 gallons were produced in Napa County, which is 37.6 percent of total permitted production.)

	2014 (Actual)
Total Acreage (Bearing Acres)	43,591
Total Wine Grape Yield (assume 4 tons/acre)	175,607
Total Gallons (assume 160 gallons/ton)	27,898,240
Total Wine Grape Sourcing Capacity @ 75% Napa County Content (total gallons x 1.333)	37,197,560
Grapes Exported for Crushing Outside of Napa (tons)	45,625
Total Grapes Crushed in Napa County	129,982
Total Gallons from Local Crush (assume 160 gallons/ton)	20,797,120
Permitted Winery Capacity gallons	
Total:	126,799,292
Cities:	10,293,530
AIASP:	47,912,500
Pending:	1,373,340

Unknown:	548,410
WDO-Exempt:	43,692,225
Post-WDO (75% Rule Applies):	12,477,348
Expansion of pre-WDO (75% Rule Applies)	11,310,349
Total Subject to the 75% Rule	22,950,787
Gallons Required to Comply with 75% Rule	17,840,773

The Committee also asked for clarification on the various production categories, as the numbers in the table above did not add correctly. The reason is double counting between categories, which is described in more detail below:

		Double Counted Gallons				
		Pending Wineries	Pre-WDO Wineries	Unknown Wineries	Airport Wineries	City Wineries
TOTAL PERMITTED PRODUCTION	126,799,292					
Wineries within cities	10,293,530			9,520		
Wineries with pending permits	1,373,340		21,000		28,500	
Wineries with unknown status	548,410		177,890			9,520
Wineries with per-WDO permits	43,692,225	21,000		177,890	600,000	
Wineries in the AIASP	47,941,000	28,500	600,000			
SUBTOTAL	22,950,787					
Pre-WDO wineries that expanded	11,310,349					
Wineries with post-WDO permits	12,477,348					
TOTAL GALLONS SUBJECT TO 75% RULE	23,787,697					
TOTAL GALLONS NEEDED TO COMPLY	17,840,773					

Frost, Melissa

Subject: FW: Please remove or revise #5 of commission considerations of apac recommendations

Importance: Low

Planning Commission Mtg.

OCT 07 2015

From: Deborah Russell Broman [<mailto:deborah@bromancellars.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 12:15 PM

To: Morrison, David; McDowell, John; McDowell, John; napacommissioner@yahoo.com

Cc: anne.cottrell@lucene.com; tkscottco@aol.com; JeriGillPC@outlook.com

Subject: Please remove or revise #5 of commission considerations of apac recommendations

Importance: Low

Agenda Item # 10B

Dear Planning Commission members and Staff,

I respectfully request that you remove or revise item number 5 under items are being sent forward for your consideration. The wording approved by APAC was .. Recommended requirements for **NEW** winery use permits, ...

The word new was moved from its original position and completely changes the context of the statement.

Best Regards,

Deborah

Deborah Russell Broman

945 Deer Park Road

St. Helena, CA 94574

707-337-4976

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of the message, please contact the sender immediately and delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.

Frost, Melissa

Subject: FW: UP #P14-00202-UP

Planning Commission Mtg.

OCT 07 2015

Agenda Item # 10B

From: Bill Dyer [<mailto:info@dyerwine.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 12:54 PM
To: McDowell, John
Cc: Planning; Morrison, David
Subject: UP #P14-00202-UP

Re: pending application for Use Permit #P14-00202-UP.

We are writing in support of the application by Hudson Vineyards to develop facilities that will allow the grapes grown on the estate vineyards to be vinified on-site. Ultimately this reduces traffic by eliminating grape deliveries to other facilities. Having had the opportunity to visit the site, we note that the proposed facility would sit lightly on the land. It would not require the removal of any natural woodlands, requiring only the transplanting of ornamental olive trees. The requirements for water supply and wastewater treatment can be met on-site. The structures would not be visible from any public roads. As a diversified farming operation, raising animals and growing vegetables in addition to grapes, the requested visitation would provide a learning experience where urban dwellers can connect to agriculture. Its location near the border of the County does not significantly add to the burden of congested areas within the valley. Turn lanes from the highway are already in place. This project supports the economical viability of a property along one of key scenic entry corridors to Napa Valley, and undoubtedly will be a showcase for our agricultural heritage.

