RESOLUTION R2020-

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAPA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A USE PERMIT AND DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO REMODEL AN EXISTING BUILDING TO ALLOW 66 SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY (SROS) UNITS (HERITAGE HOUSE) AND A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 24-UNIT APARTMENT COMPLEX (VALLE VERDE) ON A 2.88 ACRE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3700, 3710 & 3720 VALLE VERDE DRIVE (APNS 038-170-042, 043 & 046) AND DETERMINING THAT THE ACTIONS AUTHORIZED BY THIS RESOLUTION WERE ADEQUATELY ANALYZED BY A PREVIOUS CEQA ACTION

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2017 the Gasser Foundation ("Applicant") submitted an application for a use permit pursuant to Napa Municipal Code ("NMC") Chapter 17.60 ("Use Permit") to authorize redevelopment of the vacant Sunrise Senior Living Facility into 66 single room occupancy units (SROs), including 33 permanent supportive housing units; a design review permit pursuant to NMC Chapter 17.62 ("Design Review Permit") for the remodel of the Sunrise Senior Living Facility to accommodate the SROs ("Heritage House") and a Design Review Permit to construct a new three-story multi-family apartment building with 24-affordable units ("Valle Verde"); a request to abandon a portion of the terminus of Valle Verde Drive, three development concessions pursuant to State density bonus law ("Density Bonus Concessions") and a Lot Line Adjustment/Lot Merger to combine three parcels owned by the Applicant and the portion of Valle Verde Drive requested to be abandoned into two parcels, located at 3700, 3710 & 3720 Valle Verde Drive ("Site") (038-170-042, 043 & 046) (collectively, the "Valle Verde and Heritage House Continuum of Housing Project" or the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the City of Napa determined that the Project application required the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report/environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, and because the Project is a 100 percent affordable Project and may be eligible for federal funds also determined that the Project may be subject to the National Environmental Policy Act and determined to do a joint EIR/EA/Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) (collectively, “Environmental Review”), for the “Project” (State Clearinghouse No. 2018082019; the “EIR/EA”); and

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2019 the Planning Commission considered the EIR/EA and the application for the Use Permit, Design Review Permits and all written and oral testimony submitted to them at a noticed public hearing, at which time the Planning Commission heard a presentation by staff and took public testimony, and thereafter closed the public hearing and subsequently recommended that the City Council certify the EIR/EA and approve the application for the Use Permit, Design Review Permits, three requested Density Bonus Concessions, and the right of way abandonment of a portion of Valle Verde Drive; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered all information related to the Use Permit, Design Review Permits, Right of Way Abandonment of a portion of Valle Verde Drive, and Density Bonus Concessions, as presented at the public meetings of the City Council identified herein, including any supporting reports by City Staff, and any information provided during public meetings; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby determines that the potential environmental effects of the proposed Use Permit, Design Review Permits, Right of Way Abandonment and Density Bonus

R2020-
Concessions were evaluated in the EIR/EA, which was certified and adopted by the City Council prior to its action on the Application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Napa as follows:

Section 1. The City Council hereby finds that the facts set forth in the recitals to this Resolution are true and correct and establish the factual basis for the City Council’s adoption of this Resolution.

Section 2. The City Council hereby determines that the potential environmental effects of the Project were adequately examined by the Final EIR/EA for the Project which was certified by a resolution of the City Council adopted on __________, 2020 in conformance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and its implementing regulations.

Section 3. The City Council hereby approves the Use Permit for Heritage House and makes the following findings in support of the approval:

The proposed use is in accord with the General Plan, applicable specific plans, the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance, and the purposes of the district and overlay district in which the site is located.

The Site is designated Multi-Family Residential (MFR-33H) in the City of Napa General Plan (Envision Napa 2020, adopted in 1998), which is intended to develop or redevelop into a high intensity predominantly attached residential development pattern. Allowable uses include multi-family units, attached and detached single family, SRO facilities, live-work housing, and similar compatible uses such as day care and larger group quarters (e.g., residential facilities and nursing homes).

The Site is also located within the Vintage Planning Area. The MFR-33H designation allows for a minimum of 18.5 dwelling units per acre and up to 25 dwelling units per acre. However, for SROs, the City’s Zoning Ordinance provides that a factor of two shall be applied to the permitted General Plan density range. Therefore, the MFR-33H designation allows for a density range of 37 to 50 SRO units per acre. On the 1.6-acre Heritage House Site, between 59 to 80 SRO units are allowed within this density range. The Project proposes 66 SRO units on the Heritage House Site, including eight one-bedroom units. Therefore, the proposed Heritage House is consistent with the permitted density range for SRO projects.

The Project site is designated in the City’s Housing Element as a site to provide 57 100%- low income residential units to meet the City’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) obligation (Figure 6.5, page 118 of the Housing Element). The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG/MTC) is responsible for developing the RHNA and assigning the region’s share of the statewide housing need to the cities and counties within the region. It designates overall need and, within the overall need, housing needs for various income levels in the city.

Recent state planning laws require the City to show how it is meeting its production targets for its share of the RHNA. This Project will allow the City to meet or exceed its targets by providing 90 100% affordable residential units on the site.

The Project Site is within the boundaries of the Big Ranch Specific Plan. The Project is consistent with the applicable policies of the BRSP as discussed in detail in Attachment 6 to the Staff Report.
Consistent with City Council Resolution No. 1995-2 which requires a Management Plan for SRO use, a Management Plan has been prepared that addresses management, occupancy and maintenance and site security.

_The proposed use, together with the conditions applicable thereto, will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity, or to the general welfare of the City._

The Project’s EIR/EA documents that the Project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise and Transportation and Circulation, which would be significant without the implementation of mitigation measures, but would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. The EIR/EA documents that the Project would not result in any other significant or potentially significant impacts. As such, with implementation of the adopted mitigation measures, the proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts.

The Heritage House SROs meet the City’s development standards and approval of the Use Permit will not cause any health, safety and/or general welfare hardship to the community.

_The proposed use complies with each of the applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance._

The Project is located in the RM Multi-family Residential zoning designation and the Floodplain Management Overlay District. Group residential, including SROs are permitted in the RM District with a use permit pursuant to NMC Section 17.08.050. All lots comply with the minimum lot size, coverage height, and setbacks of their respective zoning district. Both structures meet the minimum required setback 20-feet or greater from the banks of water courses (NMC Section 17.52.110 b.1).

The existing Sunrise building (Heritage House) is legal non-conforming for the 50-foot riparian setback and because a small portion of the corner of the building is within the floodplain. With removal of the Zerba Bridge as a condition of approval, the building will be above the floodplain. Valle Verde meets the riparian setback requirement.

The Project meets the parking requirements. Parking for SRO units is allowed to be reduced to .50 space per unit when it meets the following:

- Development is within ¼ mile of a food market and regularly schedule public transit stop; and
- Some or all units are available long term to low income households; or
- Tenant vehicles are limited to the number of non-guest parking spaces provided; and
- Development agreement is provided regarding items b and c. above.

The Heritage House portion of the Project generally meets all of the four requirements (a-d). Development is close to ¼ mile from services, all units will be available to low income households, tenant vehicles will be restricted/managed, and an agreement is being provided.

While the Project is slightly over the ¼ mile requirement, the site is within 1,560 feet of services and is requesting a concession to allow a slightly greater distance. A management plan is being
provided for the supportive services component of Heritage House which meets the requirement for a development agreement. With the management plan, onsite managers (operated by Abode) will ensure that parking is managed by parking permit and vehicles onsite are operational.

The Project provides a total of 79 uncovered parking spaces which exceeds the minimum requirement by two spaces. Normally 24 covered spaces would be required for the Valle Verde Apartments but posts for carports would not be allowed because of existing underground utilities and easements. Therefore, consistent with density bonus law, the elimination of the requirement for carports is the second of the three concessions the Applicant is requesting.

Section 4. The City Council hereby approves the Design Review Permits for Heritage House and Valle Verde and makes the following findings in support of the approval:

The project design is in accord with the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan design policies.

The Valle Verde site is 1.3 acres, which allows for a permitted density of 23 to 33 units. The Project proposes 24 multifamily units on the Valle Verde site, which is within the allowed density range. Therefore, both the Valle Verde Apartments and the Heritage House would be consistent with the General Plan density allowance.

The proposed improvements for a 100 percent multi-family residential use of the property which would provide 90 very low income residential units is consistent with the General Plan Housing Element which identifies the site as a housing opportunity site for 57 low income residential units needed by the City of Napa to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation, and the prescribed General Plan density. The Project is also consistent with General Plan policies regarding neighborhood compatibility as the multi-family use and lot sizes are similar to other existing uses in the vicinity on Valle Verde Drive. The Project is also consistent with the BRSP.

The project design is consistent with applicable Design Review guidelines adopted by the City Council.

The proposed design, site layout and architecture as revised by the conditions of approval identified below are consistent with the goals, policies and recommendations outlined in within the Residential Design Guidelines. The Project’s lot orientation and building sizes are compatible with the existing neighborhood. The proposed architecture is consistent with the policies outlined in the Residential Design Guidelines. A mix of details, and materials are proposed on both buildings, consistent with the design principles for multifamily homes.

The Design Review Permit is in accord with provisions of this Title and will not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity of the development site, or to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

The Design Review permits for both the redevelopment of the former Sunrise Senior Living facility to accommodate the Heritage House, and the new construction of a 24-unit Valle Verde apartment complex are consistent with Title 17 of the Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance), and the Project’s EIR/EA documents that all potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of recommended mitigation measures, so approval of the Project would not result in any significant impacts. The design of the proposed Project does not result in adverse impacts to adjacent properties or to the general health, safety, and welfare of the community.
Section 5. The City Council's approval of the Use Permit and Design Review Permits, and each of them, is subject to the following conditions:

Community Development Department - Planning Division

1. This Design Review and Use Permit for Heritage House authorizes redevelopment of Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility building at 3700 Valle Verde to accommodate 66 single room occupancy units (SROs) including eight Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible one-bedroom units (Heritage House) and associated driveways, parking areas, and landscaping in accordance with the plans prepared by RSA Civil (received December 17, 2018, submitted with the application and as approved by the City Council, and as amended by these conditions of approval). This Design Review Permit for Valle Verde approves the construction of a three-story multi-family apartment building with 24 affordable units at 3710 and 3720 Valle Verde Drive, and associated driveways, parking areas, and landscaping in accordance with the plans prepared by RSA Civil (received December 17, 2018, submitted with the application and as approved by the City Council, and as amended by these conditions of approval). Parking for Heritage House and Valle Verde is provided for 79 vehicles in the parking area surrounding both buildings. This Resolution also approves the following Density Bonus Concessions in accordance with state Density Bonus Law: An increase in the maximum size of eight SRO units from 450 square feet to 650 square feet to provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible units; an increase in the distance of SRO projects to public transit required by NMC Section 17.52.460(B)(2)(d) from 1,200 feet to 1,560 feet; and an exemption from the covered parking requirement for Valle Verde due to underground utility and easement constraints.

2. The plans submitted for building permits shall conform substantially to the plans and representations submitted with the application and as reviewed and approved by the City Council, and as amended by these conditions of approval.

3. The Applicant shall develop and implement a Management Plan for Heritage House as required by City Council Resolution No. 1995-2 that addresses general operations, onsite staffing, case management follow through, and security for the operation and maintenance of Heritage House. The plan shall include, among other things, the following components:
   a. Operational Security. Operational security measures shall be sufficient to provide a safe environment.
   b. Parking Management. Resident vehicles shall be registered and operational as provided for in the Property Management Plan.

4. The Management Plan is subject to the approval of the Community Development Director and the Police Chief. The Plan shall be reviewed with City staff six months after the use commences operation, one year after the use commences operation, and then annually every year thereafter as determined to be necessary by the Community Development Director.

5. Colors and materials selection shall be carried out in substantial conformity with the colors and materials submitted and retained in the file, or as amended by the conditions of approval. Any changes to the selection of colors and materials shall require prior approval by the Planning Manager.

6. All Project signage shall be subject to a separate review and approval. Consistent with the City's Sign Ordinance, no portable (e.g. A-frame, portable rotating, flashing, animated,
moving or having the appearance of moving, inflatable) signs are permitted. Temporary signs may be permitted in accordance with NMC 17.55.120.

7. Final landscape plans shall identify outdoor furniture and/or play equipment for the two open space areas.

8. The Applicant shall comply with all mitigation measures identified in the Valle Verde and Heritage House Continuum of Housing Project Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment as set forth in Resolution ___, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is incorporated herein by reference.

9. All exterior lighting on the Site shall be properly shielded and directed downward to preclude glare conditions that might impact nearby residential uses or Salvador Creek.

10. The plans submitted for the building permit shall include a final landscape and irrigation plan designed and signed by a licensed landscape architect or landscape contractor. The final landscape plans shall specify that: (1) all plant materials be certified by the Napa County Agricultural Commissioner inspection program for freedom from the glassy winged sharpshooter or other pests identified by the Agricultural Commissioner, and (2) the Agricultural Commissioner’s Office shall be notified of all impending deliveries of live plants with points of origin outside of Napa County so that inspection can be arranged.

11. No building permit shall be issued until the Planning Division approves the landscape and irrigation plan. Prior to occupancy, the licensed professional who signed the final landscape and irrigation plan shall certify in writing to the Planning Manager that he/she has inspected and approved the installation of landscaping and irrigation and has found them to be consistent with the approved plans including, but not limited to, the certifications and inspections by the Agricultural Commissioner as well as that the systems are in working order. A substitution of an alternate licensed professional may be allowed by the Planning Manager upon a showing of good cause.

12. A Final Fencing Plan for the Project shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Manager prior to issuance of a building permit. This plan shall include fencing between the Site and adjacent neighbor properties. Fences between the Site and adjacent neighbors' properties shall be installed prior to occupancy. The Applicant shall construct a new fence between the Site and the neighboring property to the south. Should the neighboring property owner choose not to allow the Applicant to reconstruct the fence at their property line, the Applicant shall construct a new fence beyond the existing neighbor’s fence on the Project side.

13. All proposed and required fencing shall be installed in compliance with the approved landscape and fencing plan prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

14. A permit shall be obtained from the Parks and Recreation Department prior to removal of any street trees from the City right of way. Trees shall be replaced consistent with the mitigation identified in the Valle Verde and Heritage House Continuum of Housing Project Environmental Impact Report.

15. Prior to issuance of a building permit the Applicant shall provide evidence to the Planning and Code Enforcement Manager that it has paid the Notice of Determination and California Department of Fish and Wildlife fees to the Clerk of the County Board of Supervisors. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an environmental determination be prepared for this project. City staff completed an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) for this project and properly circulated it for review. The EIR/EA represents the independent judgment of the City acting as lead agency.
for the Project. The Project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment with the implementation of all the required conditions of approval and mitigation measures. The EIR/EA has been issued indicating that all identified impacts were found to be mitigated below a level of significance. A Notice of Determination (NOD) of this finding is required to be filed with a fee (currently $50). The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) requires that an additional fee (currently $3271.00) be paid with the NOD filing. The combined fees are required to be paid to the Clerk of the Board with the NOD filing.

16. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Developer shall retain a qualified consultant to conduct soil sampling to test shallow soils on the site for organochlorine pesticides and pesticide-based metals (e.g. lead and arsenic). The qualified consultant shall prepare documentation to outline the soil sample data and testing. If the residual contaminants are not detected and/or are found to be below the residential environmental screening levels (ESLs) for public health and the environment in accordance with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) requirements, no further mitigation is required. If residual contaminants are found and are above residential ESLs, the project applicants shall implement appropriate management procedures under regulatory oversight from the DTSC, such as removal of the contaminated soil and/or capping the contaminated soil under clean soil or hardscape. Copies of all environmental investigations shall be submitted to the City's Community Development Department Planning Division prior to issuance of any grading permits.

17. Any past water wells shall be removed and/or closed subject to the requirements of County Environmental Health.

18. The Community Development Director or designee is authorized to determine whether the Applicant is in substantial compliance with the conditions and requirements of these approvals.

19. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide written clearance from the Engineering Division of the Napa Sanitation District confirming that the Applicant has complied with all Napa Sanitation District requirements applicable to the Project. The Napa Sanitation District has described the applicable requirements in a letter to the Planning Division dated August 29, 2019, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A.

20. Erosion control measures shall be utilized throughout all phases of operation where sediment runoff from exposed slopes threatens to enter aquatic natural communities. At no time shall silt laden runoff be allowed to enter Salvador Creek or its riparian corridor or directed to where it may enter any of these areas. Erosion control structures shall be monitored for effectiveness and required or replaced as needed. Appropriate erosion control measures shall be installed around any stockpile of soil or other materials which could be mobilized by rainfall or runoff.

21. No fueling, cleaning or maintenance of vehicles or equipment shall take place within any areas where an accidental discharge to Salvador Creek may occur.

22. All equipment including excavator, truck, hand tools, etc. that may have come into contact with invasive plants or the seeds of these plants, shall be carefully cleaned before arriving on the Site and also carefully cleaned before removal from the Site to prevent spread of these plants.

23. Construction disturbance or removal of riparian vegetation shall be restricted to the minimum footprint necessary to complete the work. The work area shall be delineated where necessary with construction fencing to minimize impacts to habitat beyond the work area limit.

24. Staging and storage areas for equipment, materials, fuels, lubricants and solvents, shall be located outside of the stream channel banks.
25. Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps and generators, located adjacent to aquatic features shall be positioned over drip pans. Stationary heavy equipment shall have suitable containment to handle a spill or leak. All activities performed near aquatic features shall have absorbent materials designated for spill containment and cleanup activities onsite for use in an accidental spill.

26. Any equipment or vehicles operated adjacent to aquatic features shall be checked and maintained daily to prevent leaks of materials that could be deleterious to wildlife or habitat.

27. Stockpiles of soil or other materials that can be blown by wind shall be covered when not in active use. All trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered.

28. No other debris, rubbish, creosote-treated wood, soil, silt, san, cement, concrete or washings thereof, or other construction-related materials or wastes shall be allowed to enter into or be placed where they may be washed by rainfall or runoff into the aquatic features. All such waste shall be picked-up daily and properly disposed of at an appropriate facility.

29. An environmental awareness training program shall be conducted for all crews working on the Site to include education on sensitive resources such as protected wildlife with the potential to occur within the study area, water quality and environmental protection measures.

30. All temporary flagging, fencing and/or barriers shall be removed upon completion of Project construction.

31. The conditions of approval and mitigation measures outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan shall be shown on all civil drawings at the time of building permit.

32. Residents of the Project shall be provided a notice that that runs with the land, notifying residents they may be subject to occasional helicopter flights associated with the operations of the Queen of the Valley Medical Center.

33. Prior to issuance of a building permit for Heritage House or the Valle Verde Apartments, the Applicant shall execute an affordable housing agreement with the City in accordance with NMC Section 15.94.080, which shall ensure the continued affordability of all units in the Project, except for one manager’s unit in the Heritage House and one manager’s unit in the Valle Verde Apartments, for a minimum of 55 years, with rents set at an affordable rent as defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 50053. The Applicant shall provide the City with two executed affordable housing agreements (one for Heritage House and one for the Valle Verde Apartments) that are acceptable to the Community Development Director and the City Attorney, which shall be recorded against the Heritage House property and the Valle Verde Apartments property, as applicable.

Police Department

34. Plant material under windows and around doorways, entrances and pathways should be no higher than two feet. Foliage on trees should be maintained a minimum of six feet in height to allow for natural surveillance at the pedestrian level.

35. The Applicant shall utilize hostile vegetation in areas that are off limits to the public.

36. The Applicant shall utilize anti-rest style benches with anti-lying arm rests incorporated into the design, in those areas where outdoor benches may be utilized.

37. The Applicant shall utilize anti-climb fencing in areas where fencing may be used.

38. Adequate off-street lighting shall be provided to provide adequate visibility in parking areas and the Project Site by residents, law enforcement, and those passing by during nighttime hours. Light shall be white light full cutoff design, constructed of damage resistant material. Light shall be positioned in a manner which does not create dark shadow areas and does not spill light onto neighboring properties.

39. Pedestrian walkways shall have adequate pedestrian lighting illuminating the pathway.
Public Works Department

39. The project shall be subject to the requirements of (and all improvements shall be constructed in accordance with) the Napa Municipal Code, the Public Works Department Standard Specifications and Standard Plans, and the City’s “Post-Construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Design Standards”.

40. The Applicant shall construct all on and offsite improvements in accordance with improvement plans and supporting calculations that are prepared by a registered civil engineer and reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department (PW) Development Engineering Division. The improvement plans shall be prepared in conformance with the Valle Verde – Heritage House Design Review plans prepared by RSA+ dated 12/07/2018 as modified herein by these Conditions of Approval. The improvement plans and supporting calculations shall include detailed designs for all utilities, water, grading, drainage, erosion control, stormwater, and paving. The plans and calculations must be approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of any building permit.

41. The improvement plans shall be prepared in accordance with (and submittals shall be accompanied by) the “Initial Submittal Checklist”, and the “Improvement Plan Checklist”. The checklists are available on the City of Napa Website (www.cityofnapa.org) under the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division Forms and Handouts menu.

42. The Applicant shall pay a $5,000 initial cash deposit for city plan check services.

43. IMPROVEMENT PLANS – The following items shall be shown on the improvement plans prior to approval of the plans:

a. Valle Verde Dr./Firefly Lane Intersection:

   1. Applicant shall modify the existing intersection at Valle Verde Dr. and Firefly Lane to accommodate the construction of a new “L” intersection knuckle as shown on the Valle Verde – Heritage House Design Review plans.

   2. Applicant shall remove the necessary curb and gutter, landscape strip, and sidewalk along both streets to accommodate the construction of the new “L” intersection knuckle.

   3. Applicant shall install a new commercial driveway approach along the newly created “L” intersection knuckle. The commercial driveway approach shall have a minimum 20-feet wide curb opening and shall meet Fire and Materials Diversion equipment truck turning templates.

   4. The entire street curb frontage of the new “L” intersection knuckle shall be painted red and posted with “No Parking” and “No Stopping Fire Lane” (R26F - No Stopping Fire Lane).

   5. Applicant shall replace all the existing street signs along the Project frontage.

   6. Applicant shall replace the existing curb ramp located on the southwest corner of the existing intersection.

   7. Applicant shall resurface the entire Project frontage along the intersection from lip of gutter to lip of gutter and extend the sufficient length to the west and south of the intersection to provide smooth conforms. The resurface shall be a 2-inch grind and overlay. The resurface limits shall extend at a minimum to the limits of sidewalk.
saw cutting and shall be determined and approved by the Development Engineering Division.

(8) Applicant shall remove the existing City streetlights along existing Valle Verde Dr., return them to the City, and install new streetlights at locations approved by the Public Works Director.

(9) Applicant shall construct a Class I multi-use path that extends from the northwest corner of the Firefly Lane/Valle Verde Dr intersection to the existing Salvador Creek Trail north of the Site. This path shall replace the existing 4-feet wide sidewalk located west of the Site. This path shall be constructed as shown on the plans with a paved width of 10-feet and 1-foot wide shoulders on either side.

b. **Trancas Street/Valle Verde intersection:**

(1) Concurrently with the issuance of the first building permit for the Project, the Applicant will make a fairshare contribution of $50,000 towards the design and construction of pedestrian crossing improvements at the intersection of Trancas Street and Valle Verde Drive. These improvements will include installation of a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon System (RRFB) on the eastern leg of the intersection; installation of ADA curb ramps and crosswalk striping at the north and east legs of the intersection; yield markings on Trancas Street; and removal of existing crosswalk striping on the eastern leg of the intersection (“Intersection Improvements”). The City will deposit the funds into a separate account for the sole and exclusive purpose of designing and constructing the Intersection Improvements. The City shall return the contribution to the Applicant if construction of the Intersection Improvements has not commenced within five (5) years of the date the contribution is received by the City.

c. The Applicant shall partially remove, or cause the partial removal of, the existing Zerba bridge over Salvador Creek in order to comply with Policy PF/S-5d of the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan. The Applicant is responsible for coordinating the work of partial removal, and any creek bank restoration that might be required, with each of the regulatory agencies, Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (NCFCWCD), and any utility companies with utilities on the bridge. A partial bridge removal plan shall be prepared by a licensed engineer and submitted for review by the Public Works Director prior to submittal to the regulatory agencies for approval. The extent of the partial removal shall be consistent with the extent analyzed in the final EIR. Partial removal shall include removal of the bridge deck and the tops of piers; it may include removal of the western abutment if necessary, to achieve compliance with Policy PF/S-5d. The Applicant shall have the right to enter into an agreement with the NCFCWCD that provides for completion of the required work.

