



Mayor: Ann Nevero
Vice Mayor Sharon Crull
City Council: Greg Pitts
Mario Sculatti
Peter White

REGULAR MEETING
ST. HELENA CITY COUNCIL
VINTAGE HALL BOARD ROOM – SECOND FLOOR
465 MAIN STREET, ST. HELENA
AUGUST 12, 2014
5:00 PM CLOSED SESSION
6:00 PM REGULAR MEETING

PLEASE NOTE: Any person who wishes to speak regarding an item on the agenda or make a comment under the “Oral Communication” portion of the agenda may voluntarily complete a “Speaker Card” and submit it to the City Clerk BEFORE that portion of the agenda is called. Speaker cards are available on the table in back of the room. Please observe the time limit of three minutes.

- 1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. PUBLIC COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE CLOSED SESSION**
- 4. CLOSED SESSION**
 - a. **CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL--ANTICIPATED LITIGATION**
Whether to initiate litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9; (One case.)
- 5. OPEN SESSION – COUNCIL WILL RETURN TO OPEN SESSION AND ANNOUNCE ACTIONS TAKEN IF ANY (6:00 P.M.)**
- 6. PUBLIC FORUM:** Members of the public are entitled to speak on matters of municipal concern not on the agenda during Public Forum. Each person’s comments shall be limited to 3 minutes. Each person is entitled to speak on any non-agendized item only once at any meeting. Brief questions by Councilmembers for clarifications may be posed and answered, and Councilmembers may make requests that items be placed on future agendas, but in accordance with state law, no substantive discussion or action may take place unless and until the matter properly appears on the agenda.
- 7. REPORTS BY STAFF AND CITY COUNCIL, FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, and AB 1234 REPORTS:** Reports by staff and/or Councilmembers on items of general interest. Brief questions for clarification may be posed and answered, and Councilmembers may request that items be placed on a future agenda. Except under certain circumstances, the Brown Act prohibits any other discussion or action by the City Council.

CONSENT ITEMS: Members of the Council or the public may ask that any items be considered individually for purposes of considering alternative action, for extended discussion, or for public comment. Unless that is done, one motion may be used to adopt all recommended actions. (Roll Call Vote)

8. Consideration of approving out of state travel for FBI National Academy for Lt. William Imboden

Recommended Action: Approve

9. Consideration to adopt second reading of Ordinance entitled “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of St. Helena approving a Zoning Map Amendment to change the Zoning Designation on Property Generally Located at 700 Dowdell Lane in the City of St. Helena from Twenty Acre Agriculture (A-20) District to the W:Winery District (Crocker & Starr Winery)”

CEQA: Mitigated Negative Declaration (previously adopted by Resolution No. 2014-52)

Recommended Action: Adopt

10. Resolution approving an extension of Tentative Parcel Map 2005-77 for one (1) year

Recommended Action: Approve

SCHEDULED MATTERS

First Reading and Introduction of an ordinance adding a new Chapter 8.36 entitled “Single-Use Carryout Bag Reduction” to Title 8 of the St. Helena Municipal Code to regulate the use of single-use carryout bags by specified retailers.

CEQA: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15307, 15308, 150619(b)(3)

Lead Staff: Christine O’Rourke, Consultant

Estimated time: 30 minutes

ADJOURNMENT The next Regular City Council meeting is scheduled for August 26, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. in the Vintage Hall Board Room located at 465 Main Street. This agenda was posted at City Hall, 1480 Main Street, and at Vintage Hall, 465 Main Street, St. Helena, California on August 7, 2014.

Dawn Marshall, Deputy City Clerk

CHALLENGING DECISIONS OF CITY ENTITIES

The time limit within which to commence any lawsuit or legal challenge to any quasi-adjudicative decision made by the City of St. Helena is governed by Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, unless a shorter limitation period is specified by any other provision, including without limitation Government Code section 65009 applicable to many land use and zoning decisions, Government Code section 66499.37 applicable to the Subdivision Map Act, and Public Resources Code section 21167 applicable to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under Section 1094.6, any lawsuit or legal challenge to any quasi-adjudicative decision made by the City must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which such decision becomes final. Any lawsuit or legal challenge, which is not filed within that 90-day period, will be barred. Government Code section 65009 and 66499.37, and Public Resources Code section 21167, impose shorter limitations periods and requirements, including

timely service in addition to filing.

If a person wishes to challenge the above actions in court, they may be limited to raising only those issues they or someone else raised at the meeting described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City of St. Helena, at or prior to the meeting. In addition, judicial challenge may be limited or barred where the interested party has not sought and exhausted all available administrative remedies.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL RECEIVED AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA

Any supplemental writings or documents distributed to a majority of the City Council regarding any item on this Agenda, after the posting of the Agenda, will be available for public review in the City Clerk's Office located at 1480 Main Street, St. Helena, California, during normal business hours. In addition, such writings or documents will be made available on the City's web site at <http://cityofstheleena.org> and will be available for public review at the respective meeting.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.

STAFF REPORT



DATE: August 12, 2014

TO: Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Jacqueline Rubin, Chief of Police

Item No. 8

RE: Approval of Out of State Travel for FBI National Academy for Lt. William Imboden

BACKGROUND:

The F.B.I. National Academy is a highly prestigious and recommended law enforcement training course. The National Academy consists of graduate level courses designed for law enforcement managers who are leaders in their organizations or whom desire to be leaders in their organization. The courses focus on leadership and management. The National Academy is a highly sought after and competitive, ten week course of instruction that requires stringent prerequisites for admission and completion. The application process is lengthy, includes applicants from around the world and only a few chosen applicants are admitted every year. The Academy is ten weeks long and is held the F.B.I. Academy in Quantico, Virginia. (Twelve to fifteen college units are gained from the course.)

