

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2014

COUNTY OF NAPA  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

April 30, 2014

The Board of Supervisors  
County of Napa  
1195 Third Street, Suite 310  
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Appeal of the November 6, 2013 Decision by the Napa County Planning Commission on the Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit No. P13-00187 Hearing Scheduled for May 20, 2014

Dear Supervisors:

I am a resident of Napa County and I reside at 2444 Soda Canyon Road, Napa 94558.

I object to the granting of the Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit Application on the basis that the proposed permitted activity, at that location, would overburden the existing aquifer for water usage on Mount Veeder, impacting numerous nearby residences in violation of the California Water Code. Furthermore, the availability of water for purchase for this project, from the City of Napa, or Napa County, is potentially unavailable due to the current drought status in California.

The trucking of water, to this proposed winery, in addition to the large number of visitors and several very large events per year, will create additional traffic hazards on Redwood Road and Mount Veeder Road. The entrance to the proposed winery is in a location with limited visibility, which will cause unsafe driving conditions for drivers and bicyclists on Mount Veeder Road and Redwood Road.

Given the lack of adequate mitigation for this project, the impact of the proposed winery is so negatively significant as to warrant denial of the permit application. I respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors deny the Woolls Ranch use permit application.

Respectfully Submitted,



David J Hallett  
2444 Soda Canyon Road, Napa 94558

## **Trippi, Sean**

---

**From:** Coil, Gladys  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 2:31 PM  
**To:** - Board of Supervisors  
**Cc:** Watt, Nancy; Link, Leanne; McDonnell, Nancy; Parkinson, Peter (Pete); Anderson, Laura; Kindig, Pam; Tran, Minh; Darbinian, Silva; Rattigan, Molly; Grisham, Pat; Prescott, Karita; Ingalls, Sue; Trippi, Sean; Gong, Jackie  
**Subject:** FW: Appeal of the Woolls Ranch Use Permit

Below is correspondence relating to the appeal hearing currently scheduled for May 20, 2014 @ 9:40 a.m.

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

Gladys I. Coil, CCB  
Administrative Manager-Clerk of the Board  
1195 Third Street, Room 310  
Napa, CA 94559  
707-253-4196  
FAX 707-253-4176

---

**From:** Bill Hocker  
**Sent:** Friday, May 02, 2014 6:10:53 PM  
**To:** Luce, Mark  
**Subject:** Appeal of the Woolls Ranch Use Permit

Re: Appeal of the November 6, 2013 Decision by the Napa County Planning Commission on the Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit No. P13-00187  
Hearing Scheduled for May 20, 2014

Dear Supervisor Luce:

I would respectfully request that you deny the Use Permit for the Woolls Ranch Winery to be located on Mt. Veeder Road. I do so for two reasons:

First, as is shown by the necessity of trucking water to the site and in the drying up of adjacent wells after water usage was increased on this site, the aquifer does not provide the .5 acre-ft per acre that the County assumes when granting a use permit. Water allowances approved by the County should have been based on actual water conditions determined by independent hydrologists before the use permit was approved rather than relying on an arbitrary and unsubstantiated number.

After years of essentially unregulated replacement of undeveloped watershed by vineyards which draw heavily on the aquifer, we are also entering a period of ever warmer weather which will drain the aquifer even more. If wells are already going dry and water must already be trucked then any proposed additional water usage should be denied and, in fact, developers should be required to come up with plans that reduce rather than increase current water consumption in their proposals.

To permit a winery with its increased water needs is irresponsible in such an area. To permit further water usage for the toilets and drinking water and dishwashers necessary to accomodate 22,000 tourists a year is an obscene use of the resources needed to maintain the agricultural health of the County. If water is in short supply it is incumbent upon the County to make sure that agricultural needs are met before any accessory uses are undertaken, and that means prohibiting those accessory uses.

Second, the argument, advanced at the Planning Commission hearing, that an aggressive tourism plan is necessary for the economic viability of the winery project since it is in such a remote location (or any location) is disturbing. If the project cannot be economically viable without tourism then the Ag Preserve is meaningless. The infrastructure of a tourism economy, for tasting rooms, and winery enlargements and hotels and restaurants and parking lots and upgraded roads all consume the land and water that the Ag Preserve was created to protect. If the county wishes an economy based on tourism, as a more profitable alternative to agriculture, then it should change its General Plan.

Over 1,000,000 gal/yr of winery capacity, 290,000 sf of new winery construction, and 250 winery parking spaces have been presented to the Planning Commission in the last year alone. New "marketing plans" with increased tasting, "wine pairings", "marketing events", on-site consumption and that holy of holies, wine auction participation, are being applied for by many wineries in the valley. All these permits will create pressure for more hotels, restaurants, and even more parking spaces.