The Applicant shall complete removal of the bridge prior to the issuance of a building permit for the construction of Valle Verde unless the deadline is extended by the Public Works Director to no later than issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first unit in the Valle Verde project upon a determination of all of the following:

(1) the completion of the removal is delayed by the work schedule of the NCFCWCD, or the actions of the regulatory agencies, and such delay is not caused by the acts or omissions of the Applicant;

(2) a delay in the issuance of a building permit will jeopardize the state-approved financing for the Valle Verde project;
(3) the Applicant has provided the City with adequate security to ensure completion of the removal; and

(4) the Applicant has provided evidence satisfactory to the Public Works Director that construction, including any construction operational phasing, of Valle Verde will cause no more than a 0.1-0.3-foot rise in the water surface elevation at the location of finished structures surrounding the Project site.

d. The Applicant shall show on the improvement plans the datum and benchmark used for the topographic survey.

e. The Applicant shall prepare an exhibit showing all the easements that are going to be abandoned and reserved as part of the abandonment of the existing Valle Verde Dr. The Applicant shall show on the improvement plans the reserved easements and any new easements required to construct the Project.

f. All required public frontage and street improvements shall be designed and built in accordance with City of Napa ordinances and the Public Works Department Standard Specifications. Street improvements shall include curbs, gutter, standard 4’ sidewalk, 6’ planter strip, street paving, streetlights, street type driveway approaches, drainage facilities, and street trees. Final design and location of public frontage improvements shall be subject to the approval of the Public Works Director.

g. Any additional right-of-way necessary to accommodate these improvements shall be dedicated to the City prior to improvement plan approval. Please note that a 10-foot P.U.E. might be required along the new “L” intersection knuckle to accommodate the construction of all the utilities.

h. The Applicant shall provide red curb within 20 feet of the curb return at the street intersection.

i. Curb return pedestrian ramps meeting current ADA and City Public Works Standards shall be installed at the Project driveways along the new “L” intersection knuckle.

j. All public street pavements structural section installations shall include a minimum of 3 inches of Asphalt Concrete over 10 inches of Class 2 Aggregate Base material. Refer to Table 3.1 Street Design Criteria for minimal structural sections. (Revised 8/23/2018).

k. Public street access points and street corners shall be designed to satisfy the City of Napa Visibility and Fencing Standard (Std. Detail S-25). The sight distance and visibility triangle lines shall be shown on the grading and drainage plans. The visibility height limits are measured from the top of curb of the fronting street to the top elevation of the obstruction.

l. The Applicant shall provide an accessible (ADA compliant) route of travel from the fronting sidewalk to the buildings. The Site development and grading shall be designed to provide access to all entrances and exterior ground floor exits, and access to normal paths of travel, and where necessary to provide access, shall incorporate pedestrian ramps, curb ramps, etc. The accessible route of travel shall be the most practical direct route between accessible building entrances, accessible Site facilities and the accessible entrance to the Site per UBC 1127B. All proposed accessible routes of travel shall be identified on the improvement plans.

m. The improvement plans shall include an Erosion Control Plan.

n. The improvement plans shall include a Joint Trench Plan.

o. The improvement plans shall include a Construction Traffic Control Plan.
p. The improvement plans shall include all the existing utilities including overhead and underground utilities.

d. The improvement plans shall include a Public Street Repair Plan (showing the repair details and limits of repair) for all improvement installations that will result in the cutting, demolition, destruction, etc. of any existing improvements within the public right of way including but not limited to the installation of curb, gutter, sidewalk, utilities (water, sewer, storm drain, electrical, cable TV, telephone, etc.). This plan shall be updated during the construction process as necessary to reflect any unanticipated street repairs. Associated with said plan are the following requirements:

(1) The Applicant shall resurface the existing street pavement whenever a street is cut, either by a longitudinal or transverse cut, for utility or other improvement installations. The resurfacing shall extend a sufficient distance beyond any cut to ensure a smooth transition and shall consist of either a 2-inch asphalt concrete overlay, or geotextile material with a minimum 2-inch asphalt concrete overlay, depending upon the extent of the proposed pavement cuts and the condition of the existing pavement section, as determined by the City Engineer. The Developer shall also provide digouts and reconstruction of any potholed and/or alligatored areas. Installation of street paving by the Applicant shall include reconstruction of the existing pavement section as required to provide adequate conforms. The limits of such reconstruction shall be reviewed by the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division and approved by the Public Works Director as part of the construction plan review.

(2) The Applicant shall repair all pavement, curb, gutter and sidewalk that are damaged by the construction process in accordance with the Public Works Department Standard Specifications and Standard Plans.

(3) Any unanticipated street cuts or other street repair items that become evident following improvement plan approval shall be included by way of revisions to the Street Repair Plan.

r. For trenching within existing roadway areas, the Applicant's engineer shall pothole or otherwise physically determine the actual horizontal location and vertical depth of all underground utility systems throughout the proposed area of work and at all utility connection points. The Applicant shall provide at the first improvement plan submittal all the pothole information and the design of all new utility installations required to serve the Project including a schedule for implementation of such work as to prevent disrupting of utility service to adjacent properties.

s. The Applicant shall underground all new utilities to serve the Project from the existing point of connection to the Project. The Applicant is responsible for all coordination with utility companies and the design of all utility service installations that are required to serve the project, including utility layout, design and costs associated with any necessary facilities upgrades, revisions, relocations and/or extensions. The Applicant shall relocate or underground any overhead utilities that conflict with the new improvements.

44. ON-SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION - The following items related to on-site access and circulation shall be shown on the improvement plans prior to approval of the plans:

a. Curb, gutter, planter strip, 4-foot sidewalk, street paving, driveway approaches modified to meet ADA standards, and drainage facilities shall be installed on the Project’s private street frontage/parking lot as shown on the development plans.
b. All curb frontage intended for no parking shall be painted red and posted with signs (R26F - No Stopping Fire Lane).

c. The Applicant shall pave all required onsite parking areas and drive aisles thereto in conformance with the minimum City of Napa standard structural section standard (equivalent to a minimum 3 inches of Asphalt Concrete over 10 inches of Class II aggregate Base material) and the Project's geotechnical reports recommendations, whichever is larger.

d. Per City of Napa Public Works Standard Specification 3.02.02 bullet 6, when forward entry and exit is required a minimum 25-foot backup turn-around street or drive aisle width shall be provided behind all required parking spaces, including tandem spaces.

e. Per City of Napa Public Works Standard Specification 3.02.02 bullet 8, to avoid congestion at the entrance from the street to parking lots, no on-site parking space shall be allowed within the initial 20-feet of the driveway, where it connects to the public street measured from the back of sidewalk of the fronting street or from the ultimate right-of-way line in areas without sidewalks.

f. Wheel stops shall be provided for all on-site parking spaces that are adjacent to pedestrian walkways.

g. If the 1.5 foot parking overhang proposed for the 26 vehicle spaces along the drive aisle north of the existing Valle Verde Drive could not be accommodated due to the slope west of the parking spaces leading to the raised walkway, then the Applicant shall construct a retaining wall (concrete) to accommodate the new 10-foot wide bike trail. The maximum slope allowed is 2:1.

45. DRAINAGE AND GRADING - The following items related to grading and drainage shall be shown on the improvement plans prior to approval of the plans:

a. All existing storm drains, drainage inlets, storm drain manholes, etc. shall be shown in the plans along with all the relevant information describing each item such as inverts, sizes, slopes, etc.

b. If applicable the Applicant shall replace any existing non-standard drainage inlets, such as Type S-110, with a City Standard drainage inlet, such as Type D-2.

c. Lot grading and drainage system improvements shall be installed by the Applicant as part of the Project improvements. Constructed lot pad elevations shall not deviate more than 0.5 feet from the pad elevations shown on Project Plans.

d. The grading plans provided by the Applicant for review shall include the existing topography shown with contour line labeled at one-foot intervals and extending a minimum of 100-feet beyond the limits of the site, or a sufficient distance to indicate impacts on adjacent properties.

e. Detention improvements shall be incorporated into the Project storm drain system design as necessary to maintain post development 10-year, 25-year and 100-year runoff from the Site at pre-development levels. The Applicant shall provide storm drain inlets with enough capacity to ensure 100-year storm water flow enters the detention system. Supporting calculations shall be submitted to the Public Works Department for review and approval.

f. The grading and drainage plan shall include a design that allows for a 100-year overland release with all finish floor and garage slab elevations a minimum of one foot above the 100-year overland release elevation.
g. On-site storm drains, outside of City right-of-way, shall be made of SDR-35 plastic or reinforced concrete pipe.

h. The plans show proposed storm drain lines connecting to existing City of Napa storm drain lines using “Inserta Tee” connections. Blind connections are not allowed by the City of Napa. Proposed storm drain lines shall connect to existing storm drain lines using storm drain manholes as per City of Napa Standard Plans and Specifications.

i. The plans indicate on plan sheet C5.0 on the southeast corner of the Heritage House parcel that the catch basin and outfall might be replaced as part of the driveway repair. Please note that if the outfall needs to be replaced, the Applicant shall obtain all the required regulatory agency permits (Regional Water Quality Control Board etc.), needed to complete the work.

j. Per City of Napa Standard Plans and Specifications, any storm drainpipes within the City of Napa right-of-way shall be a minimum of 18-inches in diameter.

k. Any retaining walls which are greater than one foot in height, which are adjacent to a property line, shall be masonry or concrete. Wood retaining walls shall not be installed adjacent to property lines.

l. It is the City’s policy to require all new parcels to be graded to drain independently from adjoining parcels. If surface drainage is currently passing from adjoining properties onto the Site, the grading plan for the Project shall be designed to continue to accept such drainage and easements shall be established to allow such drainage patterns to continue. All surface drainage must be collected and conveyed to a public street, storm drain or approved outfall.

m. Applicant to follow and comply with City of Napa Municipal Code Chapter 8.36 Stormwater Quality Ordinance.

n. The Applicant shall provide an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) and a schedule for implementation of approved measures to the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division for review and approval with the first improvement plans submitted for review. A grading permit shall not be issued until the erosion and sediment control plan is approved.

o. CONSTRUCTION WATER QUALITY MEASURES – In accordance with the NPDES Construction General Permit, the property owner shall ensure that the Applicant and the contractor incorporate storm water quality Best Management Practices (BMP’s) outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environment Assessment (page 132) into the project construction process.

(1) **Project > 1 acre of disturbance:** Provide an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) and/or a State Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (project disturbance >1 acre), as required per the States Construction General Permit. A copy of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) along with waste discharge identification number (WDID) will need to be provided to the Public Works – Stormwater Program prior to grading permits.


**PLEASE NOTE:** Item above does not require a separate Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP). The ESCP is a part or element of these plans; however, the SWPPP must address all elements of the required ESCP. See ESCP template at:

http://www.cityofnapa.org/574/Stormwater-Quality
(2) The construction BMP’s shall be shown on the project Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP).

(3) The project property owner shall insure that the contractor manages all construction activities; and handles, stores and disposes of all hazardous and non-hazardous waste in a manner that eliminates or minimizes (to the maximum extent practicable) the discharge of pollutants (e.g. motor oil, fuels, paints/stains and solvents, asphalt products, concrete, herbicides and pesticides, etc.) to the storm drains, ground water, and/or waterways.

(4) The project property owner shall insure that the contractor incorporates spill prevention and cleanup measures into the construction operation. All discarded materials shall be removed from the site and disposed of at an approved disposal facility.

(5) The project property owner shall pay all cleanup, testing, disposal and City administrative costs associated with the discharge of pollutants into the storm drains and/or waterways as a result of the project construction activity.

p. POST CONSTRUCTION WATER QUALITY MEASURES - In accordance with the City of Napa, “BASMAA Post-Construction Manual prepared by the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Associated (BASMAA) Phase II Committee, dated July 14, 2014” the Applicant shall incorporate post Development measures (BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP’S)) into the project design to mitigate project impacts to water quality. [http://www.cityofnapa.org/574/Stormwater-Quality Under “Documents”]

(1) The post-construction BMP’s shall be shown on the project improvement plans and in the required Storm Water Control Plan (SCP).


(3) The Landscape plans shall be submitted to the Development Engineering Division with the submittal of the first (1st) Improvement Plans submittal. Landscape Plans shall illustrate all LID post construction measures and include the required plant species as specified in the BASMAA Post-Construction Manual.

(4) The post construction BMP measures shall be installed by the Applicant and designed and sized by a registered civil engineer in accordance with the City’s adopted BASMAA Post-Construction Manual and an accepted design method such as that which is outlined in the “California Storm Water Quality Association BMP (CASQA-BMP) Handbook”. The design and calculations are to be reviewed and approved by the Development Engineering Division.

(5) The project post-construction BMP’s shall include but not be limited to the applicable items listed in the City Council adopted Stormwater Quality Control Standards, BASMAA Post-Construction Manual and accepted design review Stormwater Control Plan prepared by RSA+ dated December 7, 2018.

q. The Applicant shall submit storm drain system design calculations that are prepared by a registered civil engineer for review and approval by the Development Engineering Division. Storm drain system design flows shall be calculated based on the requirements listed in the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and Standard Plans. The calculations shall include a drainage basin map showing basin limits and area in acres, hydrology, and system hydraulic...
calculations, pipe size calculations, inlet capacity calculations, stormwater quality treatment and other information necessary to support the proposed design. Storm drains will be sized to carry the flows generated by the design storm per City of Napa Standards. The storm drain system design calculations shall show that the pipes have a self-cleaning minimum velocity of three feet (3’) per second when flowing half full.

r. Install drainage facilities, including detention pipe(s), metering boxes, and other appurtenances to collect and convey all surface drainage to an approved outfall.

s. Easements (or deed restrictions requiring the reservation of easements upon property transfer) shall be established for piped, V-ditched and overland (sheet and channeled) drainage between the parcels. Drainage easements shall be provided for the drainage facilities shown on the plans in accordance with the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and Standard Plans. Easements shall have a minimum width of 10-feet. Pipes exceeding 24-inches in diameter or deeper than 5-feet will require wider easements as required by the Public Works Director. All drainage easements must be shown on the improvement plans. Easement documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department Engineering Division as to substance and by the City Attorney as to form and recorded prior to occupancy.

t. Low Impact Development (LID), Bio-retention areas, underground treatment systems, and all other treatment based BMP systems are to be sized in accordance with calculations that conform to the City’s BASMAA Post-Construction Manual dated July 14, 2014 and the State MS4 General Permit E.12 provisions and are to be reviewed and approved by the Development Engineering Division.

u. The Applicant shall install full trash capture device(s) on the Valle Verde building in accordance with the State Water Boards Trash Provisions Water Code section 13383.

(1) Trap all particles 5mm or greater
(2) Be sized to treat the 1-year, 1-hour storm event
(3) Device(s) shall be chosen from State Water Board list of certified devices.
(4) Device(s) shall be maintained at a frequency that ensures captured trash does not reduce device efficiency or create flooding, a minimum of once annually.

v. The property owner shall enter into a long term maintenance agreement with the City of Napa approved both as to form and substance by the City Attorney and City Engineer for long term maintenance, financing and monitoring for the post construction storm water best management practices that are incorporated as part of the project and as called out in the Approved Stormwater Control Plan.

(1) The agreement shall include a detailed outline of responsible parties, inspections, maintenance procedures, monitoring documentation and annual reporting to the City Public Works Department, and procedures for administration and oversight.
(2) The agreement shall be recorded prior to approval of the Improvement Plans. The agreement must provide for the perpetual maintenance and replacement of the improvement as well as appropriate provisions relating to enforcement options, the right of the City to access the property to perform work, the right of the City to recover its costs, indemnification and enforcement provisions, as well as any other provisions deemed necessary or convenient to accomplish the City’s objectives.
(3) Updated information, including contact information, must be provided to the municipality whenever a property is sold and whenever designated individuals or contractors change.

(4) Appropriate easements or other arrangements satisfactory to the City Engineer and City Attorney and necessary or convenient to ensure the feasibility of the scheme and fulfillment of maintenance responsibilities shall be secured and recorded prior to improvement plan approval.

(5) All development projects must be planned, designed and constructed consistent with the post construction standards in the city’s NPDES permit and in accordance with the post construction storm water management requirements established by the city, including but not limited to, the current version of the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association Post-Construction Manual or an updated version of that manual or other post-construction storm water management standards as adopted by Council resolution.

(6) The owner of the real property shall provide a written document, deed, agreement or similar writing acceptable to the Director, obligating the project proponent, their successors in control of the project and successors in fee title to the underlying real property (or premises), to assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of all installed treatment systems and hydromodification controls, if any, for the project.

(7) The owner or operator of any installed treatment system or hydromodification control shall provide the Director with information and physical access necessary to assess compliance with this chapter, with the city’s NPDES permit, and with any writing establishing operation and maintenance responsibilities and shall pay the city an annual fee for inspection and maintenance services in accordance with the latest Master Fee Schedule adopted by the City Council. (O2014-15, 11/18/14)

46. NOTES - The following notes shall be shown on the improvement plans prior to approval of the plans. The Applicant and the construction contractor shall satisfy the requirements stated in the following notes. The Applicant’s engineer shall include the following notes on the improvement plans prior to approval of the plans by the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division:

a. No grading and/or excavation shall be performed except in accordance with the approved erosion control plan and schedule. The contractor shall have all erosion control measures on site during the course of the work and installed in accordance with the approved erosion control plan schedule.

b. During the course of the Project construction (including non-working hours), the contractor is to provide appropriate signage, flashers, and barricades for open trenches that are approved by the Public Works Department Construction Division Inspector to warn oncoming motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians of potential safety hazards.

c. Any existing pedestrian access through and/or adjacent to the Site shall remain unobstructed during the Project construction or an alternate route shall be established as approved by the Police Chief and City Engineer.

d. During the course of the Project construction, all Project-related grading, trenching, backfilling, and compaction operations shall be conducted in accordance with the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications.
e. All construction activities shall meet the Uniform Building Code regulations for seismic safety (i.e., reinforcing perimeter and/or load bearing walls, bracing parapets, etc.).

f. Grading and construction equipment shall be shut down when not in use.

g. For all construction activity, the contractor shall control dust in accordance with the requirements of the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and Standard Plans (Part II – General Provisions – Dust Control); the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System requirements; and the California Department of Transportation Construction Manual (Chapter 4 – Construction Details – Section 10 Dust Control). Use of any City of Napa water for this purpose shall be from a metered source that is approved by the City of Napa Water Division and shall be requested in writing by the Contractor.

h. During the construction/demolition/renovation period of the Project, the contractor shall use the franchised garbage hauler for the service area in which the Project is located to remove all wastes generated during Project development, unless contractor transports Project waste. If the contractor transports the Project's waste, the contractor must use the appropriate landfill for the service area in which the Project is located.

i. The contractor shall provide for the source separation of wood waste for recycling. The contractor shall use the franchised garbage hauler for the service area in which located for collection of such wood waste, unless the contractor transports such wood waste to a location where wood waste is recycled.

47. WATER FACILITIES - The following items related to water facilities shall be shown on the improvement plans or completed prior to approval of the plans. The Water Division shall review and approve these items:

a. The size of all the existing water service(s) to the Site and adjacent parcel(s).

b. The existing water main(s) and applicable tie-in locations, details, etc.

c. The abandonment of any existing unused water service(s).

d. Installation of a single water service for each lot with approved backflow devices.

e. The size and location of all proposed water services (residential, fire, irrigation, etc.) and tie-in locations, details, surrounding utilities, etc. Domestic water shall be supplied by a master meter placed in the public right-of-way with private service laterals thereafter.

f. The size and location of appropriately sized water services with backflow devices (commercial, fire, irrigation, etc.) with tie-in locations, surrounding utilities, etc.

g. All existing service laterals to the Site shall be used prior to the installation of new services from the City water main.

h. Any unused service shall be abandoned at the City water main.

i. Installation of a sufficient number of water main valves as directed by City of Napa Water Division at City-approved locations.

j. Approved backflow prevention devices shall be installed on all new and existing domestic, irrigation, and fire water services.

k. Installation of a sufficient number of fire hydrants on all public water facilities as directed by the Fire Marshal at City approved locations.
l. Designate applicable on-Site fire hydrants as private.

m. Relocation of any affected water facilities and/or appurtenances (e.g. private fire hydrants, backflow devices, meters, etc.).

n. Water services may not be shared across property boundaries per NMC Section 13.04.230. Each parcel shall be served by a separate water meter with approved backflow devices.

o. Installation of a sufficient number of water quality monitoring/sampling stations at City-approved locations.

p. If existing services (including public hydrants) conflict with the proposed project design, the conflicting services shall be abandoned at the main. If a public hydrant is removed due to a conflict with the Project plans, a new hydrant shall be installed at a location approved by both the City of Napa Water Division and Fire Prevention Division. Extending existing hydrant laterals to avoid conflicts shall not be permitted.

q. Contact the City of Napa Fire Department to determine fire sprinkler requirements.

48. MISCELLANEOUS - The following items shall be shown on the improvement plans prior to approval of the improvement plans:

a. The Applicant shall connect the Project to the Napa Sanitation District for sanitary sewer service. Sewer services shall be shown on the improvement plans and shall be installed in accordance with Napa Sanitation District standards and reviewed and approved by the Napa Sanitation District.

b. The Site (both parcels) is located in a Special Flood Hazard Area “Zone AE” as designated on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), 06055C0508F effective September 29, 2010 and revised per LOMR 11-09-3313P effective 2/20/2012. As such the requirements of NMC Chapter 17.38 Floodplain Management apply to all new construction and substantial improvement within the Special Flood Hazard Area. These include but are not limited to:

(1) The Project Site plan shall indicate the floodplain limits and Base Flood Elevation (BFE) of the Floodplain for each parcel (building) as delineated in the current FEMA FIS and FIRM prepared for the County of Napa. All elevations should be based on NAD88 datum and so noted on the site plan.

(2) The Valle Verde building shall be elevated to at least one foot above the base flood elevation. No floodproofing is allowed for residential building.

(3) If applicable, indicate on plans water resistant materials for all construction below BFE plus one foot per FEMA Technical Bulletin 2-93.

(4) If applicable, indicate on plans that electrical, heating, ventilation, plumbing, air conditioning equipment (including ductwork) and other services are located a minimum of one foot above BFE or flood proofed to one foot above the BFE.

(5) Provide a letter prepared by a Licensed Surveyor (or Civil Engineer authorized to perform surveying by the State) verifying the correct elevation of the lowest floor relative to the FEMA identified Base Flood Elevation. All referenced elevations shall be based on NAD88 datum and the current FEMA FIS and FIRM prepared for the County of Napa.

(6) All new and existing sanitary sewer manholes that are within the floodplain limits shall be floodproof.
The proposed bioretention/detention facility as shown on the plans is entirely within the Special Flood Hazard Area Zone AE, the Applicant shall provide details on the improvement plans showing how the bioretention facility will be protected during flood events.

c. The Applicant shall install fence along the north property line. Fence type shall be determined by the Planning Division.

d. Landscape fence details (i.e. connection to existing and or new retaining walls, etc.) shall be prepared by a design professional and shall be submitted to Public Works in the first improvement plan submittal as part of the improvement plans or landscape plans. Fences shall be constructed of redwood material and shall be at a minimum 6-feet tall, unless otherwise specified.

e. This Project is subject to the requirements in NMC Chapter 5.6 Garbage Collection and Disposal regarding use of containers, sanitation of enclosure(s), etc.

f. For the proposed Valle Verde building, a turnaround dimensioned to accommodate the trash/recycling trucks which have a curb to curb turning radius of 36-feet 0-inches shall be provided at the north end of the private drive (which is currently Valle Verde Drive City public right-of-way). This area shall be striped with “No Parking” stenciled on the pavement, and a “No Parking” sign shall be erected adjacent to the right-of-way. The drive aisle from Valle Verde up to and including the turnaround area (both city property and onsite private parking area to be used for turnaround) shall be constructed such that it is able to withstand trucks weighing up to 56,000 lbs. Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW).

g. For the existing 38,770 sq.ft. Heritage House building, an 8-foot by 17-foot [minimum] enclosure is required that complies with the city’s approved Solid Waste, Recyclable Materials & Compostable Enclosures Standards. The drive aisle to be used by the solid waste/recycling collection contractor to access this enclosure shall be constructed such that it is able to withstand trucks weighing up to 56,000 lbs. Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW).

h. For the new 29,600 sq.ft. Valle Verde building, an 8-foot by 17-foot [minimum] area/room inside the building is required that complies with the city’s approved Solid Waste, Recyclable Materials & Compostable Enclosures Standards. This area/room shall service the entire building with chutes from the upper floors connected to the solid waste/recycling receptacles (which shall be limited to carts only) on the main floor. The walkway in front of the doors shall be paved equal to the width of the room and shall be kept clear at all times from the door to the street. The curbing in front of the walkway shall be painted red in order to facilitate unimpeded access for solid waste/recycling collection by the City’s contractor.

i. Only solid waste, recyclable material, and compostable carts shall be stored in the enclosures. The enclosures are strictly for the storage of containers and cannot be used for general storage of any kind.

j. This project is subject to City Ordinance O2010 18 which requires projects that exceed $100,000 in building valuation; or (b) exceed 5,000 sq.ft. of new, improved, or remodeled areas; to file a Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (WRRP) with the building permit application (which will be forwarded by Building Division staff to the C&DD Compliance Official/Materials Diversions staff). The WRRP form is provided by the City. No building permit shall be issued for any project until the Compliance Official has approved the WRRP. The plan shall document that recyclable materials shall be
site separated for recycling in order to meet the requirement of the City’s construction and demolition debris ordinance—recycling mandatory recyclables and exceeding overall 50% diversion. Official weight receipts for each load shall be obtained.

k. The Valle Verde apartment complex shall be required to comply with the State Mandated (AB 1826) Organics Recycling program with participation in the City of Napa greenwaste program which requires source separation of greenwaste from solid waste and recycling in multifamily dwellings of 5 units or more beginning April 1, 2016. The complex shall source separate green waste from other waste and subscribe to a service that includes collection and recycling of green waste.

l. Install all new underground utilities required to serve the Project underground including but not limited to water, sewer, electricity, gas, telecommunications, etc.

m. The Applicant is responsible for all coordination with utility companies and the design of all utility service installations that are required to serve the Project, including utility layout, design and costs associated with any necessary facilities upgrades, revisions, relocations and/or extensions. The Applicant shall relocate and underground any overhead utilities that conflict with the new improvements.

49. PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF IMPROVEMENT PLANS - The Applicant shall submit documentation to the Public Works Development Engineering Division for review and approval that indicates that the following items have been addressed:

a. The Applicant shall submit all required water connection fees to the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division at 1600 First Street, Napa CA. 94559. No inspections or water service from the Water Division will be initiated until all connection fees for the project have been paid.

b. The Applicant shall pay off all current account balances based on the rate in effect at the time of the permit issuance.

c. Complete the lot merger and lot line adjustment process between the four parcels (3700, 3710 & 3720 Valle Verde Drive and the abandoned portion of Valle Verde Drive) in accordance with NMC Section 16.12.040.

(1) Furnish proof of the payment of the mapping service fee as required by Napa County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 92-119.

d. Comply with the conditions of the abandonment of Valle Verde Drive set forth in the City Council resolution approving the abandonment of Valle Verde Drive.

e. The Applicant shall pay a deposit for inspection fees for Public Improvements.

f. Any work performed on neighboring properties shall be done in accordance with temporary construction easements from the impacted neighbor(s). The easements shall be obtained with copies submitted to the Public Works Development Engineering Division for review prior to the approval of the improvement plans.

g. The Applicant shall furnish proof satisfactory in form to the City Attorney of the acquisition of all rights of entry, permits, easements, etc., necessary to construct the project or to satisfy required Project mitigation measures and/or conditions prior to occupancy.

h. The Applicant shall execute a reciprocal access and maintenance agreement for all parcels, which share use of private access, drives, etc. The agreement shall be in a form subject to review and approval of the Public Works Director and approved as to
form by the City Attorney and shall be recorded prior to the approval of the improvement plans.

i. The Applicant shall submit to the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division a Soils Investigation/Geotechnical Report in accordance with NMC Section 16.36.200 with the first improvement plan submittal. The improvement plans shall incorporate all design and construction criteria specified in the report. The geotechnical engineer shall sign the improvement plans and approve them as conforming to their recommendations prior to improvement plan approval. The geotechnical engineer shall also assume responsibility for inspection of the work and prior to acceptance of the work shall certify to the City that the work performed is adequate and complies with their recommendations. Additional soils information may be required by the Chief Building Inspector during the plan check of building plans in accordance with NMC Title 15.

j. Provide acknowledgement by the District Engineer that the design of the sanitary sewer system design is approved by the Napa Sanitation District.

k. A State Department Fish and Game 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement, a Regional Water Quality Control Board 401 permit, and/or a Corps of Engineer 404 permit may be required for work done on rivers, creeks, and other waterways. The Applicant shall provide copies of these agreements or permits to the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division prior to approval of the improvement plans.

l. The Applicant shall furnish proof satisfactory to the Development Engineering Division that all regulatory agency permits (California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board) have been acquired to remove the existing bridge (deck, piers, and western abutment) and to do any repair work within the Salvador Creek Riparian corridor. If the Applicant reaches an agreement with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (NCFCWCD) for the District to remove the bridge (deck, piers, and western abutment) and perform any Salvador Creek Riparian corridor repairs then that agreement shall be submitted to the Development Engineering Division.

m. The Applicant shall submit a design exception for review and approval to lessen the 2-feet wide shoulder of the Class 1 multi-use path requirement to 1-foot wide shoulders.