Bill and Dawnine Dyer
1501 Diamond Mountain Rd.
Calistoga, CA 94515
September 29, 2015

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of the message, please contact the sender immediately and delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.

Gallina, Charlene

Planning Commission Mtg.

From: Coil, Gladys
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 8:33 AM
To: - Board of Supervisors; 'Diane Dillon'
Cc: Morrison, David; Frost, Melissa; McDowell, John; Gallina, Charlene; Anderson, Laura; Tran, Minh; Habkirk, Elizabeth; Watt, Nancy; Link, Leanne; Richard, Jeffrey; Apallas, Chris; Prescott, Karita; Morgan, Greg; Minahen, Sarah
Subject: FW:
Attachments: WINE INDUSTRY & THE FUTURE OF NAPA VALLEY 7 17 15.docx

OCT 07 2015

Agenda Item # 10B

Attached please find correspondence relating to the Agriculture Protection Advisory Committee (APAC).

(This is a Brown Act communication, please do not "reply all")

Gladys I. Coil, CCB~Admin. Mgr-Clerk of the Board Napa County Executive Office ~707-253-4196
1195 Third Street, Rm. 310~Napa, CA 94559

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and all attachments are confidential and intended solely for the recipients as identified in the "To," "Cc" and "Bcc" lines of this email. If you are not an intended recipient, your receipt of this email and its attachments is the result of an inadvertent disclosure or unauthorized transmittal. Sender reserves and asserts all rights to confidentiality, including all privileges that may apply. Immediately delete and destroy all copies of the email and its attachments, in whatever form, and notify the sender of your receipt of this email by sending a separate email or phone call. Do not review, copy, forward, re-transmit or rely on the email and its attachments in any way.

-----Original Message-----

From: Luce, Mark
Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2015 7:13 PM
To: Coil, Gladys
Subject: FW:

Hi Gladys,

Here are comments on the APAC topic from Dario Satui.

Mark

From: Dario Sattui [dario@castellodiamorosa.com]
Sent: Friday, October 02, 2015 4:10 PM
To: Luce, Mark
Cc: m.luce@sbc.net
Subject:

My thoughts. d

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of the message, please contact the sender immediately and delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.

WINE INDUSTRY & THE FUTURE OF THE NAPA VALLEY

RECENTLY THERE HAS BEEN AN INTENSIFIED DEBATE OVER THE FUTURE OF THE NAPA VALLEY SPECIFICALLY AS IT PERTAINS TO AGRICULTURE. SUCH A DEBATE IS A GREAT THING. IT BRINGS AWARENESS TO THE ISSUES AT HAND, ENCOURAGES THE CITIZENS TO THINK ABOUT AND DECIDE WHAT TYPE OF FUTURE THEY WANT FOR THE NAPA VALLEY WHILE ATTEMPTING TO AVOID THE PITFALLS. SERIOUS DEBATE CAN LEAD TO A WELL THOUGHT OUT PLAN FOR THE FUTURE WHEREBY THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CAN ACT PROACTIVELY (AS OPPOSED TO NOT HAVING A PLAN AND ALLOWING THE UNWANTED TO HAPPEN TO OUR GREAT COUNTY).

ELECTED OFFICIALS AND THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION WILL WEIGH THIS PUBLIC IMPUT TO DETERMINE THE COUNTY'S FUTURE DIRECTION AS IT RELATES TO AGRICULTURE. UNFORTUNATELY I FEAR THAT A SMALL BUT VERY VOCAL MINORITY ARE MAKING MOST OF THE NOISE WHILE THE MAJORITY STAYS SILENT. I AM DULY AFRAID THAT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS WILL MISINTERPRET THIS AS THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY. IT APPEARS THAT MANY IN THE WINE INDUSTRY PREFER NOT TO SPEAK OUT FOR FEAR OF REPERCUSSIONS, BACKLASH OR SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY ALREADY HAVE THEIRS.