I recommended Lt. William Imboden for the F.B.I. National Academy approximately one year ago. The process is conducted by the F.B.I. and includes a complete background and physical. Lt. Imboden was accepted into the October 2014 Academy Class.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:

Graduates of the F.B.I. National Academy course are more likely to become effective leaders in their organization and have an open line of communication with law enforcement leaders throughout the United States and around the world. The connections and knowledge gained during the academy is an asset to the agency and the city.

Positions at the F.B.I. National Academy are extremely limited. Securing a position and sending Lt. Imboden demonstrates a progressive mindset for the department and assists with the mentoring process. The police department has not recommended anyone to the F.B.I. National Academy in over a decade.

Lt. Imboden would be in Quantico, Virginia from October 5, 2014 through December 19, 2014.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Academy courses, food, lodging, and flight are covered by the Federal Government. The Chief will cover the hours missed during the ten week course at no cost. The only cost is a rental car and gas at an approximate cost of \$1,800.00 for the ten week course for Lt. Imboden and \$466.00 in airfare for the Chief to attend the graduation.

Total Cost \$2266.00

ALTERNATIVES:

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

Approve Lt. Imboden's travel to the F.B.I. National Academy and the Chief's attendance at Graduation.

To: City Council

From: Victor Carniglia, Interim Planning Director

Approved By: Jennifer Phillips, City Manager

Date: August 6, 2014

Subject: Agenda Item #9, The Second Reading of the Ordinance Rezoning the 22.3 acre Crocker Property Located at 700 Dowdell Lane, changing the Zoning From Agricultural A-20 to W: Winery

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt at a second reading the Ordinance Rezoning the 22.3 acre Crocker Property located at 700 Dowdell Lane from Agricultural: A-20 to W: Winery. The City Council on July 22, 2014 adopted the proposed Zone change at a first reading.

CITY OF ST. HELENA

ORDINANCE NO. 2014-7

APPROVING A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE ZONING DESIGNATION ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 700 DOWDELL LANE IN THE CITY OF ST. HELENA FROM THE TWENTY ACRE AGRICULTURE (A-20) DISTRICT TO THE W:WINERY DISTRICT (CROCKER & STARR WINERY)

APNS: 009-120-059

APPLICANT & PROPERTY OWNER: Charles Crocker

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ST. HELENA DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: Findings. The City Council determines as follows:

A. Charles Crocker owns a 22.3-acre parcel of real property (the “Property”) commonly addressed as 700 Dowdell Lane in the City of St. Helena, California, and more specifically identified by Napa County Assessor’s Parcel Number 009-120-059.

B. The Property is currently developed with an existing farmhouse and a stone agricultural structure, with vineyards planted on the majority of the site. The Property is designated “Agriculture” on the General Plan Land Use Map and zoned “Twenty-Acre (A-20) Agriculture” on the City’s Zoning Map.

C. Charles Crocker has requested an Amendment to the Zoning Map to change the existing zoning designation for the Property from the Twenty-Acre (A-20) Agricultural District to the W: Winery District (the “Zoning Map Amendment”). The requested Zoning Map Amendment is permitted under the existing General Plan land use designation and, therefore, does not require a corresponding General Plan amendment.

D. The full project as proposed includes the Zoning Map Amendment, a Use Permit, and a Design Review Permit to establish and construct a new 9,950-square foot, 25,000-gallon per year wine production facility at the Property (the “Project”). The Project will also convert the existing structures (which encompass a total of 2,400 square feet of area) to winery uses—the farmhouse will be used for storage and overflow administration uses, and the stone structure will be used for tastings and other marketing events held on-site.

E. In accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000 and following) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, sections 15000 and following) (collectively, “CEQA”), City staff has caused to be prepared an Initial Study and approved for circulation a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project (the “Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration”).

F. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for public and agency review and comment on May 29, 2014, through June 18, 2014. Copies of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration were made available to the public at City Hall on May 29, 2014, and the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was distributed to interested parties and agencies. On May 29, 2014, a Notice of Availability of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, including the time and place of the Planning Commission meeting to review the Project and Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was published in the local newspaper and posted at the project site.

G. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that implementation of the Project could result in a number of significant effects on the environment and identified mitigation measures that would reduce the significant effects to a less-than-significant level.

H. In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (the “Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program”) has been prepared for the Project.

I. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and related Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project are, by this reference, incorporated into and expressly form a part of this Ordinance.

J. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and all related environmental documents forming the basis for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration are located in, and in the custody of, the Planning Department of the City of St. Helena.

K. The Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on June 17, 2014, to consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Zoning Map Amendment, and the other Project components. Evidence, both written and oral, including staff reports and supporting documentation, public testimony, and comments from members of the Planning Commission was presented at said hearing. At the conclusion of said hearing, the Planning Commission voted 4-1 to recommend that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, approve the requested Zoning Map Amendment, and approve the Project.

L. The City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on July 22, 2014, to consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration and related Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Zoning Map Amendment, and other Project components. Evidence, both written and oral, including staff reports and supporting documentation, the Planning Commission’s recommendations, and public testimony was presented at said hearing.

M. In accordance with the requirements set forth St. Helena Municipal Code Section 17.12.050, the City Council finds the Zoning Map Amendment is consistent with the provisions of the St. Helena General Plan and St. Helena Zoning Code, and that the proposed zone change is compatible with the underlying General Plan land use designation of Agriculture.

N. The City Council further finds that the Zoning Map Amendment specifically advances the following goals and objectives from the General Plan:

- **ES1.2** To identify and expand economic sectors in which the City has competitive advantages, and capitalize on these strengths in order to diversify local economic activities and strengthen St. Helena’s role as an agricultural-based service center for the surrounding area.
- **ES2.1** Support the development of responsible visitor-serving components to the City’s economy as a valuable source of jobs, tax revenues, and cultural amenities.
- **ES2.2** Encourage visitor-serving uses oriented toward a more discriminating upscale market consistent with the Valley’s reputation as a producer of world-class wines. Discourage the introduction of uses that are dependent upon a mass tourist market.