50. PRIOR TO COMMENCING ANY ACTIVITIES ON-SITE – Prior to commencing any ground disturbing activities on-site, the Applicant shall:

a. Submit a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board’s General Construction Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order 2009-0009-DWQ).

b. Conduct a pre-construction meeting with representatives of the City whereby the Applicant and their Contractor provides the following:

   (1) (6) full-size bond copies of the approved Improvement Plans for the City’s use.

   (2) (1) job-site copy of the latest edition of the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and Standard Plans for their use.

   (3) (1) job-site copy of the approved SWPPP for their use.

51. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR REMODEL OF HERITAGE HOUSE BUILDING - Prior to issuance of the building permit for the remodel of the Heritage House
building the Applicant shall submit documentation to the Building Division for review and approval that indicates that the following items have been addressed:

a. The Applicant shall furnish proof satisfactory in form to the City Attorney of the acquisition of all rights of entry, permits, easements, etc., necessary to construct the project or to satisfy required Project mitigation measures and/or conditions prior to issuance of a building permit.

b. Submit any remaining water fees to the City of Napa Utilities Department, Water Division.

c. STREET IMPROVEMENT FEE - In accordance with NMC Chapter 15.84 and implementing resolutions to pay for the traffic improvements identified therein the Applicant shall pay the Street Improvement Fee prior to issuance of any building permit for the Project. The fee is required to mitigate the cumulative impact of the traffic generated by the Project on the City’s arterial and collector street system. Such fee shall be payable at the rate in effect at the time of payment. The findings set forth in the ordinance and implementing resolutions are incorporated herein. The City further finds that the calculation of the fees in accordance with the trip generation capacity of the Project demonstrates there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fees imposed and the cost of the street improvements attributable to this Project.

Per the Master Fee Schedule effective November 1, 2019 (Policy Resolution 16), the current rates for the Street Improvement Fee for this Project are as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit (DU)</th>
<th>Street Component Rate</th>
<th>Utility Underground Rate</th>
<th>Street Component Fee</th>
<th>Utility Underground Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Use</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$1,042/DU</td>
<td>$1,529/DU</td>
<td>$68,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Congregate Care Facility</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$352/DU</td>
<td>$518/DU</td>
<td>$26,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$42,724** **$62,582**

d. The Developer shall pay Big Ranch Specific Plan Area Development Impact Fees in accordance with Policy Resolution 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Type</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit (DU)</th>
<th>Fee Rate</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$6,136/DU</td>
<td>$404,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. The above fee amounts are provided based on the current rates.
f. City fee amounts are updated periodically. The Applicant shall pay the fees based on the rate in effect at the time of payment.

g. This Project is subject to City Ordinance O2010 18 which requires projects that exceed $100,000 in building valuation; or (b) exceed 5,000 sq.ft. of new, improved, or remodeled areas; to file a Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (WRRP) with the building permit application (which will be forwarded by Building Division staff to the C&DD Compliance Official/Materials Diversions staff). The WRRP form is provided by the City. No building permit shall be issued for any project until the Compliance Official has approved the WRRP. The plan shall document that recyclable materials shall be site separated for recycling in order to meet the requirement of the City’s construction and demolition debris ordinance—recycling mandatory recyclables and exceeding overall 50% diversion. Official weight receipts for each load shall be obtained.

h. The Heritage House apartment complex shall be required to comply with the State Mandated (AB 1826) Organics Recycling program with participation in the City of Napa greenwaste program which requires source separation of greenwaste from solid waste and recycling in multifamily dwellings of 5 units or more beginning April 1, 2016. The complex shall source separate green waste from other waste and subscribe to a service that includes collection and recycling of green waste.

52. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE VALLE VERDE BUILDING - Prior to issuance of the building permit for the Valle Verde project the Applicant shall submit documentation to the Building Division for review and approval that indicates that the following items have been addressed:

a. The existing bridge over Salvador Creek shall be removed consistent with Condition of Approval No. 43(c) and the repairs to the Salvador Creek riparian corridor shall be completed. No building permit for Valle Verde building shall be issued until the existing bridge has been removed in accordance with Condition of Approval No. 43(c).

b. The Applicant shall furnish proof satisfactory in form to the City Attorney of the acquisition of all rights of entry, permits, easements, etc., necessary to construct the Project or to satisfy required Project mitigation measures and/or conditions prior to issuance of a building permit.

c. Submit any remaining water fees to the City of Napa Utilities Department, Water Division.

d. STREET IMPROVEMENT FEE - In accordance with NMC Chapter 15.84 and implementing resolutions to pay for the traffic improvements identified therein the Applicant shall pay the Street Improvement Fee prior to issuance of any building permit for the project. The fee is required to mitigate the cumulative impact of the traffic generated by the Project on the City’s arterial and collector street system. Such fee shall be payable at the rate in effect at the time of payment. The findings set forth in the ordinance and implementing resolutions are incorporated herein. The City further finds that the calculation of the fees in accordance with the trip generation capacity of the Project demonstrates there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fees imposed and the cost of the street improvements attributable to this Project.

Per the Master Fee Schedule effective November 1, 2019 (Policy Resolution 16), the current rates for the Street Improvement Fee for this project are as follow:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit (DU)</th>
<th>Street Component Rate</th>
<th>Utility Underground Rate</th>
<th>Street Component Fee</th>
<th>Utility Underground Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Use</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,042/DU</td>
<td>$1,529/DU</td>
<td>$25,008</td>
<td>$36,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,008</td>
<td>$36,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   e. The Developer shall pay Big Ranch Specific Plan Area Development Impact Fees in accordance with Policy Resolution 16.

   f. The above fee amounts are provided based on the current rates.

   g. City fee amounts are updated periodically. The Applicant shall pay the fees based on the rate in effect at the time of payment.

   h. This Project is subject to City Ordinance O2010 18 which requires projects that exceed $100,000 in building valuation; or (b) exceed 5,000 sq.ft. of new, improved, or remodeled areas; to file a Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (WRRP) with the building permit application (which will be forwarded by Building Division staff to the C&DD Compliance Official/Materials Diversions staff). The WRRP form is provided by the City. No building permit shall be issued for any project until the Compliance Official has approved the WRRP. The plan shall document that recyclable materials shall be site separated for recycling in order to meet the requirement of the City’s construction and demolition debris ordinance—recycling mandatory recyclables and exceeding overall 50% diversion. Official weight receipts for each load shall be obtained.

   i. The Valle Verde apartment complex shall be required to comply with the State Mandated (AB 1826) Organics Recycling program with participation in the City of Napa greenwaste program which requires source separation of greenwaste from solid waste and recycling in multifamily dwellings of 5 units or more beginning April 1, 2016. The complex shall source separate green waste from other waste and subscribe to a service that includes collection and recycling of green waste.

53. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY OF THE FIRST UNIT FOR THE HERITAGE HOUSE BUILDING - Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first unit of the Heritage House building, the Applicant shall submit documentation to the Building Division for review and approval that indicates that the following items have been completed as reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division:

   a. Construct all the improvements (public and private) as shown in Phase 1 of the Valle Verde – Heritage House Phasing Plan.
b. Construct a Class 1 multi-use path that extends from the northwest corner of the Firefly Lane/Valle Verde Dr. intersection to the existing Salvador Creek Trail north of the project site. This path shall replace the existing 4-feet wide sidewalk located west of the project site. This path shall have a minimum paved width of 10-feet with 1-foot wide shoulders on either side.

c. Construct or pay in lieu fee for pedestrian crossing improvements at the Trancas Street and Valle Verde Drive intersection. These improvements shall include but are not limited to: installation of a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon System (RRFB) on the eastern leg of the intersection, installation of ADA curb ramps and crosswalk striping at the north and east legs of the intersection, yield markings on Trancas Street, and removal of existing crosswalk striping on the western leg of the intersection.

d. Construct all water improvements as shown on the approved improvement plans, the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and the special conditions listed above.

e. Submit certification that all backflow devices have been installed and tested by an AWWA certified tester (a list of testers is provided by the City of Napa) to the City of Napa Water Division. The test results shall be submitted by the Applicant to the City of Napa Public Works Department Water Division.

f. Submit a record drawing outlining as-built conditions of the completed water system improvements in both electronic and print copy formats.

g. The Applicant shall complete the water demand mitigation requirements of this Project as specified by the City of Napa Water Division. The Applicant will be contacted by the City of Napa Water Division after obtaining a building permit specifying the requirements for the proposed project.

h. Submit any remaining meter set and/or hot-tap fees to the Utilities Department, Water Division.

i. The improvements identified on the Public Street Repair Plan shall be completed.

j. All road surfaces shall be restored to pre-Project conditions after completion of any Project-related pipeline installation activities.

k. The Applicant shall replace any damaged curb and gutter along street frontages in accordance with Public Works Department Standard Specifications prior to occupancy.

l. All onsite and offsite improvements shall be installed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to occupancy.

m. Submit an inspector’s punch list indicating that all of the “Public & Private Improvements” are constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

n. Submit a certification by the Geotechnical Engineer of Record that all the work has been completed in substantial conformance with the recommendations in Soils Investigation/Geotechnical Report.

o. Submit a certification by the Engineer of Record that all work has been completed in substantial conformance with the approved Improvement Plans and Stormwater Control Plan.

p. The Applicant shall complete the Final Stormwater Inspection Sign Off form as specified in the Stormwater Control Plan and include the contractor’s and engineer of record’s signature verifying all post-construction bmp’s have been installed and inspected as
designed per the approved plans. A copy of the form may be requested from the Public Works Development Engineering Division – Stormwater Program.

q. Identify all on-site post-construction stormwater quality bmp’s and along the Project frontage with the appropriate street address (addresses to be provided by City) and GIS coordinates.

r. Prior to Final SW Sign off, all disturbed areas shall be installed with final permanent stabilization measures to insure no sediment laden water discharges from the Site.

s. Installation of street paving by the Applicant shall be completed and shall include reconstruction of the existing pavement section as required to provide adequate conforms. The limits of such reconstruction shall be reviewed by the Public Works Development Engineering Division and approved by the City Engineer as part of the construction plan review. Any necessary pavement conforms shall be installed prior to occupancy.

t. The Applicant shall replace any damaged curb and gutter along street frontages in accordance with Public Works Department Standard Specifications prior to occupancy.

u. For the existing 38,770 sq.ft. Heritage House building, an 8-foot by 17-foot [minimum] enclosure is required that complies with the city’s approved Solid Waste, Recyclable Materials & Compostable Enclosures Standards. The drive aisle to be used by the solid waste/recycling collection contractor to access this enclosure shall be constructed such that it is able to withstand trucks weighing up to 56,000 lbs. Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW).

v. Within sixty (60) days of the final inspection, the Applicant shall submit documentation (weight tags for the project debris), signed and certified under penalty of perjury, to the Compliance Official that the diversion requirement for the project per the approved WRRP has been met. Sign-off from Materials Diversion for a certificate of occupancy shall not occur until the weight tag documentation is approved. Non-compliance with the plan and City requirements may result in a fine.

w. The Applicant shall submit to the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division all improvement plans in digital auto-cad format, compatible with the City’s current version, and tied to the City’s coordinate system for all storm drain facilities, water lines, lot lines, sanitary sewer lines, sidewalks and streets. Auto-cad files shall be updated for as-built information and submitted to and approved as complete by the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division prior to occupancy.

54. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR THE FIRST VALLE VERDE BUILDING UNIT - Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first unit of the Valle Verde building, the Applicant shall submit documentation to the Building Division for review and approval that indicates that the following items have been completed as reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division:

a. Construct all water improvements as shown on the approved improvement plans, the City of Napa Public Works Department Standard Specifications and the special conditions listed above.

b. Submit certification that all backflow devices have been installed and tested by an AWWA certified tester (a list of testers is provided by the City of Napa) to the City of Napa Water Division. The test results shall be submitted by the Applicant to the City of Napa Public Works Department Water Division.
c. Submit a record drawing outlining as-built conditions of the completed water system improvements in both electronic and print copy formats.

d. The Applicant shall complete the water demand mitigation requirements of this Project as specified by the City of Napa Water Division. The Applicant will be contacted by the City of Napa Water Division after obtaining a building permit specifying the requirements for the proposed project.

e. Submit any remaining meter set and/or hot-tap fees to the Utilities Department Water Division.

f. The Applicant shall replace any damaged curb and gutter along street frontages in accordance with Public Works Department Standard Specifications prior to occupancy.

g. All onsite improvements shall be installed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to occupancy.

h. Submit an inspector’s punch list indicating that all of the “Public & Private Improvements” are constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

i. Submit a certification by the Geotechnical Engineer of Record that all the work has been completed in substantial conformance with the recommendations in Soils Investigation/Geotechnical Report.

j. Submit a certification by the Engineer of Record that all work has been completed in substantial conformance with the approved Improvement Plans and Stormwater Control Plan.

k. The Applicant shall complete the Final Stormwater Inspection Sign Off form as specified in the Stormwater Control Plan and include the contractor’s and engineer of record’s signature verifying all post-construction bmp’s have been installed and inspected as designed per the approved plans. A copy of the form may be requested from the Public Works Development Engineering Division – Stormwater Program.

l. Identify all on-site post-construction stormwater quality bmp’s and along the Project frontage with the appropriate street address (addresses to be provided by City) and GIS coordinates.

m. Prior to Final SW Sign off, all disturbed areas shall be installed with final permanent stabilization measures to insure no sediment laden water discharges from the Site.

n. The Applicant shall install full trash capture device(s) in accordance with the State Water Boards Trash Provisions Water Code section 13383. Full trash capture device(s) shall be installed on the Valle Verde building.

o. The Applicant shall submit a FEMA Elevation Certificate based on Finished Construction.

p. For the new 29,600 sq.ft. Valle Verde building, an 8-foot by 17-foot [minimum] area/room inside the building is required that complies with the city’s approved Solid Waste, Recyclable Materials & Compostable Enclosures Standards. This area/room shall service the entire building with chutes from the upper floors connected to the solid waste/recycling receptacles (which shall be limited to carts only) on the main floor. The walkway in front of the doors shall be paved equal to the width of the room and shall be kept clear at all times from the door to the street. The curbing in front of the walkway shall painted red in order to facilitate unimpeded access for solid waste/recycling collection by the City’s contractor.
q. For the proposed Valle Verde building, a turnaround dimensioned to accommodate the trash/recycling trucks which have a curb to curb turning radius of 36-feet 0-inches shall be provided at the north end of the private drive (which is currently Valle Verde Drive City public right-of-way). This area shall be striped with “No Parking” stenciled on the pavement, and a “No Parking” sign erected adjacent to the right-of-way. The drive aisle from Valle Verde up to and including the turnaround area (both city property and onsite private parking area to be used for turnaround) shall be constructed such that it is able to withstand trucks weighing up to 56,000 lbs. Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW).

r. Within sixty (60) days of the final inspection, the Applicant shall submit documentation (weight tags for the project debris), signed and certified under penalty of perjury, to the Compliance Official that the diversion requirement for the Project per the approved WRRP has been met. Sign-off from Materials Diversion for a certificate of occupancy shall not occur until the weight tag documentation is approved. Non-compliance with the plan and City requirements may result in a fine.

s. The Applicant shall submit to the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division all improvement plans in digital auto-cad format, compatible with the City’s current version, and tied to the City’s coordinate system for all storm drain facilities, water lines, lot lines, sanitary sewer lines, sidewalks and streets. Auto-cad files shall be updated for as-built information and submitted to and approved as complete by the Public Works Department Development Engineering Division prior to occupancy.

Building Division

40. Prior to Building permit issuance, the Applicant shall provide to the Building Division the following at time of Building Permit application: Note: The list below may not be a complete list.

1. A completed Building Permit application.
2. 7 complete sets of plans for construction for review and approval.
3. Energy Compliance documentation for review and approval.
4. Waste Reduction and Recycling Program form for review and approval, if applicable.
5. A Geotechnical Soils investigation report shall be required for this project.
6. Fire sprinklers are required for this project. Note: When fire sprinklers and/or fire alarm systems are required, plans shall be submitted under separate cover.

41. Verification of the following shall be required prior to Building permit issuance if applicable:

c. Napa Valley Unified School District (must show proof of payment from NVUSD), (707) 253-3549.
d. Public Works Encroachment and/or Grading permit, (707) 257-9520.
e. Napa County Environmental Health Department approval, (707) 253-6052.
f. Bay Area Air Quality Management District “Job” number for projects that require demolition of existing buildings on site, (707) 749-4762.
Fire Department

42. In accordance with the standard mitigation measures and conditions of approval set forth by the City of Napa, the Applicant shall pay the Fire Impact Fees (see current Standard Fees and Charges adopted by resolution) prior to the issuance of any building permits.

43. New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall conform to requirements set forth in the currently adopted editions of the California Building Code, California Fire Code, City of Napa standards and Nationally Recognized Standards.

44. There shall be no deferred submittals for fire protection equipment and related utilities. Fire protection plans shall not be attached to or bound with the building plan submittal package. This includes but is not limited to Automatic Fire Sprinkler, Fire Alarm, Fixed Fire Protection and Civil plans.

45. All Fire related underground piping and fire appurtenances shall be shown on the Civil plan submittal. One (1) plan set under separate cover shall be submitted and routed to the Fire Prevention Division detailing all underground piping and related fire appurtenances including but not limited to underground piping, underground sweep detail, underground trench details showing depth of burial, type of backfill manufacture’s specifications of piping, valves joints, fittings and calculated size and locations of thrust blocks, hydrants locations (designate public or private), gate shut-off valves, PIV’s, FDC’s, fire pumps, fire pump and/or riser rooms.

46. Underground utility contractor, architect and fire sprinkler contractor shall coordinate the location of risers and control valves prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

47. Fire Department plan review shall be based on the information submitted at the time of permit application. Any changes to the approved/permitted scope of work including additions, alterations, demolition, repair or a change in occupancy/use may impact the project requirements, including but not limited to the installation of additional fire protection systems or components.

48. An approved water supply capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection systems shall be provided to all premises upon which facilities or buildings are hereby constructed or moved into or within the City. Required fire flow and hydrant distribution shall be in accordance with Appendix B and C of the California Fire Code and shall be clearly detailed on the Civil Plan submittal. See sample example below showing how the fire flow information should be detailed on the plan.

BUILDING FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS EXAMPLE:- CFC Tables B105.2 & B105.1 (2)

Table B105.1(2) – Building size = 129,600 square feet
Fire Flow = 5,250 gpm at 20 psi
Duration = 4 hours

Table B105.2 - Fire sprinkler allowance = -50%
5,250 - 2,625 = 2,625 gpm
Fire Flow = 2,626 gpm @ 20 psi
Duration = 2 hours

49. Fire Protection systems shall be installed in accordance with provisions set forth in the California Fire Code as amended by the City of Napa and the applicable National Fire Protection Association Standard.

50. The fire protection equipment shall be located within an interior room having an approved exterior access door or in an exterior enclosure attached to the building, specifically, for
the purpose of housing such equipment. **Residential fire protection equipment (risers) shall be located within an interior wall (typically in the garage) having an interior access door attached to the building, specifically for the purpose of housing such equipment.**

51. Prior to building permit issuance, the use of AutoTurn or comparable software shall be used to provide a fire department circulation plan using the City’s largest apparatus (ladder truck) and demonstrate clear turning movements into and out of the Project. The plan shall include a legend that demonstrates the apparatus specifications used. The final design of fire department access components shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal prior to installation.

52. Fire Apparatus Access Roads shall be designed in accordance with provisions set forth in the California Fire Code Chapter 5 and Appendix D as amended by the City of Napa and the applicable Public Works Standard.

53. Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed minimum width of 20 feet (curb to curb) and a minimum unobstructed vertical clearance of 13’ 6”. They shall have an all-weather paved surface capable of supporting a GVW of 71,000 pounds.

54. Access roads shall be completed with all-weather surfaces prior to the stockpiling of combustible materials or beginning combustible construction. Fire apparatus access shall be provided to within 150 feet of the most remote portions of all buildings from an approved exterior route. If this cannot be achieved fire apparatus turn arounds will be needed.

55. Fire apparatus access roads shall not be obstructed in any manner, including the parking of vehicles. Vertical traffic calming in the form of speed pumps, humps or dips are prohibited along fire access roads without prior approval of the fire Code Official. The minimum width and clearances established in Section 503.2.1 shall be maintained at all times.

56. When required by the Fire Chief, fire apparatus access roads shall be designated as Fire Lanes and appropriate signs and/or markings installed in accordance with the California Vehicle Code and approved City standards.

57. Where applicable improvement plan submittals for a permit shall include locations of fire lane red curbing and fire lane signage. Please refer to and include City Public Works Standard FP-2A & 2B with plan submittals for permitting.

58. When fire sprinkler systems are required in buildings of undetermined use, they shall be designed and installed to have a sprinkler density of not less than that required for an Extra Hazard Group II use with a minimum design area of 2,500 square feet. The City of Napa requires that a fire hydrant be in service within 250 feet of the furthest point of construction prior to the stockpiling of combustible materials for the beginning of construction.

59. Fire Department Connections (FDC) shall be located not more than 100 ft. from the nearest fire hydrant.

60. Improvement Plans submitted for a permit shall include City of Napa Fire Department “Underground” standards, detail drawings and the applicable City of Napa Public Works Standard detail (W-7A, B, C or D) for Fire Service double detector check installations. **Also, a separate set of plans shall be submitted detailing all related underground Fire utilities and appurtenances including but not limited to: All underground piping, type, sizes, depth of burial, fittings, thrust blocks, risers, pumps, hydrants, FDC’s, etc.**

General Conditions

61. Unless otherwise specifically provided in this resolution, each condition of this approval shall be satisfied prior to the first to occur of: (a) approval of a final map (if this resolution includes the approval of a tentative subdivision map or tentative parcel map), (b) issuance of a building
permit, or (c) commencement of any use of land that is authorized by this resolution. An improvement agreement between the City and the Applicant (and landowner, if different) that obligates the Applicant to complete specified conditions of approval will be deemed to be a satisfaction of those specified conditions if: (i) the agreement is accompanied by required security for faithful performance and labor and materials, and (ii) the agreement is approved as to substance by the City Engineer, and approved as to form by the City Attorney.

62. Applicant shall pay all applicable fees and charges at the required time and at the rate in effect at time of payment (in accordance with the City’s Master Fee Schedule; see individual departments regarding the timing of fee payment requirements).

63. Applicant shall design and construct all improvements and facilities shown on any approved tentative map, site plan, or other documents submitted for permit approval, and with the plans and specifications submitted to and approved by City, to comply with the General Plan, any applicable Specific Plan, the Napa Municipal Code (NMC), City ordinances and resolutions, the “Standard Specifications” of the Public Works and Fire Departments, as well as any approved tentative map, site plan or other documents submitted for permit approval and with the plans and specifications submitted to and approved by City.

64. The time limit within which to commence any lawsuit or legal challenge to any quasi-adjudicative decision made by the City is governed by Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, unless a shorter limitations period is specified by any other provision. 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.

65. To the full extent permitted by law, the Applicant shall indemnify, defend, release and hold City, its agents, officers, and employees from and against any claims, suits, liabilities, actions, damages, penalties or causes of action by any person, including Applicant, for any injury (including death) or damage to person or property or to set aside, attack, void or annul any actions of City, its agents, officers and employees, from any cause whatsoever in whole or in part arising out of or in connection with (1) the processing, conditioning or approval of the subject property; (2) any failure to comply with all applicable laws and regulations; or (3) the design, installation or operation of project improvements and regardless whether the actions or omissions are alleged to be caused by City or Applicant so long as City promptly notifies Applicant of any such claim, etc., and the City cooperates in the defense of same.

66. If the Applicant is not the owner of the subject property, all agreements required to be executed by the City must be executed by the Owner(s) as well as the Applicant.

67. The conditions of project approval set forth herein include certain fees, dedication requirements, reservation requirements and other exactions. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020(d)(1), these conditions (and mitigations) constitute written notice of the statement of the amount of such fees and a description of the dedications, reservations, and other exactions. You are hereby notified that the 90-day period in which you may protest those fees, the amount of which has been identified herein, dedications, reservations and other exactions have begun. If you fail to file a protest complying with all the requirements of Section 66020, you will be legally barred from later challenging such exaction.

68. Applicant must comply with all conditions of approval set forth in this Resolution. Violation of any term, condition, mitigation measure or Project description relating to this Resolution is unlawful, prohibited and a violation of the NMC and is grounds for revocation or modification of this approval and/or the institution of civil and/or criminal enforcement and/or abatement proceedings.

69. Violation of any term, condition, mitigation measure or project description relating to this approval is unlawful, prohibited and a violation of the Napa Municipal Code and can result in
revocation or modification of this approval and/or the institution of civil and/or criminal enforcement and/or abatement proceedings.

70. Project approval would not have been granted but for the applicability and validity of each and every one of the specified mitigations and conditions, and if any one or more of such conditions and mitigations is found to be invalid by a court of law, this project approval would not have been granted without requiring other valid conditions and/or mitigations consistent with achieving the purpose and intent of such approval.

71. Approval of the Use Permit, Design Review Permits and Density Bonus Concessions will become effective on the day following Council’s approval of this Resolution. The Use Permit, Design Review Permits and Density Bonus Concessions are subject to the expiration provisions of NMC Section 17.68.170 and may be extended in accordance with the requirements of NMC Section 17.68.130.