HERE IS MY VIEW OF THE SITUATION. THE COUNTY IS CONSIDERING FURTHER LIMITATIONS ON VISITATION AND WINERY CUSTOMER EVENTS. LET ME BE CLEAR, LIMITING VISITATION AND EVENTS WON'T LIMIT TOURISM. IF TOURISTS WISH TO COME HERE THEY WILL COME. IF WINERY AFTER WINERY REFUSES TO ACCEPT THESE VISITORS BECAUSE OF LIMITATIONS ON THEIR PERMITS THEY WILL JUST SEEK OUT OTHER WINERIES IN THE COUNTY.

THIS MEANS THOSE VISITORS WILL CLOG THE ROADS CAUSING FURTHER GRIDLOCK WITH THEIR VECHICLES LOOKING FOR THE WINERIES THAT CAN LEGALLY ACCEPT THEM. WOULD IT NOT BE BETTER TO LET THE WINERIES ACCEPT MORE VISITORS, THUS PUTTING MORE CARS IN WINERY PARKING LOTS, AND GETTING THOSE CARS OFF THE ROAD INSTEAD EXACERBATING TRAFFIC PROBLEMS.

WITH FURTHER COUNTY RESTRICTIONS ON VISITATION AND EVENT, IN TIME VISITORS WILL REALIZE THEY ARE NOT WANTED IN NAPA COUNTY AND GO TO SONOMA OR OTHER WINE AREAS. SUCH A TRAGEDY WOULD RESULT IN LESS AWARENESS OF THE NAPA VALLEY, A GREATER DISCONNECT WITH THE AREA AND ITS WINES AND DIMINISH DIRECT SALES POSSIBILITIES OF OUR WINES (THE VERY THING THAT SUSTAINS MANY SMALL WINERIES). WE WOULD LOSE OUR ALLURE ANDTHE ROMANTIC AND POSITIVE PERCEPTION THAT CURRENTLY EXISTS WORLD-WIDE FOR OUR AREA AND WINES. EX-VISITORS WOULD BEGIN TO DISCOVER THAT OTHER AREAS MAKE REALLY GOOD WINES AS WELL. IN SHORT NAPA COUNTY COULD LOSE ITS DOMINANT POSITION IN THE AMERICAN WINE INDUSTRY.

TRAFFIC STUDIES HAVE ALREADY DEMONSTRATED THAT TOURISTS REPRESENT A SMALL SEGMENT OF THE TRAFFIC ON OUR ROADS. LESS THAN 17 % OF TRAFFIC IN NAPA COUNTY IS ATTRIBUTABLE TO WINERIES, INCLUDING BOTH VISITORS AND EMPLOYEES. THE VAST MAJORITY OF VECHICLES BELONG TO LOCALS AND COMMUTERS. POPULATION GROWTH IN NAPA COUNTY AND THE LACK OF ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE IS A MAIN CAUSE OF TRAFFIC CONGESTION ALONG WITH THE LACK OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

LOW COST HOUSING IN THE LOCAL TOWNS WOULD ALLEVIATE MUCH OF THE COMMUTER TRAFFIC, AS WORKERS COULD THEN AFFORD TO LIVE IN NAPA COUNTY. GIVING PREFERENCE TO NAPA

COUNTY RESIDENTS WISHING TO WORK IN THE AG/WINE INDUSTRY WOULD HELP AS WELL. CONCENTRATING MORE PRODUCTION AND BOTTLING IN THE SOUTH COUNTY INDUSTRIAL AREAS WOULD LESSEN TRAFFIC. THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE IS PARAMOUNT. THE WINE INDUSTRY NEEDS TO BE PART OF THE SOLUTION, BUT LIMITING TOURISM IS NOT THE ANSWER. IT WOULD ALSO CREATE MASS UNEMPLOYMENT. 26 % OF THE NAPA COUNTY WORK FORCE WORK AT JOBS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE WINE OR TOURISM INDUSTRIES.