O. In addition, the City Council finds that the Zoning Map Amendment to allow an agricultural processing facility (winery) for estate-grown grapes, where the winery has large land holdings of producing vineyards under common ownership, promotes and protects agriculture as a viable staple of the local economy.

P. The City Council also finds that the Zoning Map Amendment is consistent with the agricultural and wine-based economy of the area, and protects and enhances the community character reflecting these components.

Q. The City Council finds that the Zoning Map Amendment will not impact existing or planned residential neighborhoods, as the Property is located adjacent to a large Industrial Park, is near a major traffic arterial (State Highway 29/Main Street South), and is not in close proximity to concentrations of residential use.

R. Further, the City Council finds that the Zoning Map Amendment does not set a precedent for other A-20 zoned parcels to rezone to W (Winery). There is a very limited number of A-20 parcels that (i) are at least 20 acres in size, (ii) are not located in close proximity to residential land uses, and (iii) have an underlying General Plan land use designation of Agriculture.

S. The City Council finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program fully mitigate any potential adverse impacts for the Project and there will be no potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the Zoning Map Amendment or implementation of the Project, as mitigated and conditioned.

SECTION 2: Zoning Map Amended. The City Council hereby amends the Zoning Map to change the zoning designation of the Property (APN 009-120-059) from the Twenty-Acre (A-20) Agricultural District to the W:Winery District.

SECTION 3: Compliance with CEQA. Concurrently with its consideration of the Zoning Map Amendment, the City Council adopted **Resolution No. 2014-___** adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project. The

CEQA findings set forth in **Resolution No. 2014-___** are incorporated herein by this reference and expressly made a part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 4: Severability. The City Council hereby declares every section, paragraph, sentence, cause and phrase is severable. If any section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason found to be invalid or unconstitutional, such invalidity, or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of the remaining sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases.

SECTION 5: Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force 30 days after its adoption, and a summary of this ordinance shall be published once with the names of the members of the Council voting for and against the ordinance in the St. Helena Star, a newspaper of general circulation published in the city of St. Helena.

THE FOREGOING ORDINANCE was introduced at a regular meeting of the St. Helena City Council on the 22nd day of July, 2014, and was adopted at a regular meeting of the St. Helena City Council on the ___ day of _____, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Ann Nevero, Mayor

ATTEST:

Cindy Black, Interim City Clerk

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.

STAFF REPORT



DATE: August 12, 2014

TO: Mayor and City Council
FROM: Victor Carniglia, Interim Planning Director

Item No: 10

RE: Resolution approving an extension of Tentative Parcel Map 2005-77 for one (1) year.

BACKGROUND

On June 5, 2007 Tentative Parcel Map 2005-77 (TPM 2005-77) was approved by the Planning Commission. TPM 2005-77 enabled John Euser and Robert Greer, of Rutherford Investors, LLC to divide a 40,946 sf parcel into four parcels of 9,448 sf; 9,286 sf; 11,307 sf; and 10,736 sf. By the terms of the Initial Approval by the Planning Commission, the map was set to expire after two-years on June 5, 2009. However, the map has been extended by a series of actions by the state legislature as follows:

Government Code §66452.21, effective July 15, 2008 extended for one year the life of any approved tentative map that had not expired as of July 15, 2008, but that would – but for the adoption of SB 1185 – expire before January 1, 2011. Thus, §66452.21 extended the life of TPM 2005-77 until June 5, 2010.

Government Code §66452.22, effective July 15, 2009 extends for 24 months any tentative map that had not expired as of July 15, 2009, but that would – but for the addition of §66452.22 to the Code - expire before January 1, 2012. Thus, §66452.22 extended the life of TPM 2005-77 until June 5, 2012.

Government Code §66452.23, effective July 15, 2011 extends for 24 months any tentative map that had not expired as of July 15, 2011, but that would – but for the addition of §66452.23 to the Code - expire before January 1, 2014. Thus, §66452.23 extended the life of TPM 2005-77 until June 5, 2014.

The applicant has indicated that they are ready to proceed with the work necessary to fulfill the conditions required for the recording of a final map, but due to the complexity of the required infrastructure improvements, needs one final extension in order to complete the requirements and record the final map. The applicant submitted a Tentative Parcel Map Extension on April 30, 2014 before it was set to expire on June 5, 2014.

DISCUSSION

The property is designated Medium Density Residential and is located in the southwest quadrant of the city limits with frontage on Sulphur Springs Ave. Each of the lots created by the subdivision is over the 7,000 sf minimum standard.

According to Government Code §66452.6(a), by local ordinance, a city can extend the initial life of a tentative map up to an additional 12 months.

According to §16.16.110 of the St. Helena Municipal Code, upon application of the subdivider filed at least twenty (20) days prior to the expiration of the tentative map, the time at which such map expires may be extended by the City Council for one year, and on further application twenty (20) days before the expiration of the one year extension, the subdivider may request a second one-year extension, and on further application twenty (20) days before the expiration of the second one-year extension may request a third one-year extension. No extension shall be permitted beyond the third one-year extension. All extensions to this point have been by action of the State. This is the first request for an extension by the City Council.

An extension of time may be granted if the City Council finds the subdivision, at the time the application for the extension of time is heard, conforms to the then-existing general plan, is consistent with the zoning of the parcels and conforms to the improvement standards that are being imposed upon similar new subdivisions. The previously approved subdivision remains consistent with the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and has improvement standards similar to new subdivisions. Per City of St. Helena Municipal Code §3.32.040(B), development impact fees shall be paid by the owner of the property on which new development or conversion is to occur. The fees shall be collected by the City prior to the issuance of building or development permit(s) for such development or conversion, whichever occurs later. Therefore, the owner will be responsible for paying all current impact fees prior to the issuance of permits.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no negative fiscal impact to the City by approving an extension of TPM 2005-77.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION

1. Adopt Resolution **Number #** approving an extension of Tentative Parcel Map 2005-77 for one (1) year (will expire June 5, 2015).