Section 6. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Napa at a public meeting of said City Council held on the ___day of _____2020, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST: ________________________  
Tiffany Carranza  
City Clerk

Approved as to form:

______________________________  
Michael W. Barrett  
City Attorney
December 3, 2019

Via E-mail Only [pbaring@cityofnapa.org; clerk@cityofnapa.org]

Chair Beth Painter, Planning Commissioners, and Planning Staff
c/o City Clerk Tiffany Carranza and Planning Commission Secretary Patty Baring
City of Napa
955 School Street
City Hall, South Wing
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Comments re Valle Verde & Heritage House Continuum of Housing Project
Planning Commission Meeting of December 5, 2019
Agenda Item # 7.A (File No. PL17-0114)

Dear Chairperson Painter, Planning Commissioners, and Planning Staff:

This office represents the unincorporated neighborhood association known as Neighborhood Coalition to Preserve Salvador Creek (a.k.a., Neighborhood Coalition to Protect Salvador Creek, or “NCPSC”), whose members include dozens of residents adjacent to, and thus directly affected by, the proposed Valle Verde & Heritage House Continuum of Housing Project (“Project”).

This letter summarizes our clients’ concerns regarding the Project, and hereby incorporates by this reference (1) all of the other public and agency comments submitted to the City regarding the Project; (2) the attached Exhibit “A” addressing the Staff Report for the Planning Commission’s December 5, 2019 meeting; and (3) all relevant documents and information regarding NCPSC’s prior, successful lawsuit challenging BRIDGE Housing’s similarly misguided project proposed several years ago at the same site (“BRIDGE
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Project"), including without limitation the items listed in attached Exhibit "B". 1 We respectfully request that this Comment Letter, and all of the above-listed, incorporated information, be included in the administrative record, or record of proceedings, for this matter.

I. Introduction & Summary

First, we respectfully request the Planning Commission briefly postpone any consideration of this matter until we have received from the City and have had ample time to review all documents responsive to our formal Public Records Act ("PRA") request. Second, while our clients wholeheartedly support the City’s and applicant’s laudable efforts to provide much-needed affordable housing, support services, and treatment for homeless, mentally-ill, and economically-challenged individuals and families, they respectfully request that this particular Project, at this location, be denied, for the following reasons:

1. The Project is Fundamentally Incompatible with this Neighborhood. This “experimental” Project is proposed in the worst location possible - i.e., a residential neighborhood full of families, young children, and seniors, adjacent to public parks and schools, yet far from transit, jobs, and social services. However well-meaning the new No Place Like Home ("NPLH") program may be, locating dozens of unsupervised, extremely high-risk, severely mentally-ill and/or addicted persons in this quiet residential neighborhood is predictably disastrous. Given the 102-unit Silverado Creek Apartments, this neighborhood has already done more than its “fair share” toward meeting the City’s affordable housing goals.

2. The Project Severely, Negatively Affects a Very Constrained Site, and its Impacts Have Not Been Legally Disclosed, Analyzed, or Mitigated. The Project’s dense 90-unit count is excessive for such a small, physically-constrained, environmentally-sensitive riparian site, sitting directly atop the bank and including the channel of Salvador Creek - which is known habitat for endangered species - thus causing many significant environmental impacts, worse than the “too-dense”, yet much smaller, 57-unit BRIDGE Project. Unfortunately, the draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") fails to properly disclose, analyze, or mitigate the Project’s impacts, including as follows:

   a. The DEIR’s inconsistent, inaccurate, and misleading descriptions of the Project fail to satisfy the law’s most basic informational functions;

---

1 Due to the latter’s volume, we intend to separately forward electronic and/or hard copies of same ahead of any final Project-related public hearings. However, given their identification in Exhibit "B", and the City’s direct involvement in the prior lawsuit, we reasonably assume the City can itself, directly locate or obtain them in the interim.
b. The DEIR fails to sufficiently disclose, analyze, and feasibly mitigate the proposed Project’s many potentially significant impacts – including on Biological Resources, Traffic, Parking, etc.; much of the analysis is refuted by substantial evidence including still-relevant studies for the BRIDGE Project; and

c. The analyses of Project Alternatives and Cumulative Impacts are insufficient.

3. **The Project Also Fails to Comply With, and Thus Violates, Numerous Other Laws.** The laws, regulations, and requirements the Project violates include:

a. General Plan and Big Ranch Specific Plan policies, e.g., to preserve and protect creeks, riparian habitat, etc.

b. The allowed number/size of rooms and/or occupants in SRO units.

c. Minimum parking requirements for SRO projects, and more generally.

d. Recorded, legally binding deed restrictions and/or conditions of approval limiting the Sunrise property’s use to senior/affordable housing.

e. The statutory prohibition against counting toward Density Bonus eligibility the Sunrise building’s already senior/affordability-restricted units.

f. Restrictions regarding the site’s existing sewer trunk and easement.

g. The City’s own, required riparian setbacks, e.g., per Muni Code Chapter 17.52.110, and flood protection requirements.

h. Prohibitions against expanding, intensifying, or resurrecting vacant nonconforming uses, including the Sunrise facility’s noncompliant setbacks.

i. Donating *public* parking on Valle Verde Dr. to the applicant as 26 “off-street” *private* spaces is a gift of public funds, violates the prohibition against using on-street spaces to satisfy mandatory off-street parking requirements, and exacerbates longstanding parking problems.\(^2\)

Thus, as so many citizens have noted, what is sorely needed here is a *well-thought-out, scaled-back residential project that truly fits* this predominantly family/senior-oriented neighborhood and severely-constrained creekside site.

---

\(^2\) Since under CEQA a project’s noncompliance with land use/environmental laws, regulations, policies, or programs is treated as a potentially significant impact, the DEIR’s failures to disclose (much less analyze/mitigate) the above-listed examples of noncompliance constitute yet additional fatal CEQA flaws.
II. This Extremely Controversial, Experimental Project is Mistakenly Proposed on The Most Environmentally-Sensitive Site, in The Most Ill-Suited Neighborhood

Because it is proposed on the most incompatible site, in the most incompatible neighborhood, this Project – especially its No Place Like Home (“NPLH”) component - is a land use planning disaster.

While operational information about the Project’s extremely controversial, experimental NPLH component is spotty, what we’ve learned to date is extremely disturbing. For example:

The state’s NPLH program is entirely new, and thus experimental: “On July 1, 2016, Governor Brown signed landmark legislation enacting the No Place Like Home program to dedicate up to $2 billion in bond proceeds to invest in the development of permanent supportive housing for persons who are in need of mental health services and are experiencing homelessness, chronic homelessness, or who are at risk of chronic homelessness. The bonds are repaid by funding from the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). In November 2018 voters approved Proposition 2, authorizing the sale of up to $2 billion of revenue bonds and the use of a portion of Proposition 63 taxes for the NPLH program.” (Emph. added; California Department of Housing and Community Development (“HCD”) website, accessed 11/8/19: https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/nplh.shtml#background)

To that end, the program’s stated purpose is “To acquire, design, construct, rehabilitate, or preserve permanent supportive housing for persons who are experiencing homelessness, chronic homelessness or who are at risk of chronic homelessness, and who are in need of mental health services.” (Id.) More specifically, the “Population to be Served” is defined as: “Adults with serious mental illness, or children with severe emotional disorders and their families and persons who require or are at risk of requiring acute psychiatric inpatient care, residential treatment, or outpatient crisis intervention because of a mental disorder with symptoms of psychosis, suicidality or violence and who are homeless, chronically homeless, or at risk of chronic homelessness.” (Emph. added; Id.) HCD’s website further explains that the term “At risk of chronic homelessness’ includes persons who are at high risk of long-term or intermittent homelessness, including persons with mental illness exiting institutionalized settings with a history of homelessness prior to institutionalization, and transition age youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability.” (Emph. added; Id.)

However, after so clearly articulating that the persons to be served must “need... mental health services” and “require or are at risk of requiring acute psychiatric inpatient care, residential treatment, or outpatient crisis intervention” due to “mental disorder[s] with symptoms of psychosis, suicidality, or violence”, the program rather shockingly requires a
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“hands off” approach to managing, supervising, and treating such admittedly high-risk individuals: “Key features of the program include:... Funding for permanent supportive housing must utilize low barrier tenant selection practices that prioritize vulnerable populations and offer flexible, voluntary, and individualized supportive services.” (Emph. added; Id.) According to a HCD-sponsored webinar presented November 6, 2019, NPLH “case managers” need not be on-site, and can conduct periodic site visits. While HCD’s website claims “Counties must commit to provide mental health services and help coordinate access to other community-based supportive services” (Id.), to date we’ve seen zero information about what, if any, legally required “commitments” Napa County has made. Furthermore, any such commitments would be meaningless anyway, since NPLH residents cannot legally be required to use any services. They also apparently cannot be turned away, or later evicted, for misconduct. The very notion of housing, without any requirement to ever treat, such high-risk individuals is simply an untenable, unacceptable recipe for disaster. Doing so in this quiet, family/senior-oriented neighborhood, adjacent to public schools and parks, yet relatively far from transit, job centers, and social services, is a fundamental planning mistake.

Given the dearth of City- or applicant-provided information about such extremely troubling issues, our firm has had to file California Public Records Act (“PRA”) requests with the City and HCD seeking, for example, the applicant’s "supportive services plan" (e.g., describing the services proposed for the NPLH residents, whether they’re required or merely encouraged, how they’re to be provided/delivered, etc.); the applicant’s past history of relevant experience, if any, including implementation of proposed services; the types, levels and/or degrees of County mental health or other service commitments, if any; how far, near, or convenient the supposedly offered/available off-site supportive services are, vis a vis the site, etc. While we are still reviewing the thousands of pages provided by HCD, we have yet to receive any PRA-responsive documents from the City. Thus, as noted above, we are respectfully asking that the Planning Commission postpone its hearings, and refrain from any consideration of this matter, until we’ve received and had ample time to review all the City’s PRA-responsive information.

III. The DEIR Fails to Comply with CEQA


The DEIR vaguely admits “As described in CEQA Guidelines section 15121(a), an EIR is an informational document that assesses potential environmental impacts of a proposed project, as well as identifies mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed Project that could reduce or avoid adverse environmental impacts... The basic requirements for an EIR include discussions of the environmental setting, environmental impacts, mitigation
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measures, cumulative impacts, alternatives, and growth-inducing impacts.” (DEIR, p. 1.)
What the above conveniently omits, however, is how seriously California courts take
CEQA compliance. The California Supreme Court has held that “Preparation of an EIR
and consideration of comments on it from the public and other agencies enables the
agencies that will consider the project to have the information necessary to weigh
competing policies and interests” (Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990)
52 Cal.3d 553, 576); and an EIR serves “to demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that
the agency has ... analyzed and considered the ecological implications of its action.” (No
Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 86.)

A. The DEIR Fails to Satisfy CEQA’s Most Basic Informational Mandate

As noted, CEQA’s first and foremost purpose is to provide concerned citizens and
decision-makers with a complete, accurate, stable, and static Project Description - to
thereby fully, fairly inform everyone exactly what is proposed, and how and to what extent
it would affect the environment. (See, e.g., CEQA Guidelines, §15124.) An EIR must
likewise include a description of the existing environment in the vicinity of the project from
both a local and a regional perspective. (Id., §15125(a).) The EIR must discuss the
project’s regional setting and must emphasize discussion of any affected environmental
resources that are rare or unique to the region (Id., §15125(c)), and such discussion should
also include an evaluation of any inconsistencies between the proposed project and
applicable general, specific, or regional plans (Id., §15125(d)). Only then can CEQA’s key
mandate of disclosing, analyzing, and mitigating impacts be met.

Unfortunately, the DEIR fails to meet even this most basic, informational mandate. Its
main, fatal informational flaws include inexplicably omitting crucial aspects of the existing
environment and proposed Project, and portraying other Project aspects and issues in
inaccurate, contradictory, and inconsistent ways. All such problems cause uncertainty and
confusion. Some even seem intentional. For example and without limitation:

The section entitled “Description of the Proposed Project” (starting at DEIR, p. 8)
erroneously states that the existing, inactive bridge over Salvador Creek (“Zerba Bridge”)
is “located to the east of the Project site” (Emph. added; DEIR, p. 22) – as if it’s outside,
not within, the site itself, thus suggesting it’s “someone else’s property, and problem”.
This errant notion is reiterated by statements like: “The... Applicant is not proposing
removal of the existing private... bridge...” (Emph. added; Id.). While the DEIR vaguely
notes “as part of any approval, the City might nevertheless require the bridge’s partial
removal”, one gets the distinct, erroneous impression Zerba Bridge isn’t within the
Project site, and removing any portions of it is not the applicant’s responsibility or goal.
However, as the DEIR authors either know or should have known, since the Project
parcels’ eastern boundaries extend to the centerline of Salvador Creek, the bulk of
Zerba Bridge is within, and thus part of, the site itself.
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Such misleading statements about whether the site includes the Bridge, whether any portions might be removed, etc., are not only repeated over and over at pages 79, 87, etc., but also taint related discussions, such as “what if any portions of the Bridge might be removed?”, and most importantly any such activities’ resulting impacts. It not only inaccurately suggests the Project may actually proceed sans any bridge-removal\(^3\), but also seems an ill-advised excuse for only tentatively, lightly disclosing (much less seriously analyzing or mitigating) the impacts of such “merely potential” or “hypothetical” removal. Under CEQA, such misleading ambiguity is fatal.

In actuality, however, all the relevant, substantial evidence refutes any notion the Project may, might, or could proceed without removing all of Zerba Bridge. For example:

As noted in so many public comments (and further below, re Biological Impacts), Zerba Bridge’s eastern and western abutments, decking, and vertical piers serve as a “bottleneck” in the creek channel, that significantly impedes heavy storm flows, thereby causing “overtopping” of the upstream creek banks and flooding of upstream properties. As such, the City would be remiss - and presumably violate its own and other flood control/management laws/requirements - if it imprudently approved this Project on a site that includes at least half this flood-causing Bridge, without its removal.

As suggested above, equally misleading are the DEIR’s claims that “if for some reason the City were to require the Project to include some bridge-removal, then it’d only be partial”, meaning the western abutment, decking, and upper portions of the piers. As the DEIR authors should know (and the substantial evidence confirms), over time the piers’ foundations (originally lodged in the creek bed) have been undercut and exposed by forceful streamflow erosion, leaving the piers essentially hanging, suspended from the decking. (See p. 2, and Photo 1 on p. 9, of Clearwater Hydrology’s below-referenced 2014 report re “hydraulic and geomorphic analysis of channel and bank stability”, included at Tab #2 of Exhibit “B”.) Since the piers’ foundations no longer (or barely) contact the creek bed, removing the decking and/or the piers’ vaguely described “upper portions” will cause the remainder of the piers to fall into the channel.

Likewise, as discussed further below (re Biological Impacts) and noted in both CH’s initial 2014 report (re the BRIDGE Project), and recent 2019 report (updated for this Project)\(^4\), Zerba Bridge’s eastern support-wall, below and apparently part of its eastern abutment, is severely cracked. (See p. 2 of CH 2014 report, and Photo 1 at p. 9 of both CH’s 2014 and 2019 reports.) Indeed, during the period between CH’s first and second

---

\(^3\) While our clients and their current counsel were directly involved throughout the failed BRIDGE Project, none of us recalls ever hearing it could (or even might) proceed or be approved sans bridge-removal.

\(^4\) The 2014 CH report is included in Exhibit “B” at Tab #2; the 2019 CH report was submitted to the City on September 5, 2019, by NCPSC’s Bill McGuire.
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reports, a large portion of the cracked eastern support-wall failed, and is now gone. (See, e.g., Photos #1, 2, and 4, taken October 5, 2019, in Tab #4 of Exhibit “B”.) Consequently, the CH 2019 report opines that the resulting bare, exposed portions of the creek’s eastern bank will suffer continuous, further erosion from ongoing flows, exacerbated by the resulting uneven channel surface, all of which will hasten the remaining portions’ failure and loss, jeopardizing the eastern abutment itself, leading not only to wholesale structural failure, but further, deleterious erosion and related potentially significant riparian, species, and habitat impacts. (See, e.g., 2019 CH report “Conclusions”, at pp. 6-8.)

In sum, all of the above refutes any notion the Project would or will ever be approved without requiring the removal of Zerba Bridge, in toto. Indeed, that’s exactly what the Staff Report for the Planning Commission’s December 5th meeting belatedly admits. (See, Exhibit “A”.)

All of the above shows that the DEIR is fundamentally, fatally misleading and informationally bereft, because (A) it repeatedly, falsely suggests the Project may not actually involve any bridge-removal, (B) it misrepresents the extent of the purportedly “unlikely” bridge-removal, and (C) most importantly, it fails to disclose, acknowledge, analyze, or mitigate the resulting, entire bridge removal’s impacts. Such failures not only thwart CEQA’s key informational goals, but also its impact-analysis and mitigation mandates.

In addition, as discussed further below (re Biological Impacts), the DEIR’s misleading claims that “any bridge-removal impacts won’t likely occur”, and “in the off-chance they do, they won’t be potentially significant anyway” are refuted by the relevant substantial evidence, including the detailed analysis prepared by NCPSC’s fisheries expert, Dr. Alice A. Rich (“Rich Report”, see Exhibit “B”, at Tab #1) submitted to the City in June 2013 just before the Council voted to re-approve the ill-fated BRIDGE Project.

In conclusion, for all of the above reasons, the DEIR’s vague, hazy, boilerplate analysis of - and proffered mitigations for - the foreseeable entire bridge-removal’s impacts are even weaker and less adequate than those deemed legally inadequate several years ago by the Napa County Superior Court. As noted in the Rich Report, this is partly because Salvador Creek is known to be inhabited by and serve as critical habitat for state- and federally-listed species, including Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, steelhead, etc. (See further discussion below re Biological Impacts.)

This brings us to yet another key, informational flaw – i.e., that, despite the City’s prior consultants’ clear acknowledgements that endangered salmon inhabit Salvador Creek (see LSA’s “Biological Resources Report” prepared in 2013 for the BRIDGE Project) - the City’s current consultant for this Project at the very same site, WRA, somehow
omitted any such crucial, known, salmon-related information. The only “Formally-Listed Species” WRA claims “reportedly present” is steelhead - not salmon. (See, WRA’s Biological Resources Technical Report, dated May 2019, revised July 2019, found at DEIR Appendix C, pp. 15-18, incl. Table 4 - Potential Special Status Wildlife.) The only mention of salmon is in a sentence buried in a seemingly irrelevant, inconsequential section entitled Species Unlikely to Occur (Emph. added; Id., starting on p. 19), which cryptically states: “Essential Fish Habitat The Study Area contains general Essential Fish Habitat for Salmonids, specifically Chinook (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) and Coho salmon (O. kisutch).” (Id., p. 21.) That’s it. Nothing further.

Yet further, fatal informational flaws include the DEIR’s false claims that (A) since the depth of the Salvador Creek channel is less than 8 feet, the City-required riparian setback (from top of bank) is merely 20 feet, and (B) the City’s currently-required riparian setback only applies to the Project’s “Valle Verde Apartments” component (involving new construction), not the “Heritage House” component (involving renovating the existing, long-vacant Sunrise Assisted Living building). (See, e.g., DEIR pp. 85-87, including Figure 3.4-3.) Both statements are dead wrong.

First, per the City’s own Municipal Code: “Top of bank means the highest elevation of land which confines flowing waters to their channel”, and “Where the average depth of the bank is eight feet or greater, the required setback from the toe of the stream bank shall be two times the depth of the bank plus 20 feet...” (Emph. added; Napa Muni. Code Chapter 17.52.110 B.1.) Here, as shown in the cross-section and photos in both the 2014 and 2019 CH reports, the depth of Salvador Creek’s channel far exceeds 8 feet. Indeed, the depth of most of the western bank that runs right through the Project site is at least 13 feet. (See, 2019 CH report’s “Conclusions” at p. 7; and 2014 CH report’s Figure 2, creek channel Cross-Section in Technical Appendix, and Photo 5 on p. 11.) Thus, the actual City-required riparian setback (from the toe of the stream bank) is two times the depth of the channel plus twenty feet. Even if one conservatively assumes the channel’s average depth (or stream bank’s average height) is only 10 feet, the actual City-required riparian setback for this Project is at least 40 or 50 feet - i.e., twice what the DEIR erroneously claims.

Second, the fact that the Heritage House component (renovating the vacant Sunrise building) must also comply with the City’s current 40-50-foot plus riparian setback is found in the City’s own “nonconforming use” ordinance. (Napa Muni. Code Chapter 17.52.320.) Specifically, any “grandfathered” or “legal nonconforming” status the Sunrise building may have held is either already lost due to the facility’s longstanding vacancy and non-use, or will disappear given the Project’s expansion and/or intensification of previously low-impact “senior assisted living” use.
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Also misleading and inaccurate is Figure 3.4-3 itself (DEIR, p. 86), which among other things erroneously, inaccurately portrays (too far eastward) the location of Salvador Creek’s “top of bank”, which conveniently dictates and thus errantly portrays the supposed riparian setback (which as noted above, is wrong, in any case). Even with such glaring errors, however, Figure 3.4-3 still shows that (i) the Sunrise facility’s rear paved area wholly violates current setbacks, and (ii) the easternmost portions of both the Sunrise building, and proposed Valle Verde apartment building, fall within and thus violate floodplain restrictions.

Another inconsistency is found in the DEIR’s description of the so-called “stitch pier retaining structure”, aimed to prevent further, severe stream flows from eroding and undermining the Sunrise facility’s rear paved parking/vehicular travel areas. Notably, while the DEIR repeatedly states the stitch pier retaining structure will be 85 feet long (DEIR, pp. 22, 85-87), the recently-issued Staff Report (for the Planning Commission’s December 5th hearing) describes it as a whopping 185 feet long. (See 12/5/19 PC Staff Report, p. 4; Exhibit “A”, p. 2.) Again, such discrepancies are particularly problematic given both Salvador Creek’s value as riparian, protected species habitat, as well as the DEIR’s abject failures to disclose the presence of, and analyze potential impacts to, endangered Coho and Chinook salmon. A similar, glaring error of omission is that the “potential for impacts... during construction activities as a result of sedimentation, material spills, and erosion” mentions only steelhead, not salmon. Similarly errant are the DEIR’s rather broad claims that “the Project would result in an improvement of existing conditions by restoring Salvador Creek to a more natural condition...” (see, e.g., DEIR, p. 79). While this might be true if or when Zerba Bridge is fully removed, such key Project activities will also cause potentially significant impacts, and this claim is patently false as to the artificial armoring of Salvador Creek’s entire western bank, via the proposed (now) 185-foot long, very deep, stitch pier retaining structure. Given the extent to which erosion has undermined the rear, paved areas of the Sunrise facility (see Photos #17-18 in Tab 4 of Exhibit “B”), the DEIR’s claim that such an extensive stitch pier retaining structure - intended to curb further erosion of the creek’s entire western bank - “would be constructed outside of the creek channel” (DEIR, p. 22) is simply not credible.

Further, fatal confusion is found in the differing descriptions of the “site” allegedly analyzed. While the DEIR repeatedly describes the Project site as 2.9 acres, elsewhere it (as well as WRA) claims the analysis covers some 3.27 acres, which vaguely, purportedly includes “the proposed limits of work for the Project and additional areas along the Salvador Creek.” (DEIR, p. 64.)

The DEIR also contains conflicting, inconsistent descriptions of the proposed Project’s total parking spaces. While the text claims the total is 79 (DEIR p. 18), Figures 2.7-1 and 2.7-2 on pages 9 and 10, respectively, show 85 spaces. Like the many above problems regarding bridge-removal, endangered salmon, the miraculously increased stitch pier
length, etc., these mishandled parking-related facts taint the purported “analysis” and “mitigation” of parking-related impacts.

In conclusion, each of the above examples of the DEIR’s informational defects, standing alone, is a distinct CEQA violation, and taken together they deprive concerned citizens and decision-makers of the legally adequate, accurate, static, finite Project Description – rendering it impossible to properly disclose, analyze, and mitigate resulting impacts.

B. Failures to Properly Identify, Analyze, and Mitigate Biological Impacts

As suggested above, while the Project site clearly has very significant riparian attributes and habitat values, the DEIR’s effort to disclose, analyze, and mitigate the Project’s impacts to such key resources is wholly wanting.

First, as noted in their 2019 report, CH was first retained by NCPSC in 2014 to complete a comprehensive, detailed “hydraulic and geomorphic analysis of channel and bank stability for the reach of Salvador [Creek’s] channel adjacent to the then-proposed [BRIDGE] project...” (2019 CH report, p. 1.) In their prior 2014 report, CH concluded the BRIDGE Project would likely cause myriad, potentially significant, negative impacts to Salvador Creek and its environs. (2014 CH report, Tab 2 of Exhibit “B”.) For this similar yet much larger proposed Project, CH was again retained by NCPSC, analyzed the differences between the prior and current projects, re-inspected the subject reach of Salvador Creek, and updated its 2014 report. Specifically, on September 3, 2019, CH’s principal William Vandivere, P.E., conducted a follow-up inspection of the channel’s current hydrologic and geomorphic conditions. Based upon its detailed analyses in both 2014 and 2019, CH concluded the proposed Project is both contrary to currently accepted riparian and creek-protection standards and practices, and would cause myriad, significant, negative effects. (CH 2019 Report, pp. 6-7.)

Second, as noted above, if the City’s prior biological consultant LSA (for the BRIDGE Project) admitted that protected salmon are present in Salvador Creek, how can the City’s current biological consultant (for this even denser Project at the very same site) somehow “forget” such important endangered species-related facts?

Third, the above and related problems – including those noted in the Rich Report - render useless the DEIR’s purported disclosure, analysis, and mitigation of biological impacts.

C. Failures to Analyze Potentially Significant Traffic & Parking Impacts

If it’s true, as many commenters noted, the DEIR’s purported analysis of potential traffic impacts (e.g., the supposed baseline or background traffic counts taken at purportedly “affected intersections”), is based on data collected during a holiday weekend, all of the resulting impact disclosures/analyses are fundamentally unreliable, and fatally flawed.
In *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City & County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656, 697, while the court held that the inconvenience resulting from a parking shortage is a social impact, traffic and air quality impacts that may result from a parking deficit are environmental impacts that must be evaluated in CEQA documents. However, in *Taxpayers for Accountable School Bond Spending v. San Diego Unified School Dist.* (2013) 215 Cal.App.4th 1013, 1050, the court held that all physical environmental impacts that could result from a parking shortfall must be evaluated. Here, as noted, the DEIR’s analysis of potential parking impacts (shortages) suffers from crucial errors, including the above-noted inconsistent descriptions of the proposed Project’s total parking spaces, inadequate discussion of current baseline parking conditions, the effects on traffic, air quality, etc. from removing 22-plus existing, public parking spaces (within the to-be-abandoned-and-gifted-to-the-applicant Valle Verde ROW), the proposed Project’s failures to comply with or satisfy SRO parking requirements, etc.