SUGGESTING ALTERNATIVE WINE TOURING ROUTES TO GET CARS OFF OF HWY. 29 AND THE SILVERADO TRAIL, SPREADING THEM OUT OVER THE PERIPHERAL ROADS IN THE AGRICULTURAL WATERSHED COULD HELP AS WELL. GIVEN THAT THE VAST MAJORITY OF NAPA WINERIES ARE IN THE AG WATERSHED AREAS, ALTERNATIVE WINE ROUTES WOULD ASSIST THE OUT-OF-THE-WAY WINERIES BOOSTING THEIR DIRECT SALES AND EXPOSING THEIR WINERIES AND VINEYARDS.

RESIDENTS NEED TO ASK THE QUESTION WHAT DO THEY WISH THE NAPA VALLEY TO BE LIKE IN 20-30 YEARS. I THINK MOST WOULD RESPOND THAT WE NEED TO PRESERVE THE RURAL AND AGRICULTURE NATURE OF THE COUNTY. TO DO SO I BELIEVE WE HAVE 2 CHOICES.

WE CAN DENY FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF VINEYARDS, ESPECIALLY IN THE HILLSIDES, DENY EXPANDED WINE PRODUCTION AND LIMIT VISITATION AND EVENTS AND INCREASE BARRIERS TO BEING IN THE WINERY/VINEYARD BUSINESS. THAT WOULD EASE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS SOMEWHAT BUT SLOWLY KILL OFF THE WINE INDUSTRY HERE. THE WINE INDUSTRY AND ITS SATELITE BUSINESSES, THE MAJOR EMPLOYER IN NAPA COUNTY, WOULD IMplode CAUSING GREAT UNEMPLOYMENT. THE RESULT WOULD BE INCREASED PRESSURE TO BUILD HOMES IN THE AG AREAS, AND IT WOULD BE ONLY A MATTER OF TIME BEFORE OUR COUNTY WENT THE WAY OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY, ONCE PRINCIPALLY AG AND NOW COMMERCIAL, HOMES AND ASPHALT WITH NO AG REMAINING. THE LIVERMORE AREA, ONCE A PRIME GRAPE GROWING AREA IS MUCH THE SAME. THAT ALL HAPPENED IN THE TIME FRAME OF 20 YEARS, AND IT COULD EASILY HAPPEN HERE.

NOTHING IS PERFECT, BUT IF NAPA CO. WISHES TO REMAIN A RURAL COUNTY IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE BAY AREA WE MUST PROTECT AND NOURISH OUR AG INDUSTRY. AG IS THE LIFE-BLOOD THAT KEEPS THE HOMES AND ASPHALT AWAY AND KEEPS NAPA COUNTY BEAUTIFUL.

TO ACCOMPLISH THIS WE MUST DO EVERYTHING IN OUR POWER TO MAINTAIN A STRONG AG COMMUNITY, NOT DIMINISH IT. THIS WOULD INCLUDE ALLOWING PRODUCTION PERMIT INCREASES AND REASONABLE HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT. THIS MEANS NOT CAPPING DIRECT TO CONSUMER TASTING AND SALES OR WINERY EVENTS. AS OFTEN DIRECT SALES AND PERSONAL CONTACT IS THE ONLY VIABLE ROUTE FOR THE LESSER KNOWN WINERIES. MOST OF THESE GET LITTLE HELP FROM THE TWO GIANT DISTRIBUTORS. DUE TO THE GREAT CONSOLIDATION OF DISTRIBUTORS THAT HAS TAKEN PLACE IN THE LAST 20 YEARS THEY HAVE ALL THE POWER AND THE LESSER KNOWN WINERIES FEW ALTERNATIVES.