ATTACHMENTS/EXHIBITS

- A. Resolution Number **#**
- B. Written Statement
- C. TPM 2005-77
- D. Tentative Parcel Map

STAFF REPORT



DATE: August 12, 2014
TO: Mayor and City Council
FROM: Christine O'Rourke, Consultant
RE: Introduction of Single-Use Carryout Bag Reduction Ordinance

Item No. 11

Summary

Consider introducing an ordinance establishing Chapter 8.36, "Single-Use Carryout Bag Reduction," of the St. Helena Municipal Code regulating the use of single-use carryout bags by specified retailers.

Background

On July 23, 2013, City Council received a presentation from Napa Valley CanDo, a local non-profit community service organization, on single-use carryout bags. The Council directed the Sustainability Committee to draft an ordinance for Council consideration. The Council further requested that the Committee conduct outreach to local retailers and work with other Napa jurisdictions to draft a common ordinance that could be adopted by all agencies so that regulations could be consistent across jurisdictions.

Discussion

Ordinances banning single-use carryout bags are becoming increasingly popular throughout the world and in the United States. In California, many cities and counties have either adopted plastic bag ban ordinances or are currently in the process of adopting them. According to Californians Against Waste, 80 California jurisdictions, covering 109 cities and counties, have adopted ordinances to date. The majority of these ordinances are designed to regulate the use of plastic and paper carryout bags and to promote the use of reusable bags.

Plastic Bags

Single-use carryout bags are typically made of thin, lightweight high density polyethylene. For consumers, they offer a hygienic and sturdy carrying sack. Currently, almost 20 billion of these plastic grocery bags are consumed annually in California.¹ According to a study conducted for the California Integrated Waste Management Board in 2008, plastic makes up almost 10% of California's disposed waste stream. Plastic grocery and other merchandise bags are only a small part of the waste stream, accounting for less than 0.3% of the total waste stream. Nonetheless,

¹ "Master Environmental Assessment on Single-Use and Resuable Bags," Green Cities California, March 2010.

approximately 123,400 tons of plastic grocery and merchandise bags are deposited annually in California landfills.²

Statewide, almost 20 billion single use plastic carryout bags are consumed annually in California, representing approximately 531 bags per resident.³ The majority is deposited in landfills, while a significant portion ends up as unsightly litter, obstructing storm drains and drainageways, and imposing litter removal costs on local governments. Plastic bags that end up in the Napa River, the bay and the ocean pose risks for marine animals and birds that ingest the plastic bags (or the residue of plastic bags) or become tangled in the bag.⁴

Only approximately 5% of plastic bags in California and nationwide are currently recycled.⁵ Although some recycling facilities will handle plastic bags, most reject them because they can get caught in the machinery and cause malfunctioning, or are contaminated after use. In St. Helena, Upper Valley Disposal and Recycling accepts plastic grocery bags for recycling; these should be placed in the blue single stream recycling cart. Consumers may also bring plastic carryout bags to large retailers for recycling. State law requires all regulated supermarkets and large retail stores with a pharmacy that provide plastic bags to their customers to provide plastic bag collection bins in an accessible location. In St. Helena, Safeway provides a plastic bag collection bin.

Paper Bags

Single-use paper bags, like their plastic counterparts, are intended for grocery and merchandise shopping. Paper products make up 17% of the California disposal waste stream. Paper bags, including paper grocery bags, fast food bags, and department store bags, make up 0.4% of the total disposed waste stream, or approximately 155,800 tons annually.⁶

Paper bags are recycled at a higher rate than single-use plastic bags. Approximately 49.5% of paper bags nationwide are recycled.⁷ Still, over its lifetime, a single-use paper bag has significantly larger greenhouse gas emissions and results in greater atmospheric acidification, water consumption, and ozone production than plastic bags. Paper bag production and disposal

² “California 2008 Statewide Waste Characterization Study,” California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

³ “Master Environmental Assessment on Single-Use and Resuable Bags,” Green Cities California, March 2010.

⁴ “Master Environmental Assessment on Single-Use and Resuable Bags,” Green Cities California, March 2010

⁵ “Master Environmental Assessment on Single-Use and Resuable Bags,” Green Cities California, March 2010.

⁶ “California 2008 Statewide Waste Characterization Study,” California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

⁷ “Municipal Solid Waste in the United States 2011 Facts and Figures,” United States Environmental Protection Agency, May 2013.

results in over 3 times the greenhouse gas emissions associated with single-use plastic bags and consumes 4 times as much water.⁸

Effects of a Single-Use Carryout Bag Ban

Los Angeles County enacted an ordinance banning single-use plastic bags and imposing a 10 cent charge on recycled content paper carryout bags, effective July 2011. The ordinance covers about 800 stores. Los Angeles reports that among large stores, the ordinance resulted in a 95% reduction in single-use bags (both plastic and paper) and a 30% reduction in paper bag usage. Incorporating all stores, paper bag usage declined 16%.

State Regulation

In 2006, California enacted AB 2449 (Chapter 845, Statutes of 2006), which became effective on July 1, 2007. The statute requires all regulated stores to provide at least one plastic bag collection bin in an accessible spot to collect used bags for recycling. The store operator must also make reusable bags available to shoppers for purchase. AB 2449 applies to:

- A retail establishment that has over 10,000 square feet of retail space that generates sales tax and has a licensed pharmacy.
- A supermarket that has a full-line, self-service, retail store with gross annual sales of \$2 million or more and which sells a line of dry groceries, canned goods, non-food items, or perishable goods.

In September 2012, SB 1219 extended the sunset provision of AB 2449 to January 1, 2020. It also removed a provision that prohibited local governments from imposing a plastic carryout bag fee upon stores regulated by State law.