**D. Inadequate Alternatives Analysis**

An EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or to its location, but need not discuss every alternative to the project. Instead, an EIR should present “a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives.” (CEQA Guidelines, §15126.6(a).) For purposes of CEQA, the DEIR’s extremely skewed, self-serving Project “objectives” - admittedly taken straight from the applicant itself - are far too narrowly, specifically defined, thus leading to the intended, pre-ordained, legally errant conclusion that “only this particular Project, at this particular site can meet them”. (DEIR, pp. 24-26, 248-249.) While alternatives must be able to satisfy most of the basic project objectives, a project sponsor may not limit its ability to implement the project in a way that precludes it from implementing reasonable alternatives to the project. (See, e.g., *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 736 [alternatives may not be artificially limited by applicant’s prior contractual commitments that would prevent sponsor from implementing reasonable alternative].) Here, the fact that the extremely long, detailed, narrow list of the Project’s supposed objectives was taken directly from the applicant, combined with the fact it already purchased the Project site, and applied for (and apparently received assurances of) NPLH and other Project-specific funding, demonstrate that the DEIR’s myopic “alternatives analysis” fails CEQA’s “reasonable range” requirement. (See also, *San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society v. Board of Supervisors* (1984) 155 Cal.App.3d 738.)

Second, the DEIR likewise fails to sufficiently identify or analyze other, possibly feasible alternative sites. While potential alternative sites were mentioned in public comments (for example: “...Roberts Nursing on Browns Valley Rd. has been vacant for many years. It could be a possible alternative for No Place Like Home” (Comment from Sue Hepple, 3526 Shelter Creek Dr.), the DEIR essentially ignores them all.
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E. Inadequate Analysis of Cumulative Impacts

The DEIR’s purported analysis of the Project’s potentially significant Cumulative Impacts is fatally flawed, as well. Among other things, it fails to account for or include various, other relevant projects either proposed, approved, or in the proverbial “pipeline”. (See, e.g., CEQA Guidelines, §15130(a).)

IV. THE PROJECT VIOLATES MYRIAD OTHER LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the above-noted CEQA defects, many aspects of the proposed Project also fail to comply with, and thus violate, other governing laws, regulations, development standards, and recorded instruments, as well. Examples include:

- Various General Plan and Big Ranch Specific Plan policies, e.g., to preserve and protect creeks, riparian habitat, etc.
- The allowable number/size of rooms and/or occupants in SRO units.
- Minimum parking requirements for SRO projects, and more generally.
- Recorded and/or otherwise legally binding deed restrictions or conditions of approval limiting the Sunrise property’s use to senior/affordable housing.
- The statutory prohibition against counting for Density Bonus eligibility the Sunrise building’s already senior/affordability-restricted units.
- Restrictions relating to the site’s existing, large sewer pipe/easement.
- The City’s own riparian setbacks, e.g., per Napa Municipal Code Chapter 17.52.110, and related flood protection requirements.
- The City’s own prohibitions against expanding, intensifying, or resurrecting vacant “nonconforming uses”, e.g., per Napa Municipal Code Chapter 17.52.320, including without limitation the Sunrise facility’s nonconforming setback from Salvador Creek, etc.
- Finally, that this too-dense Project is being shoe-homed into a too-small site is further demonstrated by the proposal to vacate the public Valle Verde ROW. Donating public spaces to the applicant for 26 purportedly “on-site/off-street” private spaces is an improper gift of public funds, violates the Density Bonus Law’s prohibition against using on-street spaces to satisfy mandatory off-street parking, and exacerbates longstanding problems in this parking-challenged neighborhood.
V. CONCLUSION

NCPSC respectfully requests that this Project, as currently proposed, be denied because: (1) it is absolutely ill-suited for this quiet, residential neighborhood - full of families, young children, and seniors, near parks and schools, but far from transit, jobs, and social services; the NPLH component is far too experimental, unprogrammed, and unmanaged given the mandated, high-risk clientele - and in this neighborhood will likely backfire with disastrous consequences; and this neighborhood has already done far more than its “fair share” in meeting the City’s affordable housing goals; (2) the EIR fails to comply with CEQA’s stringent requirements to both clearly describe the Project, then fully disclose, analyze, and mitigate all potentially significant impacts; and (3) the Project violates myriad other legal requirements, as well. As noted in the bulk of public comments, what is sorely needed is a well-thought-out project that both complements this predominantly family/senior-oriented neighborhood, and fits within this severely-constrained creekside site.

Very truly yours,
GAGEN McCoy, et al.

Daniel A. Muller

Enclosures: Exhibit “A”
Exhibit “B” [Tabs 1-4]

c: William McGuire - NCPSC
EXHIBIT "A"
TO NCPSC’S 12/3/19 COMMENT LETTER

NCPSC’S COMMENTS RE 12/5/19 PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

The following comments regarding the 12/5/19 Planning Commission Staff Report are in addition to those in NCPSC’s 12/3/19 Comment Letter ("Comment Letter").

Staff Report, p. 3:
ROW Abandonment: As part of a separate action to be considered by the City Council, the Applicant has requested the City to abandon a 0.39-acre City owned public right-of-way, located at the terminus of Valle Verde Drive.

Comments: As noted in the Comment Letter, since according to the City’s own records up to 22 vehicles use that ROW as parking spaces on a regular, daily basis, the loss of such public parking constitutes a potentially significant impact.

Staff Report, p. 4:
The project site is adjacent to Salvador Creek. A portion of the existing pavement at the rear of the proposed Heritage House site is experiencing erosion. In order to address the erosion, without impacting the Salvador Creek riparian corridor, the Project proposes to insert a stitch wall (metal plates) below surface in two segments within the existing drive aisle of the Heritage House site. One segment would be 85-feet long and the second segment would be 100-feet long. This stitch wall will stabilize the existing pavement area behind the Heritage House by stopping the erosion along the drive aisle.

Comments: Potentially Significant Long-Term Operational Impacts: As noted in the Comment Letter, licensed hydrologist Clearwater Hydrology ("CH") concludes inter alia any proposed stitch wall/pier system along the steep, already severely-eroded western bank of Salvador Creek will cause significant, negative long-term effects, including because the system’s sole purpose (of preventing further erosion where it’s been historically happening along the outside bank of a river bend adjacent to and right below the outer edge of the paved area of the vacant Sunrise building) will be achieved, as intended, by deflecting the streamflow’s energy and erosional forces elsewhere – e.g., where there is zero or far less artificial “armoring”. Based on laws of physics - including “for every action, there’s an equal, opposite reaction” – the resulting newly artificially deflected stream flows (away from the armored stitch wall/pier system) will exacerbate and accelerate other already-problematic erosion along other nearby, unarmored sections of the creek bank, resulting in further bank instability, erosional loss of riparian land, and thus increased instream sediment load, turbidity, and water pollution. Such negative erosional impacts are not only themselves cognizable under CEQA, but also create additional, negative, CEQA-cognizable impacts including for example and without limitation, loss of the creek bank’s riparian cover/canopy, warming of creek waters, and similar damage to known habitat for endangered/protected species, including steelhead, and Coho and Chinook salmon. For these and other reasons, both CH and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife ("CDFW") recommended that, instead of installing any such artificial armoring, the creek bank be terraced back along the Sunrise/Heritage House site – whose rear paved areas (and even the rear
portion of the building itself) violate currently applicable creek/riparian setbacks, and there’s no rational or legal basis, nor substantial evidence, supporting or allowing such illegal non-compliance to continue as part of this proposed Project. Potentially Significant Construction-Related Impacts: Furthermore, any claim or notion that the construction/installation of such a substantial stitch wall/pier system - e.g., spanning 185 feet along the creek’s top of bank, and extending dozens of feet deep into the face of the steep, eroded bank itself - will somehow cause “no potentially significant impacts” to riparian resources, endangered species’ habitat, creek bank-stability, etc., is likewise unsupported by any substantial evidence, flatly refuted by all available evidence, and implausible on its face.

Onsite support programs will be provided for the 33 supportive units in Heritage House. Comments: Given the stated potential/likelihood that two persons could share each unit, focusing on or using the “unit count” unreasonably ignores and undercounts the vastly larger number of involved tenants/residents.

Staff Report, p. 5:
Staff will be onsite 24/7 and the front counter will be staffed at all times during the transition period, which will be at least a year in length.
Comments: Only the manager and a desk clerk will be on duty 24/7. The supportive staff will only be on duty 9:00 to 5:00, five days/week. Also, is there a condition of approval enforcing, and what happens after, the supposed “transition period”? Who will be monitoring the many NPLH tenants when they venture into the neighborhood?

Staff Report, p. 6:
Under the Act, a city may only disapprove or condition approval of an affordable housing development in a manner that renders the development infeasible, for one of the following reasons:

3. The Project would cause “a significant quantifiable, direct and unavoidable impact” on public health or safety, based on objective identified written public health or safety standards, policies or conditions, as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low income households.
Comments: The only way to satisfactorily avoid having to find that the Project’s NPLH component will cause significant, quantifiable, direct and unavoidable public health and safety impacts is by eliminating that component, and not housing chronically homeless individuals with serious mental/addiction issues, who cannot be required to use or attend treatment. We are aware of no substantial evidence showing that eliminating said component will somehow render the development unaffordable to low income households.

Staff Report, p. 7:
One of the fundamental goals of the Land Use Element is “to preserve and enhance the residential character of existing neighborhoods”...
Comments: This proposed Project, including its NPLH component, will most likely substantially degrade (if not destroy) rather than “preserve/enhance” the residential character of this quiet, family- and senior-centric neighborhood, and such degradation of character will result in undisclosed, unanalyzed “secondary” potentially significant environmental impacts, including reduced public parking, increased littering, loitering, human encampments, etc. in the environmentally sensitive habitat within and around Salvador Creek, the public park immediately to the north, etc.

*LU-4.1 The City shall encourage the development of housing for the elderly, disabled, and low-income households*

Comments: As noted in the Comment Letter, while our clients encourage developing housing for the above persons, this neighborhood already contains an ample supply of such housing types, and the proposed Project – including its NPLH component - is a very different, high-risk, experimental proposition, which should not be so forcefully, improperly shoe-horned into the subject, relatively small, environmentally-constrained, peaceful, family/elderly-centric neighborhood, near parks and schools, yet relatively far from public transit, jobs, social services, etc. Thus, this Project is not what the above-noted goal/policy has in mind, mandates, or requires; is not needed in the subject neighborhood; is not appropriate therein or on the subject, constrained site; and denying it, as currently proposed, is well within the City’s discretion, and would in no way run afoul of said goal/policy.

Staff Report, pp. 9-10:
The Zoning Code normally requires one parking space per sleeping room for SRO residential units. Therefore, Heritage House would normally require 66 parking spaces. However, because this is a 100 percent affordable project, the Applicants have indicated that vehicle ownership will be very low.

Comments: First, there is no substantial evidence supporting either (i) that occupants of affordable projects have lower vehicle ownership than those of other projects, or (ii) the supposed extent, degree, or amount of any such purported ownership differences. Second, since the Zoning Code defines SRO units as having only one occupant, yet the Project proposes more than one occupant/unit, (iii) the proposed Project violates the City’s own SRO requirements on their face, and (iv) the Project’s above-stated, purported “parking space requirements” are woefully understated.

Recognizing this, the Planning Commission has the authority to reduce the parking requirement to 0.5 spaces per unit when: a. Development is within ¼ mile of a food market and regularly scheduled public transit stop…

Comments: The nearest food markets are well beyond ¼ mile away from the Project site – i.e., Nob Hill and Lucky are at least 6/10 mile away.

While the Project is slightly over the ¼ mile requirement, the site is within 1,560 feet of services, and the Applicant is requesting a concession pursuant to State Density Bonus law to allow a slightly greater distance.

Comments: As noted, rather than being “slightly over”, the Project exceeds the above-noted “¼ mile requirement” by two or three times.
As a result, the following is proposed:
(66) SRO units @0.50 spaces per unit= 33 spaces

Comments: Again, as noted, these claims improperly fail to acknowledge that the Project violates the City's own, applicable requirements – e.g., by allowing more than one occupant/resident per SRO unit - and such impermissible double-stuffing of units results in far higher, unaccounted-for parking requirements, and parking impacts.

TOTAL REQUIRED (Heritage House and Valle Verde) = 77 spaces
TOTAL PROVIDED = 79 spaces

The parking layout plan prepared for the Project provides a total of 79 uncovered parking spaces which exceeds the minimum requirement by two spaces.

Comments: See above.

Roughly 22 on-street parking spaces would be removed with the abandonment of a portion of Valle Verde Drive.

Comments: As noted, there is insufficient analysis of the potentially significant impacts from the Project's acknowledged elimination of these 22 existing, public parking spaces.

Staff Report, p. 11:
The Applicant is required to improve the sidewalk to an eight-foot multi-use trail to provide ongoing connection past the project site... Several mature oak trees would need to be removed to accommodate the new trail. Mitigation is identified in the EIR/EA consistent with the requirements in the BRSP including 5:1 tree replacement.

Comments: Removing mature oak trees along the western edge of the existing path will eliminate any screening of the proposed 3-story Valle Verde apartment building’s potentially significant aesthetic/view impacts.

G. RIPARIAN SETBACK
The Project site is located directly adjacent to the Salvador Channel. The proposed new construction portion of the project (Valle Verde Apartments) incorporates a 50-foot riparian setback from the top of bank of Salvador Creek, the location of which was determined in a field consultation by project engineers with a representative of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in November 2018.

Comments: As noted elsewhere herein, and in the Comment Letter: (A) CDFW and CH recommended that Salvador Creek’s western bank be terraced back toward the west; (B) the DEIR and Staff Report continue to wholly ignore the illegality of allowing/maintaining the long-vacant Sunrise facility’s noncompliant, zero riparian setback; and (C) the notion that the applicable creek/riparian setback is 50 feet (from top of bank) appears to conflict with the DEIR’s purported 20-foot setback, and the DEIR’s analysis violates the City’s own Code since the depth of the relevant section of Salvador Creek’s bank/channel exceeds 8 feet, requiring greater setbacks.

Staff Report, p. 12:
As a condition of approval, the Applicant would be required to remove a portion of the Zerba Bridge (deck, piers, and western abutment).

Comments: The Staff Report's belated disclosure that the Project actually includes and requires removing portions of Zerba Bridge markedly differs from the DEIR’s
misleading comments, e.g., that Zerba Bridge isn’t even within or part of the Project site, and only portions of the Bridge “might, perhaps” be removed. Also, as noted at length in the Comment Letter, the Staff Report’s descriptions of such issues continue to be woefully inadequate and misleading, including for example and without limitation regarding “whether” and “how much” of the Bridge must actually be removed. Thus, it is misleading to claim only the western abutment will be removed, because the eastern abutment, its supporting walls below, and all related structures, must also be removed since (as noted by CH) they are unstable, and failing. Such additional removal will, in turn, cause further, greater impacts, including affecting additional portions of the stream bank and channel, and (in turn, for example) likely cause the mature oak and other trees on the then-unprotected, unarmored eastern bank to become vulnerable to significant erosion, and eventually fall. Such undisclosed, unanalyzed removal of the eastern abutment and its supporting walls will also logically require coordination with the owners of the eastern bank parcels, further dialogue with agencies that have jurisdiction over the subject resources, and expand the extent and degree of potentially significant impacts to/on Salvador Creek, which as noted not only contains valuable riparian resources, but is also known habitat for several endangered/protected species. These are yet further, glaring examples of the proffered analysis’s ongoing failures – e.g., to fully, fairly, and accurately perform its informational function to the public and decision-makers by describing the totality of Project-related activities, and based thereon, to fully disclose, analyze, and reasonably mitigate all of the Project’s potentially significant impacts. Such failures to disclose logically necessary Project elements or activities - and to analyze their likely impacts - also constitute further examples of improper “piecemealing”, which CEQA expressly prohibits.

Page 79 of the Draft EIR/EA identified a moderate potential for Steelhead fish (salmon) in Salvador Creek. If bridge removal occurs, work within the stream channel would require mitigation (MM BIO-2.1 and MM BIO-1-3, MM BIO-4.1) including coordination with applicable regulatory agencies for permits, to ensure that impacts to fish are avoided including debris containment and minimizing work within the channel, and requirements to minimize light intrusion into the riparian corridor.

Comments: River otters also live in Salvador Creek. Moreover, steelhead is a distinct species, not somehow interchangeable with salmon. And, as noted in the Comment Letter, the substantial evidence shows endangered/protected Coho and Chinook salmon are present (in addition to steelhead) in Salvador Creek, thus making it critical habitat for all three species - yet such crucial facts continue to go undisclosed and unanalyzed. Furthermore, without such disclosure/analysis the proposed, boilerplate, weak measures cannot serve as any effective, reliable mitigation, nor are any long-term impacts disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated.

Staff Report, p. 15:
Heritage House has an interior landscaped courtyard that would be retained and enhanced with new landscaping and amenities for residents (e.g., benches, tables, lighting) inside of the former Sunrise building. These landscaped areas add livability and value to the proposed development. Further, benches will be placed on the southeast end of the project site adjacent to the riparian corridor.

Comments: The notion such limited interior area/amenity is sufficient for the minimum 66 residents is illogical and unrealistic. The resulting inadequacy of such
space will cause said residents to find/use open space outside the Project site, resulting in myriad potentially significant impacts, including littering, loitering, and resulting environmental degradation.

Private open space is not proposed as part of the project.

Comments: See above.

Staff Report, p. 17:
The Applicant invited community members, elected officials, and others to tour existing supportive housing communities in Fremont. Main Street Village Apartments in Fremont is the home of 110 adults and children, including 67 who had been homeless. It was funded by a predecessor program to the No Place Like Home Program, and therefore, is very similar to the proposed Project.

Comments: There is no program “similar to” NPLH, e.g., which as noted requires housing tenants with known, pre-existing, severe mental problems. There are no other state programs allowing the seriously mentally-challenged tenants/clients – who admittedly must “need” or “require” treatment - to refuse treatment, testing for alcohol/drug use, etc. And, unlike the proposed Project, the referenced Fremont facility is not in the middle of a residential neighborhood.

Staff Report, p. 18:
Key features of the program include:

- Funding for permanent supportive housing must utilize low barrier tenant selection practices that prioritize vulnerable populations and offer flexible, voluntary, and individualized supportive services.

Comments: As noted, such requirements – e.g., low barrier tenant selection practices, tenants’ demonstrated “need” for treatment, yet using or attending supportive services remains voluntary – demonstrate our clients’ many legitimate concerns.

The City received 430 comment letters on the Draft EIR/EA.

Comments: Notably, almost all such input was strenuously “against” the Project, as currently proposed.

As indicated in the Final EIR/EA Master Response to Comments 4, these types of social issues, while certainly worthy of consideration in the project approval process, are not cognizable as “environmental” impacts under CEQA.

Comments: First, when, as here, there is ample, substantial evidence showing a proposed project’s purportedly “social or socioeconomic issues or impacts” may cause or contribute to any potentially significant, adverse, physical or environmental impacts, CEQA requires all such matters to be fully disclosed, and the related or resulting impacts to be fairly, fully analyzed and mitigated. Such legally required steps and analyses have not been undertaken here. Second, in deciding whether to approve, conditionally approve, direct Staff to formulate revisions to, or deny, the proposed Project, the Planning Commission should exercise its discretion in a reasonable, responsible manner that fully considers the predictable, likely adverse impacts on the health, safety, and well-being of existing residents, the majority of whom believe, and have credibly testified or commented that, they and the surrounding environs will be potentially severely, negatively
affected by this experimental, proposed Project’s huge changes to their neighborhood.

CEQA also requires that, if an EIR has identified potential significant environmental impacts from the project, the lead agency must make certain findings relating to those potential impacts. Comments: As noted herein and in the Comment Letter, there are myriad potential, and most likely probable, significant environmental impacts that have gone insufficiently disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated, including merely for example and without limitation: severe adverse effects on Salvador Creek, and the species that inhabit it, from the proposed, ill-­advised “arming” of the already-­failing western bank where erosion has undercut the asphalt parking/travel areas behind the long-­abandoned Sunrise building.

Staff Report, p. 21:
The Project’s EIR/EA determined that the Project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation and Circulation, which would be significant without the implementation of mitigation measures, but would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Comments: As noted, many key aspects of the proposed Project have been inaccurately described, or omitted, and the most relevant, reliable substantial evidence wholly refutes the above claims that the Project’s half-disclosed, potentially significant impacts will be mitigated to “less than significant” levels.
EXHIBIT “B”
TO NCPSC’S 12/3/19 COMMENT LETTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB#</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/18/13</td>
<td>Memorandum/Report regarding Fisheries Impacts, prepared by Dr. Alice A. Rich. This analysis, submitted to the City by NCPSC in June 2013 during the BRIDGE Project’s re-approval proceedings, remains highly relevant to the similar, proposed Project on the very same site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/20/14</td>
<td>Salvador Channel Stability Assessment, prepared by Clearwater Hydrology (“CH”). Originally prepared regarding the failed BRIDGE Project, this initial CH report remains highly relevant to, sheds light on, and is (and contains information, data, figures, etc.) referenced in, CH’s updated 9/4/19 report addressing any additional/different aspects/impacts of the proposed Project, submitted to the City on 9/5/19 by NCPSC’s William McGuire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>All Pleadings, Briefs, and other Court Filings in or relating to, Evidence (including the Administrative Record admitted and/or lodged in), and Transcripts of proceedings/hearings in, NCPSC’s prior lawsuit challenging the City’s initial 2012, and subsequent 2013, approvals of the prior BRIDGE Project (NCPSC v. City of Napa, Napa County Superior Court, Case No. 26-59266), much of which remains relevant to the proposed, similar Project on the very same site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/5/19</td>
<td>Photos #1 through #26, depicting various portions/areas of the Project site and its surroundings, taken by NCPSC’s counsel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 18, 2013
To: William McGuire, Chairman, NCPSC
From: Alice A. Rich, Ph.D.
Re: Review of City of Napa’s Revised IS/MND for Napa Creek Apartments Project

I. AUTHOR’S QUALIFICATIONS

My name is Dr. Alice A. Rich. I manage A. A. Rich and Associates, a fisheries and ecological consulting firm in the San Francisco Bay area, which I founded 30 years ago. I have attached a copy of my résumé and relevant professional experience and qualifications. I have had over 30 years of technical and project management experience in a wide range of fisheries-related projects. My professional experience encompasses work as a fisheries consultant, fisheries biologist, fish physiologist, analytical chemist, and university lecturer. I have worked on projects involving federal, state, and local agencies, private companies, law firms, and environmental non-profit organizations throughout the western states, Maine, British Columbia, and the Bahamas. I have designed hundreds of projects involving federal- and state-listed and candidate fish species, particularly salmonids (salmon and steelhead), including pollution and water temperature, instream flows, mining (gravel, gold, and phosphate), environmental disasters (human-induced and natural), dams and diversions, hydroelectric power, dredging and pile driving, timber harvest, urban development, and impacts of other land use activities on sensitive fish species. I have designed and supervised hundreds of fish impact studies and analyses, including threatened and endangered species surveys and analyses, limiting factor analysis, water quality and water temperature monitoring and impact analyses, fish physiology studies, fish risk assessments, instream flow analyses, fish habitat and populations surveys and analyses, fish mitigation and rehabilitation, ESA Section 7 Consultations with federal agencies, fishery resources technical reports for EIR’s, EIS’s, and other environmental documents, fish collection, salvage, and relocation, fish age determination, and macro-invertebrate sampling and analyses. In addition, my Ph.D. and M.S. degrees focused on salmonid stress physiology and I have been called upon as an expert witness on the stressful impacts of pollution, water temperature, altered instream flows, dams and diversions and hydroelectric power, migration barriers, timber harvest, catch-and-release fishing, transportation and handling on fishes, and other factors that are detrimental to federal- and state-listed fish species.
II. BRIEF BACKGROUND OF PROPOSED PROJECT

On May 15, 2012, the Napa City Council (Council) approved and adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed Napa Creekside Apartments. The MND was challenged by the Neighborhood Coalition to Protect Salvador Creek (NCPSC) and its founding member, plaintiff/petitioner William McGuire. On April 11, 2013, the Napa County Superior Court’s (Court) Peremptory Writ of Mandate set aside the Council’s approval of the project, based on an inadequate analysis of the Project’s potential biological impacts on Salvador Creek. The Court found a deficiency in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the project and ordered the preparation of a revised California Environmental Policy Act (CEQA) document that addressed the MND’s inadequacies “regarding the presence of and potential project impacts on, threatened, endangered, or protected fish species or their habitat in or adjacent to Salvador Creek, adjacent to the Project.” To address the Court’s decision on the project, the revised IS/MND (2013) now includes a Biological Resources Report (LSA, 2013).

I was retained by NCPSC to respond to the contents of the revised IS/MND, with regard to potential impacts on fishery resources, specifically on salmonids (salmon and steelhead), in Salvador Creek.

To assist in the preparation of my review of the revised IS/MND, I visited the proposed project site and reviewed numerous documents, including the following:

- Revised IS/MND (2013);
- Biological Resources Report (LSA, 2013);
- Napa Planning Commission Staff Report re Napa Creekside Apartments (June 6, 2013);
- Southern Napa River Watershed Restoration Plan (Koehler and Edwards, 2009);
- Leidy et al., 2005a,b;
- Moyle, 2002;
- USACE, 2001-2006;
- Petitioners’ Opening Brief (December 18, 2012); and,
- Petition for Writ of Mandate (June 14, 2012).

III. SUMMARY OF MY CONCLUSIONS

Under Section IV, Biological Resources of the “Environmental Checklist” in the revised IS/MND, the following have to be addressed, with regard to whether or not the proposed project would:
a. Have a substantial adverse effect either directly or through habitat modifications on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) [now called California Department of Fish and Wildlife, or CDFW] or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS."