IT IS NOT MY INTENTION TO CLEAR CUT HILLSIDE TREES, FOUL OUR ENVIRONMENT AND DEplete OUR WILDLIFE OR TO HAVE EVENT CENTERS POSING AS WINERIES. REASONABLE IMEDIMENTS TO OVER EXPANSION OR EXPANSION IN ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS MUST BE STRICTLY ENFORCED. I LIKE TO THINK I PUT MY ACTIONS WHERE MY MOUTH IS. WE HAVE PUT MOST OF OUR LAND (AND IN TIME WILL PUT ALL OF IT) IN THE LAND TRUST TO NEVER BE BUILT UPON. FURTHER I SUPPORT MANY WILDLIFE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.

LIKEWISE WITH VISITATION CERTAIN BOUNDARYS MUST BE MAINTAINED. SUFFICIENT PARKING, SEWAGE AND SANITATION AND SAFETY STANDARDS SHOULD BE PRIORITIES. YET RESIDENTS WHO MOVE INTO AG AREAS BECAUSE OF THE RURAL AND VINEYARD BEAUTY AND THEN COMPLAIN ABOUT AG GENERATED DUST, ODORS, WIND MACHINES, TRAFFIC, TRACTOR NOISE, LIGHTS AT NIGHT WHEN HARVESTING, VISITORS, ETC. SHOULD HAVE NO SAY AND THEIR OPINIONS DISREGARDED WHEN THE COUNTY IS FOMENTING POLICY OR MAKING AG DECISIONS.. AG SHOULD NOT GO OUT OF ITS WAY TO BE A NUISANCE, BUT AG HAS PRIORITY. PLEASE REMEMBER THERE IS A "RIGHT TO FARM" ORDINANCE. THESE RESIDENTS MUST REALIZE THAT THEIR VINEYARD AND HILLSIDE VIEWS ONLY EXIST BECAUSE OF AG, NO OTHER REASON. THAT IS WHY THESE PEOPLE MOVED HERE IN THE FIRST PLACE. THERE IS A PRICE TO PAY TO KEEP US BUCOLIC AND IN AG. THERE IS NO FREE LUNCH.

THE CHOICE IS SIMPLY AND OBVIOUS. YOU EITHER ALLOW WINERIES TO EXPAND THEIR PRODUCTION AND HAVE REASONABLE VISITATION AND EVENT NUMBERS AND REMAIN ECONOMICALLY STRONG, OR NAPA COUNTY BECOMES A BEDROOM COMMUNITY OF SAN FRANCISCO. THERE IS NO OTHER WAY.

SOME WINERIES CHEAT ON REGULATIONS, BECAUSE WITHOUT BREAKING SOME RULES IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT FOR MANY OF THEM TO SURVIVE. WHEN FACED WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF GOING OUT OF BUSINESS GOOD PEOPLE WILL BREAK AND SKIRT RULES.

NAPA COUNTY BEAUCRACY IS ANOTHER REASON SOME WINERIES CHEAT. COMPARE TWO NEIGHBORING COUNTIES: NAPA AND SOLANO. IN NAPA COUNTY IT CAN TAKE YEARS AND AN INORDINATE AMOUNT OF STUDIES AND MONEY TO OBTAIN A WINERY PERMIT OR EXPANSION. WHEN WE TALKED TO SOLANO COUNTY THEY PROMISED WE WOULD HAVE AN APROVED WINERY PERMIT WITHIN 3 TO 6 MONTHS OF SUBMITTING OUR APPLICATION. WHEN REGULATIONS ARE TOO UNREASONABLE GOOD PEOPLE ARE TEMPTED TO AVOID THE RULES.

