

Agriculture Protection Advisory Committee [APAC] – *Protect Rural Napa*

How much growth can the wine industry/Napa County sustain?

What are we protecting? Ag or wine industry?

What are the issues? water analysis (is there enough), traffic, roads, watersheds, wild-land corridors, trees, quality of life, cumulative impacts, infrastructure, the economics of growth of wineries, over development

1. **Minimum parcel size for new wineries: [10-40 in AP?; 160 in AW] Is this change needed?**

- Yes. We are concerned about sustaining the future of the winery industry ✓✓✓
- Negotiation and Compromise - Start with the big stuff:
 - No new wineries in the AW (state the value of the watershed to sustaining the AP) ✓✓✓
 - No new wineries beyond CAP (carrying capacity of property)
 - No new wineries until we have a CAP
 - No new wineries in the AW and 40 in AP with CAP
 - 160 AW and 40 AP with CAP
 - At least 40 acre in AP, need 160 AW
 - New wineries in Industrial Parks only
 - Parcel size is irrelevant at best, at worst will push development to remote rural areas

2. **No Net Loss of vineyards in wineries: [in building new winery should consideration be made as to how much potential vineyard land would be lost to the building (wine production &/or 'hospitality')]**

- If wineries are to be built yes, there should be protection of vineyard land AND food production land.
- No removal of vines for winery construction.
- Yes ✓✓✓
- New wineries should be located on industrial zones for numerous reasons; traffic, safety, preservation of ag, water, open space and quality of life

3. **Estate Grape requirement for new wineries: [what % grapes should be grown on the winery parcel]**

- Yes. 100% would be most stringent obviously.
- "Estate" to be defined, if parcels are continuous then 75%.
- 25%
- 100% that is what I would expect to have in the bottle as a consumer reading the label
- a winery needs to have a legitimate agricultural tie-in with the land owned by the winery, 50%

4. **Different standards in AP & AW zones, [if yes, then suggestions for different standards]:**

- More restrictions in AP. Push development to less sensitive areas in AW and/or south county. I'd like to see more protections for AW areas.
- No except of suggested acreages
- Yes
- Yes, in the AW need significantly more strict criteria in order to protect the very sensitive....
- AW – no net impact on hydrograph and net impact on groundwater levels *must recharge groundwater annually to offset pumping

5. Limiting the amount of setback variance allowed: [currently 600' – AP, 300 AW]

- NO VARIANCES! A Variance is not in compliance with the law.
- NO Variances
- Yes, no variances
- Do not allow variances. What have a rule if it is not enforced?
- There should not be any variances granted in the set back ordinance, NONE

6. Including Temporary events in the use permits:

- NO, Make wineries ask for more permits so might appreciate the value of a “temporary” permit?
- Yes, if up states an annual maximum then all events should count to the total
- NO
- Develop regional event centers in urban areas that work as corporate timeshares and discontinue special on-site event at wineries

7. Majority of employees in the vineyard or production [not hospitality/marketing]:

- YES
- Difficult to police, can be moved from one to the other at will
- Yes
- A given winery should primarily be agricultural in nature, so yes the majority of employees should be in vineyard/production
-

8. Other Issues [such as Compliance, Enforcement, water, etc....]

- Compliance
- Water Use
- Napa County should invest in existing wine industry and work to diversify economic base for county so it is more robust. Existing extent of wine-related development is already drawing criticism, permitting more is not appropriate response
- Enforcement of visitor limits
- Enforcement of gallon-age permitted
- Enforcement of market events, the limitations thereof