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native or migratory fish, or wildlife species, or with established native resident, or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

The IS/MND concluded that the proposed project would result in "Less THAN Significant Impacts" for all of the above. However, I disagree. It is my professional opinion, based on the available scientific information, and over 30 years of experience working on salmonid issues, that the proposed project could potentially have negative impacts on both salmonids and their habitat in Salvador Creek. In the following pages I summarize the support and basis for my conclusions that:

1. There is ample evidence that protected salmonids inhabit Salvador Creek in the proposed project area, and particularly most of the year in the pool under the to-be-demolished bridge;

2. The IS/MND did not address the cumulative impacts on salmonids;

3. Demolition of the bridge could negatively impact salmonids in Salvador Creek;

4. Due to the ongoing erosion along the site's western bank and lack of setback for the existing fence, reoccupation of the senior building could negatively impact salmonids; and,

5. Increased human activity in and near Salvador Creek from the project's new residence would cause potentially significant impacts from the interference, intrusions, habitat damage, and pollution.
IV. **THERE IS AMPLE EVIDENCE THAT PROTECTED SALMONIDS INHABIT SALVADOR CREEK**

The fact that there have not been many quantitative studies on salmon/steelhead presence in Salvador Creek does not mean that the creek does not support salmonids. It just means that few biologists have studied Salvador Creek. However, as noted below, there is little question of such species' presence in the subject portion of Salvador Creek flowing through the project site.

The IS/MND (page 7, first paragraph) states that “Koehler and Edwards (2009) noted that during their 2007 survey of the Salvador Creek drainage very little suitable spawning or rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead was present in the drainage. Salvador Creek is channelized upstream from Vintage High School and confined in an artificial trapezoidal channel from there to Highway 29 where it splits into two ditches running along Solano Avenue.”

Koehler and Edwards (2009) sampled only about 10% of the habitat units within the creek. They used one of the habitat methodologies described in the California Salmonid Habitat Restoration Manual (Flosi and Reynolds, 1994) and decided to sample only 10% of the total habitat in the creek. Based on the results of my own research for over 30 years conducting habitat surveys in over 100 watersheds throughout California, I have determined that sampling only 10% of the habitat results in an incorrect characterization of the creek or river in question. In all of the creeks where I have conducted habitat typing, 100% of the habitat was surveyed/sampled. Thus, to state that Salvador Creek has “...very little suitable spawning or rearing habitat” may not be an appropriate characterization for specific areas of Salvador Creek and is certainly not an accurate characterization of the pool area at the proposed project site, directly under the bridge near its northeast corner.

Despite that some reaches of Salvador Creek are not ideal, steelhead, Chinook salmon, and chum salmon have all been sighted and/or collected in the Napa River Watershed, including Salvador Creek. Thus, the proposed project could result in negative impacts on the salmonids in Salvador Creek.

During my site visit, I examined the pool under the bridge and there is salmonid rearing habitat in this area of Salvador Creek, as well as along the rest of the proposed project area.
Central California Coast Steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss)

The Central California Coast (CCC) Steelhead was listed as Threatened on August 18, 1997 (62 FR 43937) and reaffirmed January 5, 2006 (71 FR 834). In addition, the Final Ruling, for Designating Critical Habitat for the CCC steelhead was listed on September 2, 2005 in the Federal Register (70FR52488-52627).

There have been a number of surveys that resulted in either collection or observation of the CCC steelhead in Salvador Creek. In March 1977, CDFW surveyed about one mile of Salvador Creek, from Vintage High School (upstream of the project site) to the confluence with the Napa River, including the project site (Beracoo, 1977 as listed in Leidy et al., 2005). The surveyors observed six adult steelhead between Big Ranch Road (about 1,000 feet downstream from the project site) and the Napa River. In addition, juvenile steelhead have been captured in the Napa River during the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Napa River Annual Fisheries Monitoring Program; juvenile steelhead have been sampled throughout the Napa River Watershed (USACE, 2001–2006). In addition, as part of their public testimony during the 2012 Planning Commission and Council hearings, several speakers (including member of the NCPSC and Councilmember Kriker) stated that salmon, steelhead, and trout inhabited Salvador Creek in the proposed project area (Transcripts of Planning Commission hearing in April 2012, and Council hearing in May 2012, cited in Petitioners’ Opening Brief, December 18, 2012). Thus, the proposed project could have negative impacts on the CCC Steelhead.

Chinook Salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)

Chinook salmon are not known historically to have inhabited the Napa River Watershed. The timing of observations of Chinook salmon suggests that the fish are part of the Central Valley Fall-run Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), but whether or not any other ESU’s occur is

---

1 Chinook Salmon: The Napa River is not included in the NMFS ESU maps for ESU-listed Chinook salmon in California (NMFS, 2005). Chinook salmon ESU’s in the region include Sacramento River Winter-run, California coast, and Central Valley Spring, Fall and Late-Fall runs. Further investigation, such as conducting spawning surveys on the Napa River and genetic testing of juvenile fish collected in the Napa River would determine whether or not the juvenile Chinook salmon captured in the Napa River originated from any of these ESU’s.
unknown. The Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon ESU is considered a State Species of Special Concern.

Both adult and juvenile Chinook salmon have been observed in Salvador Creek. During stream surveys from August 30-31, 2007, juvenile (60-80 mm) were observed just upstream of Big Ranch Road (Koehler and Edwards, 2009). August is during the low-flow season when construction would likely occur at the proposed project site. Prior to the 2007 observation, it was unknown whether or not Chinook salmon successfully spawned in Salvador Creek. Adult Chinook salmon have been documented spawning in Salvador Creek in 2007 and in a number of years prior to that. Spawning was concentrated in upper reach 2 (within the proposed project area) and reach 3 near Vintage High School (Koehler and Edwards, 2009). Such activities are also corroborated by various Napa Valley Register articles, e.g., including those published in 2002 and 2004. Thus, the proposed project could negatively impact juvenile Chinook salmon.

**Chum Salmon (Oncorhynchus keta)**

The chum salmon is designated by the CDFW as a California Species of Special Concern. Although the Napa River Watershed did not historically support chum salmon, recently small numbers have been recorded in the Napa River (USACE, 2005). It has been suggested that the salmon are using the Napa River for spawning. Although, it is not known whether or not they inhabit Salvador Creek, it is possible that they could. The statement in the IS/MND that “…Chum salmon generally have low ability to scale falls and other obstacles (e.g., weirs) that other salmonids can navigate (Moyle, 2002), so would not be expected to occur in the creek above the weir just downstream of the project area”, is not based on any evidence. The description of chum salmon in Moyle (2002), that the IS/MND based their statement on, was not based on any information in California, but rather from information from Alaska and British Columbia.

Furthermore, Koehler and Edwards (2009) stated that, “No fish migration barriers were identified in Salvador Creek.” Thus, the weir in Salvador Creek (near the bridge at the proposed project site) would not be an impediment to adult chum salmon. In 2005, 31 juvenile chum salmon were captured in the Napa River and marsh area at the mouth of the River. (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2006). Thus, there is no evidence that chum salmon could not inhabit Salvador Creek. And, the proposed project could have negative impacts on juvenile chum salmon.
V. **THE IS/MND DID NOT ADDRESS CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ON SALMONIDS**

The IS/MND did not address the issue of cumulative impacts on salmonids or any other species, for that matter. Federal and State environmental regulations require consideration of cumulative impacts to provide decision makers with an understanding of the relationship between short-term uses and long-term productivity of the environment. One example of the federal regulatory definition of cumulative effect is:

*The impact on the environment which results from incremental impact of the action when added to the other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions...* (40 CFR. 1508.7)

CEQA appears to similarly define and require analysis of cumulative impacts, as follows:

*A lead agency must find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment and therefore require an EIR if the project's potential environmental impacts, although individually limited, are cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means the project's incremental effects are significant when viewed in connection with the effect of past projects; other current projects, and probable future projects.* (Pub. Res. Code section 21083(b)(2); Guidelines, sections 15064(h)(1), 15065(a)(3)).

The revised IS (p 20) recites the above CEQA definition. But, the text on page 21 concludes that there will be no cumulative impacts, without any analysis or mention of other past, current, or foreseeable future projects. Thus, the revised IS/MND does not actually undertake any assessment or analysis of cumulative impacts— as to salmonids, their habitat, or anything else.

Based on my experience, site visit, and review of relevant information, there is substantial evidence that the project may cause potentially significant “direct” impacts. Similarly, the project would also likely cause potentially significant “cumulative” impacts when viewed together with other past, current, reasonably foreseeable projects. Such impacts include potential harm to salmonids and their habitat from debris falling into the pool during bridge demolition, increase human intrusion in the creek by the project's many new residents, and further erosion of the creek's western bank below the existing fence.
VI. BRIDGE DEMOLITION WOULD NEGATIVELY IMPACT SALMONIDS

The IS/MND (page 8) states that, "Demolition of the bridge could directly impact special-status species, or cause 'take' of stray salmon or steelhead from rubble, machinery, or other materials forcibly entering the water. This would constitute a significant impact should any protected fish be harmed during demolition." As to such acknowledged significant impacts, the IS/MND (p. 8) claims that, "Bridge deconstruction shall be conducted during the low flow season (May 1 - October 1) to comply with state regulations and minimize the potential for occurrence of special-status fish species. These seasonal restrictions will make the occurrence of protected adult fish species highly unlikely in the bridge area during deconstruction, because there would not be enough flow for them to swim over the weir and access the bridge site."

The above conclusions are not supported are contradicted by reliable substantial evidence. For example, the conclusion that no harm could result if bridge demolition is limited to the low-flow season fails to address that even during the low-flow season, salmonids have been sighted in Salvador Creek in the project area (Koehler and Edwards, 2009; Baracou, 1977). Furthermore, while it may be true that adult salmonids would probably not be present, as summer is not the time of year when spawning migration and spawning occurs for any of the three salmonid species discussed previously, there would likely be juvenile salmonids in the pool at the base of the bridge (see Section V., above). While ESA acknowledges the potential presence of both adult and juvenile salmonids, their above discussion and conclusions, regarding impacts only mentions adults, and inexplicable ignores such acknowledged juveniles.

The removal of the bridge abutments and/or piers as noted in the IS/MND would have a negative impact on the salmonids. Water would be present in Salvador Creek; and this demolition work within the creek would be deemed by NMFS as resulting in "incidental take" under the federal ESA. NMFS would be involved via ESA Section 7 Consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and write a Biological Opinion (BO) for the project, estimating the number of salmonids that would die, and stating such as an "incidental take". Thus, the removal of the abutments and piers would result in a negative impact (mortality) on juvenile salmonids in Salvador Creek in the proposed project area.

The IS/MND (p. 8) also states that, "Discharges of materials during construction into Salvador Creek could also constitute significant impacts by having a substantial adverse effect on special-status species; a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat, and a substantial adverse effect..."
on federally protected waters." As to this acknowledged significant impact, the IS/MND claims that, "Compliance with existing federal and state regulations by implementation of the following measures would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant levels." "Debris containment methods shall be utilized during removal of the old bridge to prevent construction material or debris from entering the water or riparian habitat." 

NMFS and CDFW would not allow removal of the bridge without collecting and relocating the fish and diverting the water, so that the construction crew could work in a relatively dry creek area.

Finally, as proposed mitigation, the IS/MND involves periodic monitoring of bridge demolition activities by a qualified biologist. However, such monitoring only involves three visits of undisclosed duration, i.e., before, during, and after the demolition, which is also of undisclosed duration. Such a measure would not protect the salmonids in the creek or their habitat. I and my colleagues have worked on dozens of projects that required the presence of biological monitors. It has been my experience that both NMFS and CDFW usually require full-time biological monitors on-site during construction/demolition activities. As a fisheries biologist from CDFW told me last week, "The more time a monitor is there the better." It has also been my experience from monitoring dozens of projects for over ten years that when my biological monitors do not show up at a site, but "check-in" to see if things are proceeding according to plan, the construction companies become really lax and are not careful to protect the creek at all. Thus, having a biological monitor show up only once in the middle of construction, even if it were for the entire day, will fail to see or prevent past and future violations, thereby resulting in negative impacts on salmonids.

Additionally, the one visit by the monitor during demolition seems to involve devising recommendations to correct deficiencies in the debris containment plan. Contrary to the above-noted assurances, this strongly suggests that some deficiencies or failures are expected or likely to happen—which as noted would result in debris entering and contaminating the creek, potentially harming or killing salmonids and damaging the habitat in the large pool immediately below. Furthermore, nowhere does the mitigation require actually following or implementing any of the biological monitor's corrective recommendations. Thus, the premise that no meaningful debris will fall into or enter the large pool below the bridge is not supported by my personal experience, logic, or other relevant evidence.
In sum, the IS/MND has not addressed the above issues–i.e., that bridge removal would likely have negative impacts on the salmonids and their habitat in Salvador Creek.

VII. EROSION AND LACK OF SETBACK ALONG THE EXISTING FENCE COULD NEGATIVELY AFFECT THE SALMONIDS IN SALVADOR CREEK

According to the IS/MND, the project involves constructing a new fence along the northern portion of the project site, on the parcels where the to-be-demolished house is located. Because it is required to comply with riparian setbacks, the new fence would be located some distance to the west of, and away from, the creek’s western bank.

As part of my inspection of the entire site and some of its surroundings, I observed the southern portions of the project site where the existing multi-unit senior building is located, as well as the associated paved parking areas (between the east side of the building and the creek’s western bank), and the existing fence along this portion of the site’s eastern side, i.e., at the top of Salvador Creek’s west bank. As noted in the IS/MND, along the eastern edge of the southern portions of the site, there is no setback between the existing fence and the creek bank/riparian corridor. For this reason, the IS/MND characterizes the existing fence and some of the other senior building’s site improvements (such as the paved parking areas east of the existing building, etc.) as “non-conforming”. Despite the lack of setback, and the above-noted requirement to construct the new fence in compliance with setbacks, during the project’s re-occupation of the existing building, the existing fence is proposed to remain where it is; roughly parallel to, and only one or two feet from, the creek’s top-of-bank.

The bank along and just below the existing fence and paved parking areas is eroding. It is my opinion that such erosion presents significant risks of sedimentation into the creek, which is deemed “pollution” by law, and is known to harm salmonid species.

Also, due to the lack of any setback in this area, the noted ongoing erosion, and lack of sufficient armoring throughout this area of the creek bank, at some point during project occupation/operation the bank will likely require armoring.

The above problems and associated potentially significant impacts were also noted in an e-mail to the City, dated May 7, 2013, by Ms. Suzanne Gilmore of CDFW, as part of CDFW’s comments on the revised IS and proposed MND. In response to CDFW’s comments, LSA prepared a memorandum dated May 23, 2013, claiming that, “The Salvador Creek channel on the west side immediately adjacent to the project area site is already armored with large...
boulders and concrete.” This simply is not an accurate description of the eroding bank, as it has little support.

The LSA response further states that, “The long term stability of the channel will be assured by the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District’s Stream Maintenance Program which includes this reach of Salvador Creek and is approved under CDFW Stream Alteration Agreement 1600-2011-0349-R3.” While that may be true, it does not address the fact that since the bank is below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM), its repair would most likely involve the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, leading to an ESA Section 7 Consultation with NMFS. Work within the channel at the base of the bank would require fish collection and relocation, and NMFS would write a BO that would include “incidental take”. Thus, in addition to the ongoing potentially significant impacts on salmonid habitat from bank erosion and sedimentation prior to any bank repair, the repair itself would also result in negative impacts on salmonids. None of this appears to be addressed in the documents that I have reviewed.

VIII. INCREASED HUMAN ACTIVITY FROM THE PROJECT’S NEW RESIDENTS WILL CAUSE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

Similar to many streams, some portions of Salvador Creek contain better salmonid habitat than others; the pool under the bridge at the northeast corner of the site appears particularly valuable. It is also attractive to nearby residents, not only aesthetically, but also as a place for potentially damaging recreational activities, mostly by the area’s younger residents. Based on the current, existing negative effects of human intrusions at Salvador Creek within and near the project site—which I personally observed during my site visit, and reviewed in the relevant project-related documents and public testimony—it is my opinion that introducing the project’s many additional residents at this site on top of Salvador Creek’s western banks would result in significantly more human intrusions (than now) in and about the creek’s banks and channel. The increased intrusions would most likely cause potentially significant negative impacts to the salmonids within Salvador Creek and their habitat (e.g., in the form of habitat damage, erosion, littering, pollution, and possibly occasional, accidental harm to individual salmonids). The notion that the level of “baseline” human intrusions would remain static or somehow decrease upon project occupancy is simply contradicted by all seemingly relevant evidence, including the project.
applicant's lack of success in preventing such intrusions by residents of their adjacent apartment complex, my own observations and experience, and human nature. Thus, the proposed low fencing most probably would not keep people away from the creek. Nor would the project's new residents or management be able to adequately "police" or otherwise prevent increased intrusions.
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## Résumés
INTRODUCTION

*A. A. Rich and Associates (AAR)* was established as a fisheries and ecological consulting firm in 1983. The firm is a certified (California PUC No. 9KS00077; CalTrans UDBE No. 36285) woman-owned sole proprietorship, located in the San Francisco Bay Area, owned and managed by Dr. Alice A. Rich. Dr. Rich has over 30 years of technical and administrative experience on a wide range of projects in fishery resources management. *AAR* has completed hundreds of freshwater, estuarine, and marine studies in California, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, British Columbia, the Yukon, Maine, and the Bahamas. *AAR* provides the following services in fishery resources management:

- Threatened and Endangered Species Surveys and Analyses;
- ESA Section 7 Consultations with Federal Agencies;
- Biological Assessments;
- Fishery Resources Technical Reports for EIR’s, EIS’s, and other environmental documents;
- Water Quality and Thermal Impact Studies;
- Instream Flow Analysis;
- Fish Habitat (e.g., spawning, rearing) and Population Assessments;
- Fish Mitigation and Rehabilitation Studies;
- Fish Age Determination (e.g., otoliths, scales, fin rays);
- Fish Collection, Salvage, and Relocation;
- Ecological Risk Evaluation of Fishes;
- Limiting Factor Analysis;
- Expert Witness Testimony;
- Applied Environmental Physiology and Toxicology; and,
- Macro-invertebrate Collection and Analyses.

*AAR* is fully equipped to conduct field studies. Equipment includes boats, electroshocking gear, beach seines, fyke nets, block nets, water temperature and water quality supplies and apparatus, IFIM field gear, field computers, etc. To process data, conduct statistical analyses, and produce technical reports, *AAR* uses a number of data management and statistical computer programs, including *Sigmaplot, Microsoft Office Access, Excel, Sigmastat, SPSS, ArcView* (GIS Mapping), *Microfish*, and *Microsoft Word*. High quality analysis and products are provided throughout each phase of a study. The following pages highlight ongoing and completed projects conducted by *AAR*.
FISHERY RESOURCES REHABILITATION PROJECTS

- Adaptive Management Plans
- Biological Assessments and Monitoring
- De-Watering, Fish Salvage and Relocation
- Endangered Fish Species Section 7 Consultations
- Endangered Fish Species Surveys
- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Lagoons
- Mitigation Plans
- Rehabilitation Plans
- Water Quality and Water Temperature Studies
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ALHAMBRA CREEK WATERSHED (CONTRA COSTA COUNTY) STEELHEAD RESTORATION PROJECT (Urban Creeks Council, Berkeley, CA)

Although local citizens have studied the biology of the Alhambra Creek Watershed for many years, no comprehensive professional studies on the fishery resources have been undertaken. To address fishery resources conditions, AAR performed the following Tasks: (1) Conducted habitat (Habitat Typing) and population surveys to determine the existing fishery resources habitat and population conditions; and, (2) Provided recommendations for the rehabilitation of the fishery resources in the creek, specifically the anadromous steelhead.

FISH REHABILITATION OF SALMONIDS IN CODORNICES CREEK, ALAMEDA COUNTY (Urban Creeks Council, Berkeley, CA)

The Urban Creek Council (UCC) has long been interested in Codornices Creek. Recently, juvenile rainbow/steelhead were collected in a downstream pool associated with a CalTrans Project. As a result, the UCC wanted to know how viable the creek was for steelhead and contracted AAR to assess fishery resources conditions. AAR provided the following: (1) Fish habitat survey (Habitat Typing); (2) Water temperatures monitoring (3) Urban Creeks Steelhead Guide; (4) Creek Monitoring Plan for Codornices Creek; (5) The design of a GIS database for the UCC; and, (6) Steelhead collection and relocation for a steelhead migration passage improvement project.

SALMONID FEASIBILITY STUDY IN CODORNICES CREEK, ALAMEDA COUNTY (Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, CA)

In the early 1990's, in response to local interest in whether or not Codornices Creek had viable steelhead habitat, AAR performed the following Tasks: (1) Stream habitat survey (Habitat Typing) to determine the existing fishery resources conditions; (2) Bank erosion surveys; and, (3) Recommendations for the rehabilitation of the fishery resources in the creek.

LITTLE HASTINGS ISLAND CONSERVATION BANK, SOLANO COUNTY, IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF RESTORATION MEASURES FOR THREATENED AND ENDANGERED FISH SPECIES (Wildlands, Inc., Rocklin, CA)

The purpose of the Little Hastings Island Conservation Bank is to provide regional compensation for impacts to federal- and/or state-listed fish species, and/or species of concern (Central Valley steelhead, delta smelt, winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley fall and late-fall runs Chinook salmon, North American green sturgeon, longfin smelt, Sacramento splitail, white sturgeon, and river lamprey). AAR is evaluating the habitat to determine whether or not there are on-site restoration measures that would provide additional habitat for these species of fishes.

SALMONID REHABILITATION IN WALKER CREEK, MARIN COUNTY (Marin Municipal Water District, Marin Rod and Gun Club, County of Marin, California State Coastal Conservancy)

AAR designed and undertook a salmonid restoration project on Walker Creek, a creek that flows into Tomales Bay. Tasks included: (1) Stream habitat (Habitat Typing) and population assessments; and, (2) Steelhead Rehabilitation Plan.
A.A. RICH AND ASSOCIATES

FISHERY RESOURCES SURVEYS WITHIN THE TOWN OF FAIRFAX, MARIN COUNTY (Town of Fairfax, CA)

Following the December 2005 flooding of the Town of Fairfax, there was a need to determine fishery resources conditions in the watershed. As a result, the Town of Fairfax contracted with AAR to conduct watershed-based studies that included: (1) Fish habitat (Habitat Typing) and population surveys; (2) Water quality monitoring; (3) Water temperature monitoring; (4) Data analyses; and, (5) A Fishery Resources Technical Report that included descriptions of protective measures for steelhead in the watershed.

STEELHEAD TROUT RESTORATION PLAN FOR THE CORTE MADERA CREEK WATERSHED IN MARIN COUNTY (Friends of Corte Madera Creek, Larkspur, CA)

As part of a project to rehabilitate the Corte Madera Creek Watershed, AAR conducted watershed-based fishery resource studies, including: (1) Fish habitat (habitat typing) and population surveys; and, (2) Water temperature monitoring. Based on the results of the analyses, Dr. Alice Rich prepared a Fishery Resources Technical Report that included a Steelhead Trout Restoration Plan for the Watershed. AAR is providing assistance with permitting and Section 7 Consultations for ongoing salmonid restoration projects.

USACE WALL RE-CONSTRUCTION IN NAPA CREEK - FISH COLLECTION AND RELOCATION (U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NAPA, CA)

In connection with the reconstruction of a wall along Napa Creek and the Napa River in downtown Napa, AAR provided the following services: (1) Wrote a Biological Assessment that included mitigation measures to protect any T & E fish species (e.g., steelhead, delta smelt, Chinook salmon) that would be affected by the project; (2) Provided assistance with permitting and Section 7 Consultations with federal agencies; (3) Collected and relocated fish, including the federal- and state-listed fish species, during the de-watering operations in the channel; and, (3) Prepared a Final Report summarizing the results of the fish collection and relocation effort.

CITY OF SANTA ROSA MASTER AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES (CITY OF SANTA ROSA, CA)

The City of Santa Rosa has awarded AAR a multi-year Master Agreement for professional services. Services include fisheries habitat and population surveys, fish habitat restoration and mitigation, collection and relocation of fishes, including T &E fish species, water quality and water temperature monitoring, and fisheries technical reports.

SALMONID REHABILITATION IN ARROYO CORTE MADERA DEL PRESIDIO IN MILL VALLEY, MARIN COUNTY

To assess the feasibility of restoring salmonids to the creeks in Mill Valley, AAR undertook studies that included: (1) Fish habitat (Habitat Typing) and population assessments; and; (2) A Salmonid Restoration Plan that included (a) Fish rehabilitation measures and implementation; (b) Monitoring the success of the project; and, (c) Public involvement to assist with the rehabilitation efforts.
STREAM REHABILITATION IN EASKOOT CREEK, STINSON BEACH, WEST MARIN COUNTY
(Envirornmental Action Committee of West Marin, Point Reyes Station, CA)

To determine whether or not steelhead conditions in Easkoot Creek in Stinson Beach, California, could be improved, the Environmental Action Committee of West Marin was interested in determining the fishery resources conditions of Easkoot Creek. To that end AAR performed the following Tasks: (1) Conducted fish habitat (Habitat Typing) and population surveys; (2) Reported the results of the study; and, (3) Designed curricula for school children (fourth and eighth grades) interested in knowing more about their creeks.

SALMONID REHABILITATION FEASIBILITY PROJECT IN PILARCITAS CREEK, HALF MOON BAY (San Francisco Water Department, CA)

To determine whether or not flow releases would enhance trout habitat in Pilarcitos Creek, AAR conducted a salmonid rehabilitation feasibility study for the San Francisco Water Department. Tasks included: (1) Identification of habitat (Habitat Typing) and water quality requirements for rainbow and anadromous steelhead trout; (2) Analysis of stream flow releases that would provide suitable habitat conditions; and, (3) Recommendations of possible stream rehabilitation measures that could be implemented to enhance rainbow and steelhead trout conditions.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE CASA DE FRUTA EXPANSION ON THE STEELHEAD IN PACHECO CREEK, HOLLISTER, SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA (San Francisco Water Department, CA)

To determine the potential impacts of the expansion of the Casa de Fruta project on steelhead in Pacheco Creek, AAR: (1) Conducted fishery resources habitat surveys; (2) Identified steelhead and rainbow trout requirements; (3) Analyzed potential impacts of the proposed project; and, (4) Provided a report detailing the fishery resources conditions, potential impacts, and recommended measures to mitigate potential impacts of the project on steelhead.

FISHERY RESOURCES SURVEYS IN SONOMA COUNTY CREEKS (Circuit Rider Productions, Windsor, CA)

In connection with an erosion control project for the State Coastal Conservancy, AAR conducted a fishery resources habitat (Habitat Typing) assessment of a number of Sonoma County coastal creeks.