WHY IS WINERY VISITATION CRITICALLY IMPORTANT ? WINE DOESN'T MAGICALLY SELL ITSELF, NOT EVEN GREAT NAPA COUNTY WINES. AS HARD AS IT IS TO MAKE GOOD WINE, MAKING WINE IS THE EASY PART, SELLING IT MUCH MORE DIFFICULT. VISITATION EXPOSES THE CHARMS, RURAL BEAUTY AND GREAT WINES OF NAPA COUNTY. VISITORS ENJOY AND HAVE FUN COMING TO THE NAPA VALLEY. THIS POSITIVE EXPERIENCE HELPS CREATE AND BUILD THE AURA. IT WINS OVER LONG TERM CUSTOMERS, IT CEMENTS RELATIONSHIPS, IT COMPELS VISITORS TO THINK NAPA VALLEY WINES WHEN THEY RETURN HOME. IT HELPS MAKE OUR WINES MORE THAN THEY ARE. IT IS A MAJOR COMPONENT OF HOW PEOPLE FEEL ABOUT THE NAPA VALLEY AND ITS WINES. REMEMBER PERCEPTION IS OFTEN MORE IMPORTANT THAN REALITY. AND FINALLY IT GIVES WINERIES A BETTER PROFIT MARGIN WHEN THEY CAN SELL DIRECT. AND REMEMBER REVENUE FROM DIRECT SALES AND TAXES STAY IN NAPA CO.

INSTEAD OF FOCUSING ON LIMITING VISITATION, EVENTS AND PRODUCTION THE COUNTY SHOULD, IN MY VIEW, FOCUS ON HOW TO KEEP HOUSING DEVELOPMENT OUT OF THE AG AREAS. THE MORE HOUSES IN THE AG AREAS THE MORE THERE WILL BE PRESSURE TO CURTAIL, PUT LIMITATIONS AND GET RID OF AG. GROWTH, IF IT MUST BE, SHOULD BE CONCENTRATED IN THE TOWNS AND CITIES OF NAPA COUNTY.

WINERY EVENTS ARE SIMILARLY IMPORTANT FOR THE SAME REASONS. YOU CREATE POSITIVE FEELINGS, WIN OVER NEW AND RETAIN THE LOYALTY OF CURRENT CUSTOMERS WHILE EDUCATING THEM ABOUT WINE AND NAPA COUNTY WINES IN PARTICULAR. AND MOST IMPORTANTLY WE CAN

SHOW OFF OUR WINES AT HOSPITALITY EVENTS IN WINERY AND VINEYARD SETTINGS WHERE HUGE, POSITIVE IMPACTS ARE MADE.

FINALLY A MAJOR PART OF THE NAPA COUNTY TAX BASE COMES FROM THE WINE INDUSTRY, WHETHER IT BE SALES TAX ON DIRECT SALES, SALES AT RESTAURANTS AND ELSEWHERE, TOT TOURIST TAXES ON HOTELS OR PROPERTY TAXES ON HIGH VALUE VINEYARDS AND WINERIES. AS FOUND IN THE COUNTY'S RECENT TRAFFIC STUDY, NOT ALLOWING VISITATION TO NAPA COUNTY WOULD FORCE EACH NAPA COUNTY RESIDENT TO SPEND AN ADDITIONAL \$ 10,000 PER YEAR TO MAKE UP THE LOST TOT INCOME – THE ONLY TAX THAT REMAINS COMPLETELY IN NAPA COUNTY.

VISITATION IS A HUGE BOOST TO NAPA COUNTY'S ECONOMY AND NOT JUST BECAUSE OF THE TAXES IT RAISES. BESIDES BEING THE INDUSTRY EMPLOYING THE MOST PEOPLE IN NAPA CO., VISITATION ADDS TO THE COFFERS OF BUSINESSES AS DIVERSE AS BAKERIES, SHOE STORES, AUTO MECHANICS, GOLF COURSES, STATE PARKS, YOU NAME IT. WITHOUT A VIABLE WINE INDUSTRY ALL THE FORMER CRUMBLES AND THE HOUSING INDUSTRY BOOMS.