Existing and permitted winery capacity in the County has probably already exceeding the ability of county grapegrowers to supply their 75% contribution. Watershed areas are reaching their limits for new vineyard development at the same time the County continues to permit new wineries and winery expansions every month to accommodate increased tourism. It is past time for the Supervisors to consider a moratorium on all winery construction and tourism marketing plans until someone has a chance to look at the cumulative effects that water depletion in a warming climate and that paving over vineyards for tourist attractions will have on the ability of the County to remain an agricultural economy. A good place to start the moratorium is with the tourist facility being planned for the water starved acres of Woolls Ranch.

Sincerely,

Bill Hocker,  
Resident of Napa County at  
3460 Soda Canyon Road  
Napa, CA 94558



## Trippi, Sean

---

**From:** Coil, Gladys  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 8:50 AM  
**To:** Luce, Mark; Link, Leanne; Tran, Minh; Darbinian, Silva; Rattigan, Molly; Grisham, Pat; Prescott, Karita; Kindig, Pam; Banks, Andrea; Ingalls, Sue; McDowell, John; Trippi, Sean; Parkinson, Peter (Pete); Gong, Jackie  
**Subject:** FW: Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit No. P13-00187 Hearing Scheduled for May 20, 2014

Below is correspondence relating to the appeal hearing currently scheduled for May 20, 2014 @ 9:40 a.m.

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

Gladys I. Coil, CCB  
Administrative Manager-Clerk of the Board  
1195 Third Street, Room 310  
Napa, CA 94559  
707-253-4196  
FAX 707-253-4176

---

**From:** Luce, Mark  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 01, 2014 2:29 PM  
**To:** Coil, Gladys  
**Subject:** FW: Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit No. P13-00187 Hearing Scheduled for May 20, 2014

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

---

**From:** Lynne Hallett  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 30, 2014 11:35:40 PM  
**To:** Wagenknecht, Brad; Dillon, Diane; Dodd, Bill; Caldwell, Keith; Luce, Mark  
**Subject:** Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit No. P13-00187 Hearing Scheduled for May 20, 2014

April 30 2014

County Administration Building

1195 Third Street, Suite 310  
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Appeal of the November 6, 2013 Decision by the Napa County Planning  
Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit No. P13-00187

Commission on the

Hearing Scheduled for May 20, 2014

Dear Supervisors:

I am a resident of Napa County and I reside at 2444 Soda Canyon Road, Napa 94558.

I object to the granting of the Woolls Ranch Winery Use Permit Application on the basis that the proposed permitted activity, at that location, would overburden the existing aquifer for water usage on Mount Veeder, impacting numerous nearby residences in violation of the California Water Code. Furthermore, the availability of water for purchase for this project, from the City of Napa, or Napa County, is potentially unavailable due to the current drought status in California.

The trucking of water to this proposed winery, in addition to the large number of visitors and several very large events per year, will create additional traffic hazards on Redwood Road and Mount Veeder Road. The entrance to the proposed winery is in a location with limited visibility, which will cause unsafe driving conditions for drivers and bicyclists on Mount Veeder Road and Redwood Road.

Given the lack of adequate mitigation for this project, the impact of the proposed winery is so negatively significant as to warrant denial of the permit application. I respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors deny the Woolls Ranch use permit application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lynne Hallett

2444 Soda Canyon Road

Napa, CA 94558

April 22, 2014

Mr. Mark Luce,  
Napa County Supervisor  
1195 Third Street, Room 310  
Napa, CA 94559

RE: Use Permit for Progeny Winery

Dear Mark,

I am writing in support of the Progeny Winery on Mt. Veeder. My understanding is the Planning Commission approved the Use Permit for the Progeny Winery on November 6, 2013. This approved Use Permit was, subsequently, put on hold in response to water usage issues raised by two adjoining neighbors. My assumption is that the neighbors contend that a small winery on the Woolls property will materially affect the availability of water on their properties.

Paul and Betty Woolls are among the most consciences people that I know. Everything they do is to the highest standard and purposely designed for minimal impact on the environment and the interests of owners of surrounding properties. They carefully integrated their commitment to minimal impact into every aspect of the design for their winery. They are justly proud that the design for their small winery accomplishes this purpose.

I admit to some confusion regarding the purpose of the scheduled hearing. The small winery, as proposed and approved, will not have a material impact on the availability of ground water in that location. A small winery just doesn't use that much more water than a single-family residence.

Thank you for an opportunity to express my views. I do hope that the prior decision is re-affirmed so that Paul and Betty Woolls can move ahead with their carefully designed small winery.

Best regards,

Robert Craig

cc. John.McDowell@countyofnapa.org.