STEELHEAD REHABILITATION PROJECT IN SUSCOL CREEK, TRIBUTARY TO THE NAPA RIVER (Friends of the Napa River, Napa, CA)

AAR designed and managed a steelhead restoration project in Suscol Creek, a tributary to the Napa River. The project included: (1) Stream habitat (Habitat Typing) and population assessments; (2) Water temperature (thermographs) monitoring; and, (3) Steelhead Rehabilitation Plan, including monitoring the success of any rehabilitation measures undertaken.
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SALMONID MONITORING IN THE GARCIA RIVER, MENDOCINO COUNTY (Rawles, Hinkle, Carter, Behnke, and Oglesby, Attorneys, Ukiah, CA)

In response to illegally re-routing the Garcia River with the objective of reducing flood-related problems, landowners received a "cease and desist" order from the California Water Quality Control Board. In response to this action, the California Department of Fish and Game and other agencies directed the landowners to assess the potential damage of their actions on the salmonids in the Garcia River. To that end, AAR was hired to address the fishery resources issues. AAR's Tasks included: (1) Designing and implementing a salmonid monitoring plan; (2) Identifying salmonid rearing habitat; (3) Conducting fishery resources population surveys; (4) Monitoring water temperatures; (5) Conducting salmonid immigration and spawning use surveys; (6) Developing a riparian vegetation plan; and, (7) Analyzing data and writing annual reports.

FISHERY RESOURCES REHABILITATION PROJECT IN THE PIETA CREEK WATERSHED, MENDOCINO COUNTY (Mendocino County RCD, Ukiah, CA)

In an effort to improve steelhead conditions in the Pieta Creek Watershed, the Mendocino County Resource Conservation District contracted with AAR to conduct a two-year fisheries rehabilitation project. The project included: (1) Fish habitat (Habitat Typing) and population surveys; (2) Water quality monitoring; (3) Erosion surveys and erosion control measures; and, (4) Analysis, reports of results, and recommendations.

U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROGRAMMATIC EIS FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ACT (Montgomery Watson, Sacramento, CA)

As part of the Bureau's Programmatic EIS for the Central Valley Improvement Act, AAR reviewed and analyzed past, present, and proposed anadromous fish restoration projects for the entire Central Valley. This review of restoration projects included both state- and Federal-funded projects on Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, striped bass, American shad, and white sturgeon. Riverine systems included both the mainstem and tributaries of the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE PAHRANGAT NATIONAL WILDLIFE, NEVADA (Harris Environmental, Tucson, AZ)

AAR is evaluating the fishery resources of the Pahrangat National Wildlife Refuge in Nevada, including an analysis of the endangered Pahrangat roundtail chub. Tasks include: (1) Fish population and habitat surveys; (2) Identification of significant native fishery resources and their habitats; (3) Develop habitat protection strategies for the native fishes of the refuge and the Pahrangat Valley; (4) Develop an invasive/exotic aquatic species control strategy; (5) Monitoring fishery resources; (6) Develop a Long-Term Recreational Fishery Resources Plan; (8) Provide fishery resources technical reports; and, (9) Assist the Pahrangat National Wildlife Refuge with fishery resources-related issues.
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WATER QUALITY, STREAM FLOWS, AND FISH PHYSIOLOGY PROJECTS

- Adaptive Management Plans
- Age and Growth Studies
- Agriculture
- Biological Assessments and Monitoring
- CEQA and NEPA Permitting Processes
- Dams and Diversions
- De-Watering, Fish Salvage and Relocation
- Dredging and Mining
- Endangered Fish Species Section 7 Consultations
- Endangered Fish Species Surveys
- Expert Witness Testimony
- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Lagoons
- Macro-invertebrate Studies
- Marinas, Boat Activities, and Piers
- McNeil Substrate Sampling
- Mitigation Plans
- Oil Pipelines
- Pile Driving
- Rehabilitation Plans
- Risk Evaluations
- SCUBA and Snorkeling Surveys
- Stream Flows
- Stress Physiology
- Use of Salmonid Smolt Indicators
- Vineyard Conversions
- Water Quality and Water Temperature Studies
CALTRANS BRIDGE PROJECT, BLYTHE, CALIFORNIA (California Department of Transportation, Riverside, CA)

This CalTrans project consisted of removing the Palo Verde Drain Bridge near Blythe, California, and constructing a new wider bridge at the same site. This project was funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Because the federally-listed (as endangered) razorback sucker inhabits the Palo Verde Drain, CalTrans required that the area be monitored during construction activities. A. A. Rich and Associates (AAR) provided the following biologically-related tasks required by CalTrans: (1) Installed fish exclusion fencing upstream and downstream of the project area before the water diversion pipe was installed and water was diverted; (2) Performed a survey of the construction site for razorback sucker after the fish exclusion netting was installed; (3) Collected and removed fishes within the area to be de-watered; (4) on-site during de-watering operations; (4) Prepared a training manual titled, “Working around endangered species”; (5) Inspected the site, cleaned and repaired the nets and removed any fish that were trapped in the nets at least once per week; (6) Monitored compliance of the construction company with avoidance and protective measures; (7) If construction company was not in compliance, halted work and took corrective action; (8) Reported to the Caltrans engineer all activities that were non-compliant with the specifications; (9) Present during final walk through inspection; (10) Provided monthly logs of site inspections, including photos; and, (11) Reviewed all contract change orders that arise during construction activities.

HERITAGE RANCH COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT GALLERY WELLS EMERGENCY REPAIR PROJECT, SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA (Heritage Ranch Community Services District, Paso Robles, CA)

In March 2011, a higher than expected release of water from the Nacimiento Reservoir occurred, resulting in an increased river flow rate and damage to the Heritage Ranch Community Services District's (HRCSD) gallery wells through scouring of the river bottom and removal of river bed material. To repair the gallery wells, the HRCSD had to uncover the wells. As federally designated critical habitat for steelhead existed on-site, all fish had to be collected and relocated prior to diverting the Nacimiento River. AAR contracted to collect and relocate all fishes in the approximately 1200 foot length of project area. One of the issues was potential impacts of sediment to the steelhead during collection and relocation of fishes. Dr. Rich provide direction, with regard to minimizing stress on fishes during the relocation process. Dr. Rich provided a report of the methods and results of these activities to NOAA Fisheries.

CALTRANS FREEWAY PROJECT, SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - PERMIT COMPLIANCE MONITORING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FREEWAYS (H. T Harvey and Associates, Alviso, CA)

As part of a CalTrans project to expand the highway system, AAR monitored the progress of the construction, with regard to the biological effects on creeks. AAR's Tasks included: (1) Monitoring construction for compliance with all permits related to riparian habitat and wetlands; and (2) Monitoring re-vegetation of Calabazas and San Tomas Aquino creeks, and the Guadalupe River mitigation sites.
CALTRANS BRIDGE PROJECT, MARYSVILLE, CALIFORNIA (California Department of Transportation, Marysville, CA)

This CalTrans project consisted of repairing and replacing a bridge over the Feather River in downtown Marysville. Because the federally-listed Chinook salmon, steelhead, and North American green sturgeon inhabit the Feather River, fishes had to be collected and relocated prior to construction, and construction activities had to be monitored by fisheries biologists. A. A. Rich and Associates (AAR) provided the following biologically-related tasks required by CalTrans: (1) Installed fish exclusion fencing upstream and downstream of the project area before the water diversion pipe was installed and water was diverted; (2) Performed a survey of the construction site for razorback sucker after the fish exclusion netting was installed; (3) Collected and removed fishes within the area to he de-watered; (6) on-sight during de-watering operations; (4) Prepared a training manual titled, “Working around endangered species”; (5) Inspected the site, cleaned and repaired the nets and removed any fish that were trapped in the nets at least once per week; (6) Monitored compliance of the construction company with avoidance and protective measures; (7) If construction company was not in compliance, halted work and took corrective action; (8) Reported to the Caltrans engineer all activities that were non-compliant with the specifications; (9) Present during final walk through inspection; (10) Provided monthly logs of site inspections, including photos; and, (11) Reviewed all contract change orders that arise during construction activities.

CALTRANS BRIDGE PROJECT, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA (California Department of Transportation, Oakland, CA)

AAR is working on a 3-year CalTrans project in Oakland, California. The project is a seismic retrofit of portions of the Highway 880 freeway in Oakland, Alameda County, California. A part of this project involves retrofitting the highway over the Lake Merritt Channel. Because there are a number of Federally-listed fishes (i.e., Central Valley steelhead, Spring-run Chinook salmon, Winter-run Chinook salmon, North American green sturgeon) in the vicinity of the project area that could be affected by the construction activities, CalTrans is requiring that the area be monitored during construction activities. AAR is providing the following biologically-related tasks required by CalTrans: (1) Providing biological monitors at the site during pile driving activities; (2) Providing biological monitors at the site during any construction activities that are over or in the Lake Merritt Channel; (3) Removing and relocating any aquatic life during de-watering process prior to pile driving activities; (4) Providing weekly logs of activities, including photos, to CalTrans; (5) Monitoring compliance of the construction company with avoidance and protective measures; (6) When the construction company is not in compliance, halting work until the problem is remedied; (7) Reporting to the Caltrans engineer all activities that are in non-compliance with the specifications; and, (8) Reviewing all contract change orders that arise during construction activities.
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SOUTHERN STEELHEAD MIGRATION PASSAGE PROJECT, SANTA YNEZ RIVER SYSTEM, SANTA BARBARA COUNTY (Morrison & Foerster representing the San Lucas Ranch, Santa Ynez, CA)

AAR spent over three years assisting a private landowner in the Santa Ynez River System in Santa Barbara County, with her dispute against the Cachuma Operation and Maintenance Board (COMB) who planned to alter Hilton Creek, a tributary of the Santa Ynez River. At issue was COMB's plan to alter existing conditions in Hilton Creek to facilitate the upstream movement of the endangered Southern steelhead so that the fish could access the upper reaches of the watershed, all land within the active San Lucas Cattle Ranch. Steelhead had never inhabited Hilton Creek upstream of the migration barriers, including a ten-foot waterfall. In addition to the watershed being on private property, the problem with COMB's plan was that the actions would result in harm to the Southern steelhead. If the endangered Southern steelhead were allowed to spawn within Hilton Creek on the San Lucas Ranch property, their progeny would die, due to the lack of water in the creek throughout the spring and summer months; the creek within the San Lucas Cattle Ranch is dry most of the year. To assist their Client, AAR performed the following Tasks: (1) Conducted extensive physical habitat (availability of rearing and spawning habitat) surveys throughout Hilton Creek and the Santa Ynez River; (2) Conducted water quality and water temperature monitoring of Hilton Creek for three years; (3) Designed and produced a video of Hilton Creek habitat conditions that was provided to both the Client and the surrounding landowners; and, (4) Provided an analysis of existing conditions and testified as to the negative impact of COMB's plan to the endangered Southern steelhead. Dr. Alice Rich also provided expert witness testimony on behalf of AAR's client.

LAGOON BREACHING (DREDGING) IMPACTS AT THE MOUTH OF THE CARMEL RIVER (Carmel Point and Lagoon Preservation Association, Carmel, CA)

Mechanically breaching (dredging) the Carmel River Lagoon is eroding a road on Carmel River Point. AAR assisted the Carmel Point and Lagoon Preservation Association (Association) to determine the best breaching methodology for steelhead while protecting the road and homeowners' property. Project Tasks included: (1) Analyzing existing biological and chemical data for adult or juvenile steelhead inhabiting the lagoon or passing through it; (2) Working with the Federal, state, and local agencies to identify solutions; (3) Providing written reports and oral and written testimony on behalf of the Association; and, (4) Oral expert witness testimony provided by Dr. Alice Rich.

THERMAL CONDITIONS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER SYSTEM ON CHINOOK SALMON AND STEELHEAD (California Department of Fish and Game, Fresno, CA)

The San Joaquin and its tributary rivers are listed as impaired by high water temperatures, under the State's Clean Water Act Section 303 (d). Dr. Alice Rich provided the California Department of Fish and Game with expert testimony on the impacts of the existing thermal conditions within the San Joaquin River and its tributary rivers. The testimony included: (1) Analyzing the physiological effects of water temperatures on the various life stages of fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead; and, (2) Analyzing the effects of water temperature-related mortality (both sublethal and lethal) on populations of fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the San Joaquin River System.
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IMPACTS OF DREDGING ON THE FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE PETALUMA RIVER RELATED TO THE BAHIA PROJECTS, NOVATO, CALIFORNIA (Bahia Homeowners Association, Novato, CA)

AAR assisted the Bahia Homeowners Association with the fishery resources issues connected with their dredging project. Tasks included: (1) Section 7 Consultation with the Federal agencies to assess the potential impacts of the project on Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, and Sacramento splittail; (2) Consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, the Regional Water Quality Control Board to identify their concerns; (3) Preparation of an Environmental Assessment, regarding the Federally-listed fish species; and, (4) Design of post-project monitoring.

PG & E’s MOKELOMNE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT – COLE CREEK GRIZZLY RACK RESTORATION WATER QUALITY MONITORING (PG & E, San Ramon, CA)

To repair the grizzly rack of the Cole Creek Diversion, PG&E constructed a cofferdam and diverted instream flow around the project area. In accordance with the water quality certification from the California Regional Water quality Control Board, a water quality program was required. AAR provided assistance to PG&E by monitoring turbidity, water temperature, conductivity, settleable solids, and other water quality parameters using a HydroLab Quanta water quality analyzer. Sample sites were located upstream and downstream of the dam repair area.

THERMAL EFFECTS OF PG & E’S DE SABLA-CENTERVILLE PROJECT ON SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON IN THE BUTTE CREEK AND WEST BRANCH FEATHER RIVER SYSTEMS (California Sportfishing Protection Alliance Berkeley, CA)

PG&E operates its 26.6 megawatt DeSabla-Centerville Project within the Butte Creek and West Branch Feather River watersheds. The existing PG&E license for the project is due to expire in 2009 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may issue a license to operate the project for a term of up to 50 years. Butte Creek provides one of the last viable remaining habitats for Spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead. Dr. Alice Rich provided testimony on the existing thermal conditions within the Project Area. The testimony included: (1) analyzing the physiological effects of water temperatures on the various life stages of Spring-run Chinook salmon; and, (2) analyzing the effects of water temperature-related mortality (both sublethal and lethal) on the population of Spring-run Chinook salmon in the Butte Creek Watershed.

THERMAL IMPACTS OF THE DELTA WETLANDS PROJECT ON SALMONIDS (California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA)

AAR assisted the California Department of Fish and Game (CFG) with the analyses for a project in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in which water would be stored for later discharge. One of the key issues for this project was the potential thermal impacts on Chinook salmon. As a fish physiologist specializing in thermal impacts on fishes, Dr. Alice Rich assisted CFG in their preparation for the State Water Resources Control Board Hearings and was an expert witness on CFG’s behalf.
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THERMAL IMPACTS OF REDUCED FLOWS ON CHINOOK SALMON AND STEELHEAD IN THE YUBA RIVER
(California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA)

*AAR* assisted the California Department of Fish and Game (CFG) with the analysis of a water diversion and the potential thermal impacts on the Chinook salmon and steelhead. Dr. Alice Rich assisted CFG with their preparation for the State Water Resources Control Board Hearings and was an expert witness on CFG’s behalf.

STUDIES ON INSTREAM FLOWS, WATER TEMPERATURES, AND GROWTH OF ANADROMOUS FISHES IN THE AMERICAN RIVER (County of Sacramento, CA)

Dr. Alice Rich designed and conducted laboratory and field physiology studies to determine the relationship between instream flows, water temperature, and the growth of Chinook salmon, rainbow and steelhead trout, and American shad in the lower American River. At issue were the effects of the potential diversion of water from the American River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District for domestic uses. The results of the studies were presented by Dr. Alice Rich to the State Water Resources Control Board.

A REVIEW OF STUDIES ON EXISTING FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE AMERICAN RIVER (County of Sacramento, CA)

*AAR* reviewed existing information on the status of the fishery resources of the lower American River between Discovery Park and Nimbus Dam. At issue were the effects of the potential diversion of water from the American River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District for domestic uses. Tasks included: (1) Analysis of 40 years of historical data on Chinook salmon spawning escapement; (2) Review of existing data to assess optimal water temperature ranges for fishes; and, (3) Presentation of results by Dr. Alice Rich to the State Water Resources Control Board.

LEWISTON DAM POWER PLANT REPLACEMENT PROJECT (Trinity Public Utility District, Weaverville, CA)

*AAR* is working with the Trinity Public Utility District on the replacement of the Lewiston Dam Power Plant. *AAR* is addressing potential fishery resources impacts of the proposed project. Fish species of management interest include the spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and steelhead. Issues of concern include construction-related activities, river flows and water temperature. *AAR* is writing the Biological Assessment for the fishery resources component to this project.

CHINOOK SALMON SMOLT QUALITY IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATERSHED (California Department of Fish and Game, Fresno, CA)

Dr. Alice Rich designed and supervised a Chinook salmon smolt quality study in the San Joaquin, Merced, and Tuolumne rivers. Physiological smolt and stress indicators were monitored in emigrating fish during the parr-smolt transformation. The data were then used to assess smolt quality at different sites (the rivers, the State Pumping Facility, fish trucked to Antioch) as the fish emigrated from the system. Smolt quality was correlated to survival, using tag return data.
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SMALL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT IN CANYON CREEK, EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA (Eagle Hydro Partners, Millbrae, CA)

In connection with a small hydroelectric project, AAR evaluated the water availability and potential conflicts that streamflow withdrawals would have on existing salmonids. The project included: (1) Field habitat studies; (2) Flow duration analysis; and, (3) Analysis, report of results, and recommendations.

IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED RIVER ISLANDS PROJECT IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATERSHED ON THREATENED AND ENDANGERED FISH SPECIES (Califa Development Company, Lathrop, CA)

The proposed River Islands at Lathrop project is a large housing development project on Stewart Tract in the South Delta near Stockton. As part of the project, an assessment of potential impacts on fishery resources is required. To that end, AAR is assisting the Applicant with fishery resources issues. Tasks include: (1) Section 7 Consultation with all agencies to assess the potential impacts of the project on Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, green sturgeon, and Sacramento splittail; (2) Designing and implementing on-site biological monitoring to limit impacts of boat dock construction on the sensitive fish species; (3) Monitoring of water quality and water temperature; (4) Facilitating the design of a fish screen; (5) Fish Monitoring Plan to assess any impacts of the project on T&E species; (6) Designing rehabilitation measures to protect the federal- and state-listed fish species; and, (7) Participation in meeting with Applicant and agency biologists; and, (8) Periodic Fishery Resources Technical Reports, Water Temperature Reports, and Water Quality Reports.

SALMONID REHABILITATION FEASIBILITY PROJECT IN PILARCITAS CREEK, HALF MOON BAY (San Francisco Water Department, CA)

To determine whether or not flow releases would enhance trout habitat in Pilarcitos Creek, AAR conducted a salmonid rehabilitation feasibility study for the San Francisco Water Department. Tasks included; (1) Identification of habitat (Habitat Typing) and water quality requirements for rainbow and anadromous steelhead trout; (2) Analysis of stream flow releases that would provide suitable habitat conditions; and, (3) Recommendations of possible stream rehabilitation measures that could be implemented to enhance rainbow and steelhead trout conditions.

IMPACTS OF BOAT DOCKS ON SALMONIDS IN THE CALAVERAS RIVER WATERSHED IN CONNECTION WITH THE BROOKSIDE PROJECT, STOCKTON (Washburn, Briscoe, and McCarthy, Attorneys, San Francisco, CA)

The Brookside Project is a housing development located in Stockton. As part of the environmental process, the Applicant was required to monitor the effects on fishery resources of the multiple boat dock as associated with the development. AAR’s Tasks included; (1) Section 7 Consultation with all agencies to assess the potential impacts of the project on Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, and Sacramento splittail; (2) Designing and implementing on-site biological monitoring to limit impacts of boat dock construction on the sensitive fish species; and, (3) Designing and implementing a three-year water quality and water temperature monitoring effort to assess any impacts of the project on the T&E fish species.
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**IMPACTS OF DREDGING ON STRIPED BASS IN CLIFTON COURT FOREBAY IN THE SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA (Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, CA)**

_AAR_ assessed the potential impacts of different concentrations of suspended sediments on striped bass as a result of dredging in Clifton Court Forebay in the San Joaquin Delta.

**CITY OF SANTA ROSA MASTER AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES (CITY OF SANTA ROSA, CA)**

The City of Santa Rosa has awarded _AAR_ a multi-year Master Services Agreement for professional services. Services include fisheries habitat and population surveys, fish habitat restoration and mitigation, collection and relocation of fishes, including T &E fish species, water quality and water temperature monitoring, and fisheries technical reports.

**FISHERY RESOURCES FLOW STUDY OF WEBER CREEK RESERVOIR IN EL DORADO COUNTY (El Dorado Irrigation District, Placerville, CA)**

In connection with a proposed operational change in the Weber Creek Reservoir in El Dorado County, California, potential impacts on fishery resources had to be addressed. _AAR_ conducted a fishery habitat study on Weber Creek. _AAR’s_ Tasks included: (1) Reviewing existing data; (2) Conducting field habitat surveys; and, (3) Performing analysis, reporting results, and providing recommendations.

**WATER STORAGE-WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT IN THE NOYO RIVER WATERSHED, MENDOCINO COUNTY (City of Fort Bragg, CA)**

_AAR_ conducted a seven-year assessment of fishery resources for a proposed water supply expansion for the City of Fort Bragg. Of concern were the impacts on coho salmon and steelhead trout populations in the Noyo River. _AAR’s_ Tasks included: (1) Summer salmonid rearing habitat and population surveys; (2) Salmonid spawning surveys; (3) Salmonid critical riffle surveys; (4) Estuary water in connection with a quality and fish sampling; (5) Data analysis and assessment of the project on fishery resources; and, (6) Annual reports on results, conclusions, recommendations, and mitigation measures.

**IMPACTS OF A SEASONAL GRAVEL DAM ON AQUATIC RESOURCES IN LAGUNITAS CREEK AND TOMALES BAY IN MARIN COUNTY (North Marin Water District and Giacomini and Sons, Marin County, CA)**

As part of the California State Water Board Hearings, regarding raising Kent Lake, _AAR_ assisted both the North Marin Water District and the Giacomini Dairy Cattle Ranch, with regard to fishery resources issues. _AAR’s_ Tasks included: (1) Studies on salmonid smolt trapping; (2) Water temperature monitoring and analysis; (3) Neomysis (opossum) shrimp studies; (4) Salmonid predation studies; (5) Analysis of the potential impacts of the summer dam on salmonids, sturgeon, tidewater goby, and opossum shrimp; and, (6) Expert Witness Testimony by Dr. Alice Rich at the State Water Resources Control Board Hearings for the raising of Kent Lake.
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FISH KILL IN BEAR GULCH CREEK AS A RESULT OF BROKEN MAIN WATER PIPE BY CALTRANS IN WOODSIDE, SAN MATEO COUNTY (Tetra Tech, Oakland, California)

Dr. Alice A. Rich provided expert opinion on the cause of steelhead mortalities in Bear Gulch Creek as a result of a broken main water pipe caused by a CalTrans crew during guard rail replacement in Woodside, California. As a result of the pipe break, 11,000 gallons of chlorinated water flowed into Bear Gulch Creek and killed about 20 endangered Central Coast steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss).

NAPA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN AND EIR-IMPACTS ON FISHERY RESOURCES FROM VINEYARD CONVERSIONS (Napa County, Napa, CA)

AAR assisted Napa County with the fishery resource issues that needed to be addressed for an update of the Napa County General Plan and EIR. AAR submitted a Fishery Resources Technical Report that included: (1) Distribution of Federal- and state-listed fishes, and other sensitive fish species; (2) Importance of Indicator Species, such as salmonids (salmon and trout), in determining a watershed’s ecological health; (3) Importance of identifying habitat requirements and limiting factors for sensitive fish species; (4) Life history stages and requirements for the Federal- and state-listed fishes; (5) Fishery resources habitat conditions, including water temperature, water quality, and physical habitat; (6) Factors that limited salmonid production in the Napa County Watershed; (7) General impacts of vineyard conversions and other development on fishery resources; and, (8) Recommendations for integrating the requirements of the fishery resources with those of future development in Napa County, including Best Management Practices (BMP’s), and maintenance channel dredging and clearing.

IMPACTS OF CHEVRON’S VALERO PIPELINE PROJECT ON FEDERAL-LISTED FISH SPECIES (Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo, Attorneys, South San Francisco, CA).

Dr. Alice A. Rich provided assistance on the: (1) Potential impacts of Chevron’s Valero Pipeline on threatened and endangered fish species and Essential Fish Habitat, in particular those in Carquinez Strait; and, (2) Mitigation measures to minimize impacts. Issues of concern included sampling stress on fish during fish collections and sampling during the pup-smolt transformation of anadromous salmonids.

TIRE TOXICITY STUDY IN PHOENIX LAKE, MARIN COUNTY (Marin Municipal Water District, Corte Madera, CA)

AAR assessed the impacts of rubber tires, placed in Phoenix Lake in Marin County for bass habitat, on the fishery resources of the Lake. Tasks included assessing the content of rubber tires and the potential impacts of the decay of the tires on largemouth bass.

IMPACT OF PROPYLENE GLYCOL SPILL ON BENTHIC HABITAT IN SEWARD CREEK, MENDOCINO COUNTY (Fetzer Vineyards, Hopland, CA)

As a result of a potentially toxic spill at Fetzer Vineyards in Hopland, California, the winery was required to assess the potential damage to Seward Creek. Fetzer Vineyards contracted with AAR to undertake the following Tasks: (1) Habitat characterization; (2) Macro-invertebrate sampling; and, (3) Water quality analysis based on macro-invertebrates as an indicator species.
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FISHERY RESOURCES SURVEYS IN WILDCAT CANYON, MONTEREY COUNTY (Hoge, Fenton, Jones & Appel, Attorneys, Monterey, CA)

AAR conducted fishery resources surveys related to erosion problems connected with road construction. Of particular concern was the problem of hillside and bank erosion on salmonids in the creek. The project included: (1) McNeil spawning gravel sampling; (2) Electrofishing surveys; (3) Analysis of salmonid habitat; and, (4) Expert witness testimony by Dr. Alice Rich.

AGGREGATE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE UPPER RUSSIAN RIVER (Mendocino County Planning Dept, Ukiah, CA)

As part of the Aggregate Resources Management Plan for the Upper Russian River, AAR evaluated the impacts of past, present, and future gravel mining on fishery resources, particularly steelhead trout, including: (1) Documenting the status of fishery resources conditions; (2) Identifying appropriate gravel extraction sites; (3) Identifying appropriate extraction methods; (4) Developing a Fishery Resources Monitoring Plan; and, (5) Integrating fishery resources needs into the Aggregate Resources Management Plan.