IN SUMMATION A STRONG NAPA VALLEY AG INDUSTRY CAN KEEP THIS COUNTY BEAUTIFUL, RURAL AND IN AG WHILE AT THE SAME TIME MAINTAINING A STRONG, VIBRANT ECONOMY WITH LOW UNEMPLOYMENT. INSTEAD OF PUTTING MORE AND MORE OBSTACLES IN FRONT OF WINERIES AND VINEYARDS, NAPA COUNTY SHOULD BE ON ITS KNEES THANKING THE WINE INDUSTRY AND TRYING TO MAKE THE PATHWAY EASIER, NOT MORE DIFFICULT.

PLACE UNDUE BURDENS AND RESTRICTIONS ON THE WINE INDUSTRY, AND IT IS THE BEGINNING OF THE END. PRECISELY FOR THAT REASON SOME WELL KNOWN NAPA CO. WINERIES ARE ALREADY MOVING ELSEWHERE, OUTSIDE OF THE COUNTY.

THE SOLUTIONS ARE RELATIVELY SIMPLE. I URGE ALL OF YOU NOT TO CAVE IN TO A VERY VOCAL, WELL MEANING, BUT IN MY VIEW WRONG, SMALL GROUP OF CITIZENS.

SINCERELY,

DARIO SATTUI

NAPA COUNTY
1984-2012 Land Use Summary
 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

LAND USE CATEGORY	ACREAGE BY CATEGORY (1)																	1984-2012 NET ACREAGE CHANGED
	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000 (2)	2002 (3)	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012			
Prime Farmland	25,870	27,151	27,803	28,261	28,467	29,548	29,519	29,936	31,515	31,894	32,446	31,999	31,742	31,621	31,379	5,509		
Farmland of Statewide Importance	4,805	5,426	5,842	6,860	7,264	7,338	7,432	8,063	9,082	9,696	9,792	9,679	9,798	9,709	9,740	4,935		
Unique Farmland	11,782	11,982	12,995	13,716	15,202	14,689	15,027	15,752	16,705	17,902	17,812	16,359	16,326	16,414	16,461	4,679		
Farmland of Local Importance	26,970	25,950	25,784	23,540	22,764	22,387	22,142	20,653	21,104	19,714	19,280	18,991	18,490	18,463	18,562	-8,408		
Important Farmland Subtotal	69,427	70,509	72,424	72,377	73,697	73,962	74,120	74,404	78,406	79,206	79,330	77,028	76,356	76,207	76,142	6,715		
Grazing Land	191,670	190,811	189,537	188,236	187,324	186,961	186,722	185,643	180,920	180,181	179,907	179,299	178,957	179,029	179,036	-12,634		
Agricultural Land Subtotal	261,097	261,320	261,961	260,613	261,021	260,923	260,842	260,047	259,326	259,387	259,237	256,327	255,313	255,236	255,178	-5,919		
Urban and Built-Up Land	17,450	17,750	18,450	19,346	19,824	20,212	20,325	20,599	21,114	21,397	22,244	22,815	23,328	23,556	23,535	6,085		
Other Land	204,767	204,245	202,903	203,296	202,413	202,075	202,157	202,678	203,024	202,676	201,981	204,320	204,825	204,670	203,796	-971		
Water Area	22,545	22,545	22,545	22,603	22,603	22,649	22,535	22,535	22,397	22,396	22,396	22,396	22,396	22,396	23,349	804		
Total Area Inventoried	505,859	505,860	505,859	505,858	505,861	505,859	505,859	505,859	505,861	505,856	505,858	505,858	505,863	505,858	505,858	-1		

(1) Figures are generated from the most current version of the GIS data. Files dating from 1984 through 1992 were reprocessed with a standardized county line in the Albers Equal Area projection, and other boundary improvements.

(2) Due to the incorporation of digital soil survey data (SSURGO) in 2000, acreages for farmland, grazing and other land categories may differ from those published in the 1998-2000 Farmland Conversion Report.

(3) Due to the incorporation of an updated digital soil survey data (SSURGO) during this update, acreages for farmland, grazing and other land use categories may differ from those published in the 2000-2002 California PERCENTAGE OF COUNTY INVENTORIED: 100%

Planning Commission Mtg.
 OCT 07 2015
 Agenda Item # 10B