Legislative action at the state level to ban single-use plastic bags has repeatedly failed to pass over the past several years, but Senate Bill 270 is making significant progress this year. SB 270 passed the Senate and has advanced to the Assembly. Most recently, it passed the Assembly Natural Resources Committee on May 14, 2014, and was referred to the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 270 has the following provisions:

1. Applies to: large grocery stores (minimum gross annual sales of \$2 million); stores of at least 10,000 square feet that have a pharmacy; and convenience food stores, food marts, or other

⁸ “Master Environmental Assessment on Single-Use and Resuable Bags,” Green Cities California, March 2010.

stores that sells milk, bread, soda and snack foods and has a Type 20 or Type 21 license issued by the Dept. of Alcoholic Beverage Control.

2. Prohibits covered stores from providing customers with single-use carryout bags.
3. Exempts: bags provided for prescription medicine; nonhandled bags used to protect items from damaging or contaminating other items when placed in a carryout bag; bags that contain unwrapped food items; and nonhandled bags designed to be placed over articles of clothing on a hanger.
4. Allows covered stores to provide recycled paper bags and reusable bags if they are made available for not less than 10 cents.
5. Allows covered stores to sell compostable bags for not less than 10 cents if a majority of households in the jurisdiction have access to curbside collection of food waste for composting and the jurisdiction has voted to allow them.
6. Goes into effect on July 1, 2015.
7. Allows a jurisdiction to enforce the law by imposing civil fines.
8. Prohibits jurisdictions from passing their own plastic bag ban ordinance after January 1, 2015.
9. Allows jurisdictions that adopt a local ordinance before September 1, 2014, to continue to enforce that ordinance, and to make any amendments to it up until January 1, 2015. After that time, the only amendment the jurisdiction may make is to increase the amount that is charged for the recycled paper, reusable or compostable bag (but not less than 10 cents).
10. Allows jurisdictions that pass a first reading of an ordinance before September 1, 2014, and adopt the ordinance before January 1, 2015, to enforce that ordinance.

Draft Ordinance

The proposed ordinance is based on a model ordinance developed in cooperation with the City of Napa and other Napa County jurisdictions. The ordinance would ban the distribution of plastic carryout bags by all retailers except take-out food establishments, or any other business that receives 90% or more of its revenue from the sale of prepared food. Retailers who choose to make paper bags available to customers as an alternative must charge at least 10 cents for each paper carryout bag provided. The ordinance would exempt plastic or paper product bags (bags without handles used for produce, meat or bulk food items), bags for prescription drugs, bags used to segregate merchandise that could damage or contaminate other merchandise when placed in a carry-out bag, and bags used to wrap meat, fish or frozen food.

Retail stores would be required to itemize the charge for each paper or reusable bag on the customer receipt. The paper bag charge would not be applicable to customers who participate in the state's Supplemental Food Program. The charges accumulated by the sale of paper carryout bags would be retained by the merchant to offset the increased costs of paper vs. plastic bags.

The proposed ordinance would be phased in as follows:

- Supermarkets with at least \$2,000,000 in annual sales would be required to comply with the ordinance beginning January 1, 2015, and
- All other retail stores would be required to comply with the ordinance beginning July 1, 2015.

The proposed ordinance is very similar to the City of Napa's draft ordinance except that Napa's ordinance would apply to all retailers beginning January 1, 2015. The other Napa jurisdictions are reportedly working on a single-use bag reduction ordinances.

Community Input and Sustainability Committee Recommendation

The Sustainability Committee discussed the draft ordinance at several meetings and gathered input from the Chamber of Commerce and other interested community members. While the Chamber of Commerce supports a ban on plastic bags, they have advocated for an exemption for "gift bags" or "branded shopping bags" that have become a marketing and branding item for retailers (see attached letter from the St. Helena Chamber of Commerce). The Sustainability Committee considered this request but ultimately felt there are suitable replacement bags available that meet the ordinance requirements, i.e., paper bags that contain at least 40% recycled material, are fully recyclable (no ribbon handles), and have printed on the outside of the bag the word "Recyclable," the name and location of the manufacturer, and the percentage of post-consumer recycled content. The Committee agreed to recommend phasing in the ordinance for small retailers so they would have adequate time to use up their stock of existing carryout bags and obtain replacement bags.

If the Council determines that "gift bags" should be exempt from the ordinance, then the following changes to the ordinance must be made:

8.36.020 Definitions

K. "Single-Use Carryout Bag" means a bag provided by a Retail Establishment to a Customer at the check stand cash register, point of sale or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting merchandise out of the establishment, provided that "Single-Use Carryout Bag" specifically excludes any Reusable Bag, ~~or~~ Recycled Paper Bag or Gift Bag and excludes any bag provided to the Customer to (1) transport produce, bulk food or meat from a produce, bulk food or meat department within a store to the point of sale; (2) hold prescription medication dispensed from a pharmacy; (3) segregate merchandise that could damage or contaminate other merchandise when placed together in a Reusable Bag or Recycled Paper Bag; or (4) contain or wrap meat, fish, or frozen foods, whether prepackaged or not.

L. "Specialty Bag or Gift Bag" means a paper shopping bag made of a minimum 175 grams per square meter paper weight, with a flat bottom, side gussets, reinforced turn top, and ribbon, rope or cord handles.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

There have been a number of CEQA lawsuits filed and threatened by the Save the Plastic Bag Coalition in response to local agencies adopting a bag ban ordinance without the preparation of an EIR. In June 2013, the California Court of Appeals upheld the County of Marin's determination that their single-use carryout bag ordinance was categorically exempt from CEQA. Marin County enacted an ordinance that bans single-use plastic bags at grocery stores, pharmacies and convenience stores and imposes a minimum 5 cent fee on single-use paper bags. The ordinance affects about 40 retailers in the unincorporated areas of the county. The County determined it was categorically exempt from CEQA because it was a regulatory action designed to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of natural resources and the environment.

The proposed single-use carryout bag reduction ordinance relies upon the same CEQA categorical exemptions used by the County of Marin. The action to adopt the ordinance is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) (CEQA) because the ordinance is a regulatory action that will protect natural resources and the environment generally and is, therefore, categorically exempt from further CEQA review under Sections 15307 and 15308 of the CEQA "Guidelines." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§ 15307, 15308.) In addition, the action to adopt the ordinance is exempt from CEQA because there is no possibility that the adoption of the ordinance may have a significant effect on the environment. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15061(b)(3)).

Alternatives

The Council may choose to:

- Approve the amendments to the Municipal Code by adoption of the attached ordinance.
- Modify or eliminate any of the proposed amendments,
- Continue consideration of the amendments for further analysis, or
- Choose to not adopt regulations on single use carryout bags.

Attachments

1. Draft Ordinance
2. Letter from the St. Helena Chamber of Commerce dated July 15, 2014

Draft

CITY OF ST. HELENA

ORDINANCE NO. ____

**ADDING A NEW CHAPTER 8.36, “SINGLE-USE
CARRYOUT BAG REDUCTION,” TO TITLE 8 OF THE
ST. HELENA MUNICIPAL CODE**

**THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ST. HELENA DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS
FOLLOWS:**

SECTION 1: Findings

The City Council finds as follows:

1. The use of all single-use shopping bags (plastic, paper, biodegradable) causes severe environmental impacts, including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, litter, harm to wildlife, ground level ozone formation, atmospheric acidification, water consumption and solid waste generation; and
2. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board’s 2009 study of single-use plastic bag recycling rates, in 2009, approximately Nineteen Billion (19,000,000,000) single-use plastic bags were used in California but less than 5% were recycled (<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/publications/Detail.aspx?PublicationID=1373>); and
3. The City Council takes legislative notice of a compilation of numerous studies that point to the economic and environmental benefits of recycling and waste reduction, including the benefits of such practices on governmental efficiency and public cost savings, assembled and indexed by Californians Against Waste at www.cawrecycles.org/facts_and_stats; and
4. Numerous studies such as the California Coastal Commission’s 2006 study titled “Eliminating Land-based Discharges of Marine Debris in California: A Plan of Action from The Plastic Debris Project” (http://www.plasticdebris.org/CA_Action_Plan_2006.pdf), have documented the prevalence of single-use plastic carry-out bags littering the environment, blocking storm drains and fouling beaches; and

5. According to the Natural Resources Defense Council, California cities spend about \$11 per resident to keep litter from ending up in our oceans as marine pollution, and clean-up of plastic bags is estimated to be between 8% to 25% of the litter clean-up costs (http://docs.nrdc.org/oceans/oce_13082701.asp), and the City of St. Helena's General Fund must bear the brunt of the clean-up costs of this litter; and
6. Plastic bags are a significant source of marine debris and are hazardous to marine animals and birds which may confuse single-use plastic carry-out bags for a source of food resulting in entanglement, suffocation, poisoning, and death to at least 267 species worldwide including sea turtles, birds, and marine animals (Laist, D. W., 1997. Impacts of marine debris: entanglement of marine life in marine debris including a comprehensive list of species with entanglement and ingestion records. In: Coe, J. M. and D. B. Rogers (Eds.), Marine Debris – Sources, Impacts and Solutions. Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 99-139); and
7. Of all single-use bags, single-use plastic bags have the greatest impacts on litter and marine life (Green Cities California, March 2010. Master Environmental Assessment on Single-Use and Reusable Bags); and
8. The use of single-use paper bags result in greater (GHG) emissions, atmospheric acidification, water consumption, and ground-level ozone production than single-use plastic bags (Green Cities California, March 2010. Master Environmental Assessment on Single-Use and Reusable Bags); and
9. The various studies contained in the City's legislative record suggest that from an overall environmental and economic perspective, a sustainable, practical and appropriate alternative to single-use plastic and paper carry-out bags is a shift to reusable bags; and
10. There are several alternatives to single-use carry-out bags readily available in the City of St. Helena, including the use of reusable bags or the reuse of recycled paper bags; and
11. An important goal of the City is to procure and use sustainable products and services; and
12. It is the City's desire to conserve resources, reduce the amount of GHG emissions, waste, litter and marine pollution and to protect the public health and welfare including wildlife, all of which increase the quality of life for the City's residents and visitors; and
13. Studies such as the "Implementation of the County of Los Angeles Plastic and Paper Carryout Bag Ordinance" (<http://ladpw.org/epd/aboutthebag/PDF/Bag%20Ban%20Status%20Nov%202012.pdf>) document that prohibiting plastic bag distribution and placing a mandatory charge on paper bags will dramatically reduce the use of both types of bags; and
14. The City will not receive any revenue from the paper bag charge, and therefore the charge is not a "tax" or a "fee" as defined by Section 1(e) of Article XIII C of the California Constitution; and

15. The record contains, and the City Council legislatively notices substantial evidence that prohibiting the sale of single-use plastic bags, requiring retailers to charge a nominal fee for the sale of recycled paper bags, and incentivizing the use of reusable bags will conserve resources, reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the production of single-use bags, reduce waste and marine pollution, protect sensitive local water resources and water quality, and enhance the quality of life for City of St. Helena residents, visitors and wildlife.
16. The City Council considered all information related to this matter at a duly noticed public meeting of the City Council on August 12, 2014. Evidence, both written and oral, including staff reports and supporting documentation, and public testimony was presented at said meeting.

SECTION 2: Chapter 8.36 is hereby added to Title 8 of the St. Helena Municipal Code to read as follows:

Chapter 8.36 SINGLE-USE CARRYOUT BAG REDUCTION

8.36.010 PURPOSE AND INTENT

The purposes of this chapter are to:

- A. Enact a bag reuse program that reduces waste and pollution, and that decreases the use of Single-Use Carryout Bags in the City of St. Helena.
- B. Protect the environment from the negative impacts of Single-Use Carryout Bags by reducing the use of Single-Use Carryout Bags, with a provision that would require retail stores within the City of St. Helena to charge customers who request Recycled Paper Bags.
- C. Provide an incentive for customers to use reusable bags or bring their own bags by exempting application of the bag charge from those customers who use reusable bags or bring their own bags.

8.36.020 DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this chapter, the following definitions shall apply:

- A. “Customer” means any Person obtaining Merchandise from a Retail Establishment.
- B. “Director” means the Planning Director of the City of St. Helena, or a designee of the Planning Director or City Manager.

- C. “Merchandise” means any consumer goods as that term is defined by California Civil Code section 1791(a), except that “Merchandise” shall also include clothing and consumables, as those terms are defined by California Civil Code Sections 1791(c) and (d), respectively. “Merchandise” does not include Prepared Food. “Merchandise” includes, but is not limited to, liquor and beer, clothing, electronics and groceries that are not Prepared Food.
- D. “Person” means any human person, as well as any other form of legal entity (including a corporation, partnership, joint venture, limited liability company, or sole proprietorship).
- E. “Post-consumer Recycled Material” means a material that would otherwise be destined for solid waste disposal, having completed its intended end use and product life cycle. Post-consumer Recycled Material does not include materials and byproducts generated from, and commonly reused within, an original manufacturing and fabrication process.
- F. “Public Eating Establishment” means a restaurant, take-out food establishment, or any other business that receives ninety percent (90%) or more of its revenue from the sale of Prepared Food to be eaten on or off its premises.
- G. “Prepared Food” means food or beverages which are prepared on the premises by cooking, chopping, slicing, mixing, freezing, or squeezing, and which require no further preparation to be consumed. Prepared Food does not include any raw or uncooked meat product, or fruits and vegetables that are intended to be prepared for consumption off site.
- H. “Recycled Paper Bag” means a paper bag provided by a Retail Establishment to a Customer in accordance with this Chapter, at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting merchandise out of the establishment that contains no old growth fiber and a minimum of forty percent (40%) Post-consumer Recycled Material; is one hundred percent (100%) recyclable; and has printed on the outside of the bag the word “Recyclable,” the name and location of the manufacturer, and the percentage of Post-consumer Recycled content.
- I. “Retail Establishment” means a commercial establishment that sells Merchandise at retail directly to the Customer, and is located within or doing business within the geographical limits of the City of St. Helena. Retail Establishment does not include Public Eating Establishment.
- J. “Reusable Bag” means either a bag made of cloth or other machine washable fabric that has handles, or a durable plastic bag with handles that is at least 2.25 mil thick and is specifically designed and manufactured for multiple reuse.
- K. “Single-Use Carryout Bag” means a bag provided by a Retail Establishment to a Customer at the check stand cash register, point of sale or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting merchandise out of the establishment, provided that “Single-Use Carryout Bag” specifically excludes any Reusable Bag or Recycled Paper Bag and excludes any bag provided to the Customer to (1) transport produce, bulk food or meat from a produce, bulk food or meat department within a store to the point of sale; (2) hold prescription medication dis-

pensed from a pharmacy; (3) segregate merchandise that could damage or contaminate other merchandise when placed together in a Reusable Bag or Recycled Paper Bag; or (4) contain or wrap meat, fish, or frozen foods, whether prepackaged or not.

8.36.030 Single-Use Carryout Bags

- A. No Retail Establishment shall provide a Single-Use Carryout Bag to a Customer.
- B. No Retail Establishment shall provide a Recycled Paper Bag to a Customer for the purpose of transporting Merchandise out of the establishment unless: (1) the Retail Establishment charges the Customer an amount of ten cents (\$0.10) or more per bag, and (2) the amount of the charge for each Recycled Paper Bag is separately itemized on the sales receipt provided by the Retail Establishment to the Customer.
- C. Retailers shall retain the proceeds from the collection of the charge required by 5.65.040(B) for the point of sale purchase of a Recycled Paper Bag. This chapter does not restrict how retailers use these monies.
- D. Nothing in this chapter shall prohibit Customers from using bags of any type that they bring to a Retail Establishment themselves or from carrying away goods that are not placed in a bag.

8.36.040 Exemptions

A Retail Establishment may provide a Reusable Bag or a Recycled Paper Bag at no cost at the point of sale to a customer who is participating in the California Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children pursuant to Article 2 of Chapter 1 of Part 2 of Division 106 of the Health and Safety Code, or a customer who is participating in the Supplemental Food Program pursuant to Chapter 10 of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

8.36.050 Operative date.

- A. This chapter shall become operative on January 1, 2015, for any full-line, self-service Retail Establishment with gross annual sales of two million dollars (\$2,000,000), or more, that sells a line of dry grocery, canned goods, or non-food items and some perishable items.
- B. This chapter shall become operative on July 1, 2015, for all Retail Establishments.

8.36.060 Enforcement

The Director shall have primary responsibility for enforcement of this chapter. The Director is authorized to make all necessary and reasonable rules and regulations with respect to the enforcement of this chapter. All such rules and regulations shall be consistent with the provisions of this chapter.

It is a violation of this Code, subject to punishment and prosecution pursuant to Chapter 1.20 of

this Code, for any Retail Establishment to violate or fail to comply with any provision of this chapter.

SECTION 3: If any section, sub-section, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase in this ordinance, or any part thereof, is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining sections or portions of this ordinance or any part thereof. The city council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, sub-section, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, sub-sections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases may be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4: The City Council hereby finds that the action to adopt this Ordinance to add Chapter 8.36 to Title 8 of the St. Helena Municipal Code is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) (CEQA) because the ordinance is a regulatory action that will protect natural resources and the environment generally and is, therefore, categorically exempt from further CEQA review under Sections 15307 and 15308 of the CEQA “Guidelines.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§ 15307, 15308.) In addition, the action to adopt this Ordinance exempt from CEQA because there is no possibility that the adoption of the Ordinance may have a significant effect on the environment. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15061(b)(3)). The City Council bases this determination on the findings contained in the ordinance and the staff report to the City Council and evidence referred to therein that summarize the facts and evidence the City Council considered and relied upon to make this determination.

SECTION 5: This ordinance shall take effect and be in force 30 days after its adoption, and a summary of this ordinance shall be published once with the names of the members of the Council voting for and against the ordinance in the St. Helena Star, a newspaper of general circulation published in the city of St. Helena.

THE FOREGOING ORDINANCE was introduced at a regular meeting of the St. Helena City Council on the 12th day of August, 2014, and was adopted at a regular meeting of the St. Helena City Council on the 12th day of August, 2014 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Ann Nevero, Mayor

ATTEST:

Cindy Black, Interim City Clerk



July 15, 2014

The Honorable Ann Nevero
Mayor, City of St. Helena
1480 Main Street
St. Helena CA 94574

Dear Mayor Nevero and Members of the St. Helena City Council,

The St. Helena Chamber of Commerce commends the Sustainability Committee for taking on the issue of single use bag reduction. Almost everyone can agree that reducing plastic and paper bags and moving towards the use of reusable bags is environmentally responsible and, with more municipalities implementing bag reduction ordinances, it is ultimately inevitable.

The Chamber supports the effort to ban plastic bags and reduce the use of recycled paper bags as good policy for our town and our planet. For our locals, it will be an adjustment, but one we are confident they are willing and, in many cases, are already making.

The Chamber will show our support for the ordinance by sourcing a reusable linen "St. Helena, Napa Valley's Main Street" bag for retailers to consider. We will make them available for purchase at a bulk discount to our retailers and we will create something that is stylish and useful.

However, the draft ordinance before the Council has the right intent but has a side effect that we believe is unintended. The current draft ordinance also bans branded shopping bags, such as the bags a customer would receive when shopping at Palladium, Woodhouse and Daisy.

Our retail businesses on Main Street are iconic for St. Helena. These mom-and-pop shops offer our locals and visitors something beyond homogenized box stores. A key to St. Helena's charm, uniqueness and hometown feeling is our individualized shops. Branding their image on shopping bags is important for their marketing and advertising. The Chamber has an active and effective PR campaign that promotes "Shop St. Helena". The campaign is directed at Bay Area high-value visitors, defined as those visitors who spend the most when they visit Napa Valley. Our first images of this campaign include our classic shopping bags as an enticement to come visit St. Helena. The bags are an effective way to showcase the uniqueness of our shopping district and the quality of their products.

Visit Napa Valley's 2012 Economic Impact Study and Visitor Profile show that visitors to Napa Valley are crucial to the Valley's economy. The studies show that St. Helena is the most visited town in the Valley and that retail shopping is 3rd in activities only to wine tasting and dining. Given that a significant





source of St. Helena economy is driven by visitors, it is important for us to take into consideration what we can do for our retail businesses.

The Chamber promotes our town as “THE” shopping district in Napa Valley. It’s become part of our overall destination marketing strategy because it is based in fact; St. Helena has the best shopping for visitors (and locals) in the Napa Valley. We, as a community, expect our Main Street shops to be eclectic and high quality, offering what you cannot find in a formula store. We should then support and protect their image by allowing them to continue to market their brand through this avenue.

In addition to their marketing value, we believe these shopping bags are reusable. They should not be considered single-use because of their weight, construction and quality. They are easily repurposed for a variety of uses. The City Council has the discretion and opportunity to determine and define what is reusable and what is exempt in this ordinance. The Chamber respectfully requests that the Council consider these bags as essential to the essence of St. Helena and include them in the definition of “reusable” or exempt them completely.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pam Simpson".

Pam Simpson

CEO/President



Proposed Amendment to the Draft Carry Out Bag Reduction Ordinance

2 Options:

1. Redefine Reusable to include the shopping bags.
2. Exempt the shopping bags from the Ordinance.

Section

8.36.020 DEFINITIONS:

Reusable Bag:

“Reusable Bag” means either a bag made of cloth, another machine washable fabric that has handles, a durable plastic bag with handles that is at least 2.25 mil thick and is specifically designed and manufactured for multiple reuse, or a paper shopping bag, branded by a St. Helena business, made of a minimum 175 grams per square meter paper weight, with a flat bottom, side gussets, reinforced turn top, and ribbon, rope or cord handles.

-or-

8.36.020 DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this chapter, the following definitions shall apply:

L. “Branded Shopping Bag” means a paper shopping bag, branded by a St. Helena business, made of a minimum 175 grams per square meter paper weight, with a flat bottom, side gussets, reinforced turn top, and ribbon, rope or cord handles.

8.36.040 Exemptions

A Retail Establishment may provide a Reusable Bag or a Recycled Paper Bag at no cost at the point of sale to a customer who is participating in the California Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children pursuant to Article 2 of Chapter 1 of Part 2 of Division 106 of the Health and Safety Code, or a customer who is participating in the Supplemental Food Program pursuant to Chapter 10 of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. A Retail Establishment may also provide, at no cost at the point of sale to the customer, a Branded Shopping Bag.

Source: Visit Napa Valley

2012 Economic Impact Study and Visitor Profile Study by Destination Analysts.

Quick Facts:

In 2012

- Total direct visitor spending inside the county \$1.4 billion.
- Average Daily Visitor Spending on Retail in Napa Valley \$53.14 (excludes wine purchase)
- Annual Visitor Spend on Retail \$483, 000
- Jobs supported by Napa Valley Visitor: 10,498 1,591 in Retail Stores
- Napa Valley visitor payroll \$300 million
- Visitor spending in Napa Valley on an average day: \$3.82 million
- Annual visitor spending per Napa County resident: \$10,027
- St. Helena was the most visited town 66.6%
- Shopping ranked # 3 after Wine Tasting and Dining 53.8%
- Number of visitors who considered traffic an issue 4.2%

Here is a snapshot of what we've learned:

- 92.9% of visitors said they are "likely or very likely" to return
- 2.94 million total visitors in 2012
- Average visitor spends \$205.26 per day
- Overnight guests spend, per couple, \$254.15 per day on lodging

Shop St. Helena