GRAVEL EXTRACTION MINING IN THE EEL RIVER, HUMBOLDT COUNTY (Mercer Fraser Company, Eureka, CA)

Mercer Fraser Company was required by NOAA Fisheries to prepare a document that analyzed the existing fishery resources conditions for each of Mercer Fraser’s gravel mining bars in the Eel River. To that end, AAR assisted Granite with fishery resources issues. AAR’s Tasks included: ((1) Section 7 Consultation with the federal agencies; (2) writing a Fishery Resources Technical Report that included: (a) Assessing past and present fishery resources conditions; (b) Identifying appropriate extraction methods; (c) Providing an Adaptive Management Plan that incorporated long-term cause-and-effect monitoring (e.g., fish populations and fish use, fish habitat, water temperature, water quality); and, (3) Facilitating meetings.

GRAVEL EXTRACTION MINING IN THE MAD RIVER, HUMBOLDT COUNTY (Granite Construction Company, Ukiah, CA)

Granite Construction Company (Granite) was required by NOAA Fisheries to prepare a document that analyzed the existing fishery resources conditions for each of Granite’s gravel mining bars in the Mad River. To that end, AAR assisted Granite with fishery resources issues. AAR’s Tasks included: ((1) Section 7 Consultation with the Federal agencies; (2) Writing a Fishery Resources Technical Report that included: (a) Assessing past and present fishery resources conditions; (b) Identifying appropriate extraction methods; (c) Providing an Adaptive Management Plan that incorporated long-term cause-and-effect monitoring (e.g., fish populations and fish use, fish habitat, water temperature, water quality); and, (3) Facilitating meetings.
A.A. Rich and Associates

PHOSPHATE MINE EXPANSION EVALUATION IN DRY VALLEY CREEK, IDAHO (FMC Corporation, Soda Springs, ID)

AAR assisted with fishery resources issues, regarding, a phosphate mine expansion project in Dry Valley Creek (part of the Blackfoot River Watershed) in Southeastern Idaho. The main issue of concern that AAR was responsible was the potential impact of the project on the Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Tasks performed by AAR included: (1) Fish habitat and population surveys; (2) Heavy metal analysis; (3) Macro-invertebrate sampling and analysis; (4) Food-growth relationships; (5) Sediment impacts; and, (6) Heavy metal impacts, including bioaccumulation of heavy metals by fishes.

GOLD MINE EXPANSION EVALUATION OF THE EAST FORK OF THE SOUTH FORK OF THE SALMON RIVER, PAYETTE NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO (Maxim Technologies, Boise, ID)

AAR provided a fishery resource analysis for an EIS being prepared for a gold mine expansion on a tributary of the Salmon River in the Payette National Forest, Idaho. Of particular concern were the potential toxic impacts on the threatened spring-run Chinook salmon, proposed federally-threatened steelhead, bull trout, and westslope cutthroat trout. Issues of concern included food-growth relationships, sedimentation, heavy metal, and macro-invertebrate impacts, and risk analysis of potential chemical spills.

ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION OF GOLD MINE FAILURE IN THE MIDDLE FORK BOISE RIVER WATERSHED, IDAHO (Monarch Greenback, Boise, ID)

In connection with a catastrophic failure of a gold mine tailings impoundment, AAR designed a Fishery Resources Risk Evaluation. Of particular concern were the potential toxic impacts on the Federally-listed threatened bull trout and other sensitive salmonid fishes. Issues of concern included toxicological impacts, food-growth relationships, sedimentation impacts, and macro-invertebrate impacts.

GOLD MINE EXPANSION EVALUATION STUDIES IN THE HUMBOLDT RIVER WATERSHED, NEVADA (Maxim Technologies, Helena, MT)

AAR completed the fishery resources portion of the EIS for the expansion of a gold mine in the Humboldt River in Nevada, including: (1) Reviewing information on the water quality and thermal impacts of the expansion of the gold mine on fishery resources; (2) Identifying thermal requirements of each life stage of the key fish species; (3) Evaluating the potential impacts of heavy metals and other potentially polluting agents to the fishes; and, (4) Identifying the cumulative impacts of this and other mining activities (past, present and proposed) on fishery resources.

LEEVILLE GOLD MINE EIS, HUMBOLDT RIVER WATERSHED, CARLIN, NEVADA (Maxim Technologies, Helena, MT)

Future operations of the Leeville Gold Mine involved cooling water from the mining operations discharged into the Humboldt River in Nevada. AAR was responsible for addressing potential impacts on fishery resources, including: (1) Identifying life stage requirements of key fish species affected by the project; (2) Evaluating the potential impacts of heavy metals and other pollutants to the fishes; (3) Evaluating the potential impacts of de-watering on the fishery resources and riparian habitat; and, (4) Identifying the cumulative impacts of this and other mining activities (past, present and proposed) on fishery resources.
PERMIT COMPLIANCE MONITORING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FREeways IN SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO BAY (H. T Harvey and Associates, Alviso, CA)

As part of a CalTrans project to expand the highway system, AAR monitored the progress of the construction, with regard to the biological effects on creeks. AAR's Tasks included: (1) Monitoring construction for compliance with all permits related to riparian habitat and wetlands; and (2) Monitoring revegetation of Calabazas and San Tomas Aquino creeks, and the Guadalupe River mitigation sites.

PHYSIOLOGICAL STRESS INDICATORS TO MONITOR FISH HEALTH AT THE MILFORD HYDROELECTRIC FACILITY ON THE PENOBSCOT RIVER (Lakeside Engineering, NH)

AAR provided technical expertise on the physiological impacts of fishways on alewives and Atlantic salmon in the Penobscot River in Maine. Included in this project was the use of physiological indicators to assess the stressful impacts of fishways and design methods to alleviate stress on the fish.

SALMONID FRY STRANDING STUDY IN THE SKAGIT RIVER, WASHINGTON (R.W. Beck and Associates, Seattle, WA)

As part of a Seattle City Light project to assess the significance of salmonid fry stranding as a result of pothole formation, AAR conducted studies to identify which physiological indicators of smoltification (e.g., lunar cycle, photoperiod) could be used to predict the severity of fry stranding.

WATER QUALITY EVALUATION FOR USE IN THE DESIGN OF A SALMONID HATCHERY WATER TREATMENT FACILITY IN WHATCOM CREEK, BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON (Calien Construction Company, Bellingham, WA)

AAR evaluated existing water quality conditions for use in the design of a water treatment facility for a salmonid hatchery. AAR's Tasks included: (1) Assessment of water quality requirements for rainbow and steelhead trout; (2) Assessment of existing water quality conditions; and, (3) Analysis, report of results, and recommendations.

AGE AND GROWTH STUDIES OF MARINE AND FRESHWATER FISH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND THE YUKON TERRITORY (Dames and Moore, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada)

AAR determined the age composition for populations of a number of different fish species (e.g., starry flounder, Arctic grayling, prickly sculpin, mountain whitefish, etc.) collected in the Kilmat River Estuary in northern British Columbia and in several lakes and creeks in the Yukon Territory. To determine age, otolith and scale analysis were used, together with data on lengths and weights of the fishes.
ATLANTIC SALMON DELAYED MORTALITY ASSOCIATED WITH CATCH-AND-RELEASE FISHING IN THE PENOBSCOT RIVER, MAINE (Bangor Hydro-Electric Company, Bangor, ME)

AAR conducted a study on the delayed mortality associated with the catch-and-release of emigrating Atlantic salmon smolts and returning adults in the Penobscot River in Maine. To assess the potential physiological stress associated with catch-and-release fishing AAR used physiological indices. This information was then to be correlated with tag-return data in an effort to increase adult returns.
SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN RIVER FISHERY RESOURCES

PROJECTS

- Adaptive Management Plans
- Age and Growth Studies
- Biological Assessments and Monitoring
- Dams and Diversions
- De-Watering, Fish Salvage and Relocation
- Dredging and Pile Driving
- Endangered Species Section 7 Consultations
- Endangered Fish Species Surveys
- Expert Witness Testimony
- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Housing Developments
- Marinas, Boat Activity, and Piers
- Mitigation Plans
- Rehabilitation Plans
- SCUBA and Snorkeling Surveys
- Stream Flows
- Stress Physiology
- Use of Salmonid Smolt Indicators
- Water Quality and Water Temperature Studies
LITTLE HASTINGS ISLAND CONSERVATION BANK, SOLANO COUNTY, IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF RESTORATION MEASURES FOR THREATENED AND ENDANGERED FISH SPECIES
(Wildlands, Inc., Rocklin, CA)

The purpose of the Little Hastings Island Conservation Bank is to provide regional compensation for impacts to federal- and/or state-listed fish species, and/or species of concern (Central Valley steelhead, delta smelt, winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley fall and late-fall runs Chinook salmon, North American green sturgeon, longfin smelt, Sacramento splitail, white sturgeon, and river lamprey). AAR is evaluating the habitat to determine whether or not there are on-site restoration measures that would provide additional habitat for these species of fishes.

HABITAT CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR BEALE AIR FORCE BASE IN THE SACRAMENTO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA (Beale Air Force Base, California)

In connection with revising a Habitat Conservation and Management Plan that addresses natural resources issues at Beale Air Force Base, AAR is conducting snorkeling surveys for Central Valley steelhead and fall-run Chinook salmon in Dry Creek on the Base.

THERMAL IMPACTS OF REDUCED FLOWS ON CHINOOK SALMON AND STEELHEAD IN THE YUBA RIVER (California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA)

AAR assisted the California Department of Fish and Game (CFG) with the analysis of a water diversion and the potential thermal impacts on the Chinook salmon and steelhead. As a fish physiologist specializing in thermal impacts on fishes, Dr. Alice Rich assisted CFG with their preparation for the State Water Resources Control Board Hearings and was an expert witness on CFG’s behalf.

THERMAL CONDITIONS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER SYSTEM ON CHINOOK SALMON AND STEELHEAD (California Department of Fish and Game, Fresno, CA)

The San Joaquin and its tributary rivers are listed as impaired by high water temperatures, under the State’s Clean Water Act Section 303 (d). Dr. Alice Rich provided the California Department of Fish and Game with testimony on the existing thermal conditions within the San Joaquin River and its tributary rivers. The testimony included: (1) Analyzing the physiological effects of water temperatures on the various life stages of fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead; and, (2) Analyzing the effects of water temperature-related mortality (both sublethal and lethal) on populations of fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the San Joaquin River System.
THERMAL IMPACTS OF DELTA WETLANDS PROJECT ON SALMONIDS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN DELTA
(California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA)

AAR assisted the California Department of Fish and Game (CFG) with the analyses for a project in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in which water would be stored for later discharge. One of the key issues for this project was the potential thermal impacts on Chinook salmon. As a fish physiologist specializing in thermal impacts on fishes, Dr. Alice Rich assisted CFG in their preparation for the State Water Resources Control Board Hearings and was an expert witness on CFG’s behalf.

STUDIES ON INSTREAM FLOWS, WATER TEMPERATURES, AND GROWTH OF ANADROMOUS FISHES IN THE LOWER AMERICAN RIVER (County of Sacramento, CA)

Dr. Alice Rich designed and conducted laboratory and field physiology studies to determine the relationship between instream flows, water temperature, and the growth of Chinook salmon, rainbow and steelhead trout, and American shad in the lower American River. At issue were the effects of the potential diversion of water from the American River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District for domestic uses. The results of the studies were presented by Dr. Alice Rich to the State Water Resources Control Board.

A REVIEW OF STUDIES ON EXISTING FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE AMERICAN RIVER (County of Sacramento, CA)

AAR reviewed existing information on the status of the fishery resources of the lower American River between Discovery Park and Nimbus Dam. At issue were the effects of the potential diversion of water from the American River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District for domestic uses. Tasks included: (1) Analysis of 40 years of historical data on Chinook salmon spawning escapement; (2) Review of existing data to assess optimal water temperature ranges for fishes; and, (3) Presentation of results by Dr. Alice Rich to the State Water Resources Control Board Hearings.

THERMAL EFFECTS OF PG & E’S DE SABLA-CENTERVILLE PROJECT ON SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON IN THE BUTTE CREEK AND WEST BRANCH FEATHER RIVER SYSTEMS (California Sportfishing Protection Alliance Berkeley, CA)

PG&E operates its 26.6 megawatt DeSabla-Centerville Project within the Butte Creek and West Branch Feather River watersheds. The existing PG&E license for the project is due to expire in 2009 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may issue a license to operate the project for a term of up to 50 years. Butte Creek provides one of the last viable remaining habitats for Spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead. Dr. Rich provided testimony on the existing thermal conditions within the Project Area. The testimony included: (1) Analyzing the physiological effects of water temperatures on the various life stages of spring-run Chinook salmon; and, (2) Analyzing the effects of water temperature-related mortality (both sublethal and lethal) on the population of Spring-run Chinook salmon in the Butte Creek Watershed.
A.A. RICH AND ASSOCIATES

LEWISTON DAM POWER PLANT REPLACEMENT PROJECT (Trinity County Public Utility District, Weaverville, CA)

AAR is working with the Trinity County Public Utility District on the replacement of the Lewiston Dam Power Plant. AAR is addressing potential fishery resources impacts of the proposed project. Fish species of management interest include the spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and steelhead. Issues of concern include river flows and water temperature. AAR is writing the Biological Assessment for the fishery resources component to this project.

RESORT AND HISTORICAL THEME PARK IMPACTS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATERSHED (Califa Development Company, Lathrop, CA)

Project in which AAR's Tasks included: (1) Inventory of all fishery resources; (2) Site-specific habitat studies; (3) Identification of fish species of special importance (i.e., T & E species and candidate species); (4) Assessment of existing fishery resources conditions; (5) Assessment of potential impacts of the project; and, (6) Development of mitigation measures.

IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED RIVER ISLANDS PROJECT IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATERSHED ON THREATENED AND ENDANGERED FISH SPECIES (Califa Development Company, Lathrop, CA)

The proposed River Islands at Lathrop project is a large housing development project on Stewart Tract in the South Delta near Stockton. As part of the project, an assessment of potential impacts on fishery resources is required. To that end, AAR is assisting the Applicant with fishery resources issues. Tasks include: (1) Section 7 Consultation with all agencies to assess impacts of the project on Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, green sturgeon, and Sacramento splittail; (2) Designing and implementing biological monitoring to limit impacts of boat dock construction on the sensitive fish species; (3) Monitoring of water quality and water temperature; (4) Facilitating the design of a fish screen; (5) Fish Monitoring Plan to assess any impacts of the project on T&E species; and, (6) Periodic Fishery Resources Technical Reports, Water Temperature Reports, and Water Quality Reports.

EIR/EIS FOR WATER ENTITLEMENT FROM THE AMERICAN RIVER (Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Sacramento, CA)

AAR conducted a fishery resources assessment of the impacts of diverting 15,000 acre-feet per year of SMUD's American River entitlement to Sacramento County. Issues of concern included: fish screens; fish species of special concern (e.g., winter-run Chinook salmon, delta smelt, Sacramento splittail); and, hydrological impacts. Tasks undertaken by AAR included: (1) Review of relevant data; and, (2) Analysis, impact assessment, mitigation measures and, recommendations.
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IMPACTS OF BOAT DOCKS ON SALMONIDS IN THE CALAVERAS RIVER WATERSHED IN CONNECTION WITH THE BROOKSIDE PROJECT, STOCKTON (Washburn, Briscoe, and McCarthy, Attorneys, San Francisco, CA)

The Brookside Project is a housing development located in Stockton. As part of the environmental process, the Applicant was required to monitor the effects on fishery resources of the multiple boat dock as associated with the development. AAR’s Tasks included: (1) Section 7 Consultation with all agencies to assess the potential impacts of the project on Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, and Sacramento splittail; (2) Designing and implementing on-site biological monitoring to limit impacts of boat dock construction on the sensitive fish species; and, (3) Designing and implementing a three-year water quality and water temperature monitoring effort to assess any impacts of the project on the T&E fish species.

SACRAMENTO YACHT CLUB MAINTENANCE DREDGING PROJECTS – IMPACTS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN GREEN STURGEON (Sacramento Yacht Club, Sacramento, CA)

AAR is currently assisting the Sacramento Yacht Club with their Maintenance Dredging Permit Application. Tasks include assessing the impacts of the project on the North American green sturgeon and its critical habitat.

IMPACTS OF DREDGING ON STRIPED BASS IN CLIFTON COURT FOREBAY IN THE SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA (Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, CA)

AAR assessed the potential impacts of different concentrations of suspended sediment on striped bass, as a result of dredging in Clifton Court Forebay in the San Joaquin Delta.

IMPACTS OF THE RECLAMATION REFORM ACT ON CENTRAL VALLEY FISHERY RESOURCES (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, CO)

As part of the Bureau’s Reclamation Reform Act (RRA) in the Central Valley, potential impacts on fishery resources had to be addressed. To that end, AAR completed a Technical Memorandum for Aquatic Resources that included: (1) Aquatic resources habitat and population conditions for the Central Valley; (2) Statistical analysis of potential changes that could have occurred on the aquatic resources as a result of implementation of the RRA; and, (3) Impact Assessment of the RRA on aquatic resources, including: winter-run Chinook salmon, Delta smelt, and striped bass.

U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROGRAMMATIC EIS FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ACT (Montgomery Watson, Sacramento, CA)

As part of the Bureau’s Programmatic EIS for the Central Valley Improvement Act AAR reviewed and analyzed past, present, and proposed anadromous fish restoration projects for the entire Central Valley. This review of restoration projects included both state- and Federal-funded projects on Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, striped bass, American shad, and white sturgeon. Riverine systems included both the mainstem and tributaries of the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.
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KNIGHTS LANDING RIVER ACCESS/BOAT LAUNCHING FACILITY RENOVATION (Yolo County Planning, Resources and Public Works Department, Woodland, CA)

AAR is providing a Biological Assessment to determine the potential impacts of the Yolo County's renovation of the Knights Landing boat launching facility on biological resources. The BA will provide information on existing conditions, potential impacts, and mitigation measures to minimize those impacts on the threatened and endangered (T&E) species that could be affected by the project. The T&E species that could be affected by the project include: (1) Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha); (2) Central Valley steelhead (O. mykiss); (3) Delta smelt (Hypomesus transpacificus); (4) Western pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata marmorata); and, (5) Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsonii).

EIR AND MASTER PLAN FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT EXPANSION IN ROSEVILLE (City of Roseville, CA)

As part of the EIR and Master Plan for the wastewater treatment expansion in Roseville, potential impacts on fishery resources had to be addressed. To that end, AAR conducted fishery resources assessments of Dry Creek, Pleasant Grove Creek, and Auburn Ravine Creek. Issues of concern were the potential water temperature and water quality problems associated with sewage effluent into streams containing salmonids. AAR's Tasks included: (1) Stream habitat (Habitat Typing) surveys; (2) Fish population surveys (electrofish, seine); (3) Review of relevant data; (4) Analysis, report of results and recommendations; and, (5) Integration of fishery resources issues into the Master Plan.

IMPACTS OF TRANS-SIERRA TRANSMISSION LINE INTERTIE (ESA, San Francisco, CA)

In connection with the EIR for the Trans-Sierra Transmission Line Intertie, AAR conducted a fishery resources assessment of over 400 square miles of streams along proposed alternate routes. Riverine systems included the American, Bear, Truckee, Carson, and Yuba rivers; Prosser, Dry, Wolf, Auburn Ravine, Weber, and Alder creeks; and, Dutch Flat, Rollins and, Camp Far West reservoirs. AAR's Tasks included: (1) Developing criteria for assessing the fishery resources values of each water course; (2) Assessing the effects of erosion and sedimentation on fishery resources; and, (3) Providing mitigation measures for fishery resources.

CHINOOK SALMON SMOLT QUALITY IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATERSHED (California Department of Fish and Game, Fresno, CA)

Dr. Alice Rich designed and supervised a Chinook salmon smolt quality study in the San Joaquin, Merced, and Tuolumne rivers. Physiological smolt and stress indicators were monitored in emigrating fish during the pre-smolt transformation. The data were then used to assess smolt quality at different sites (the rivers, the State Pumping Facility, fish trucked to Antioch) as the fish emigrated from the system. Smolt quality was correlated to survival, using tag return data.
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SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN AND OPEN SPACE PLAN (San Joaquin County Council of Governments, Stockton, CA)

In connection with the development of the San Joaquin County Habitat Conservation Plan, AAR conducted a fishery resources assessment, including: (1) Analysis of existing information; (2) Identification of life stage requirements of fish species of special importance; (3) Identification of impacts of factors (e.g., urban development, activities undertaken by public agencies, agriculture, water diversions, etc.) affecting fishery resources; (4) Transformation of data into GIS format (ArcInfo); and, (5) Identification of measures to mitigate for the loss of fishery resources and/or habitat.

IMPACTS OF AGUAS FRIAS ROAD BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION ON FISHES IN BUTTE CREEK (Eco-Analysts, Chico, CA)

AAR assessed the potential impacts of bridge construction on threatened/endangered fish species, including the spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, and the Sacramento splittail. AAR undertook the following fishery resources Tasks: (1) Literature review of relevant studies and information on fishery resources; (2) Consultations with state and federal agencies; (3) Assessment of general fishery resources habitat conditions; (4) Determination of potential impacts of the project on fishery resources; and, (5) Identification of measures to mitigate for potential impacts of the project.

CHINOOK SALMON AND STEELHEAD SNORKELING SURVEYS IN DRY CREEK, BEALE AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA (U. S. Department of Defense, Beale Air Force Base, CA)

As part of updating the Beale Air Force Base Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, AAR is conducting field surveys (snorkeling) to determine the presence/absence of the fall-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead in Dry Creek within the Beale Air Force Base.
DREDGING AND MINING PROJECTS

- Adaptive Management Plans
- Age and Growth Studies
- Lagoons
- Biological Assessments and Monitoring
- CEQA and NEPA Permitting
- Dams and Diversions
- De-Watering, Fish Salvage and Relocation
- Endangered Species Section 7 Consultations
- Endangered Fish Species Surveys
- Expert Witness Testimony
- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Bioaccumulation of Heavy Metals
- Macro-invertebrate Studies
- Mitigation Plans
- Rehabilitation Plans
- Risk Evaluations
- Stream Flows
- Stress Physiology
- Water Quality and Water Temperature Studies
EFFECTS OF RE-SUSPENDED SEDIMENTS DUE TO DREDGING AND DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT ON SENSITIVE FISH SPECIES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY ESTUARY (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco, CA)

Concern has been raised over the level of suspended sediments caused by dredging and dredging operations on fishes in the San Francisco Bay Estuary. The potential impacts of suspended sediment caused by dredging activities in the San Francisco Bay Estuary are compounded by the fact that there is a high degree of uncertainty associated with the distribution of many fish species, both spatially and temporally. The Corps has contracted with AAR to conduct an analysis of the effects of dredge-related suspended sediments on the sensitive fishes in the Bay. The information will be used to design specific research to address the issue.

TOOLS FOR ASSESSING AND MONITORING FISH BEHAVIOR IN RELATION TO DREDGING ACTIVITIES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY ESTUARY (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco, CA)

The potential behavioral effects of dredging and dredging material placement on fishes in the San Francisco Bay Estuary have been a source of environmental concern for decades. Exposure of fishes to dredging operations may result in detrimental effects that are often mediated by behavioral responses. The San Francisco Bay Long-term Management Strategy (LTMS) members are interested in better understanding the behavioral responses of fishes to environmental effects of dredging operations. The Corps has contracted with AAR to conduct an analysis of the methods used to assess behavioral effects of dredging activities on fishes. The overall goal is to provide the Corps and the San Francisco Bay LTMS agencies with a firm technical basis upon which to design and implement studies on the behavioral effects of dredging activities on sensitive fish.

SACRAMENTO YACHT CLUB MAINTENANCE DREDGING PROJECTS – IMPACTS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN GREEN STURGEON (Sacramento Yacht Club, Sacramento, CA)

AAR is currently assisting the Sacramento Yacht Club with their Maintenance Dredging Permit Application. Tasks include assessing the impacts of the project on the North American green sturgeon and its critical habitat.

IMPACTS OF DREDGING ON STRIPED BASS IN CLIFTON COURT FOREBAY IN THE SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA (Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, CA)

AAR assessed the potential impacts of different concentrations of suspended sediment on striped bass, as a result of dredging in Clifton Court Forebay in the San Joaquin River Delta.
AGGREGATE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE UPPER RUSSIAN RIVER
(Mendocino Co Planning Dept, Ukiah, CA)

As part of the Aggregate Resources Management Plan for the Upper Russian River, AAR evaluated the impacts of past, present, and future gravel mining on fishery resources, particularly steelhead trout, including: (1) Documenting the status of fishery resources conditions; (2) Identifying appropriate gravel extraction sites; (3) Identifying appropriate extraction methods; (4) Developing a Fishery Resources Monitoring Plan; and, (5) Integrating fishery resources needs into the Aggregate Resources Management Plan.

GRAVEL EXTRACTION MINING IN THE MAD RIVER, HUMBOLDT COUNTY (Granite Construction Company, Ukiah, CA)

Granite Construction Company (Granite) was required by NOAA Fisheries to prepare a document that analyzed the existing fishery resources conditions for each of Granite’s gravel mining sites in the Mad River. To that end, AAR assisted Granite with fishery resources issues. AAR’s Tasks included: (1) Section 7 Consultation with the Federal agencies; (2) Writing a Fishery Resources Technical Report that included: (a) Assessing past and present fishery resources conditions; (b) Identifying appropriate extraction methods; (c) Providing an Adaptive Management Plan that incorporated long-term cause-and-effect monitoring (e.g., fish populations and fish use, fish habitat, water temperature, water quality); and, (3) Facilitating meetings between agency biologists and Granite.

GRAVEL EXTRACTION MINING IN THE EEL RIVER, HUMBOLDT COUNTY (Mercer Fraser Company, Eureka, CA)

Mercer Fraser Company was required by NOAA Fisheries to prepare a document that analyzed the existing fishery resources conditions for each of Mercer Fraser's gravel mining sites in the Eel River. To that end, AAR assisted Granite with fishery resources issues. AAR’s Tasks included: (1) Section 7 Consultation with the federal agencies; (2) Writing a Fishery Resources Technical Report that included: (a) Assessing past and present fishery resources conditions; (b) Identifying appropriate extraction methods; (c) Providing an Adaptive Management Plan that incorporated long-term cause-and-effect monitoring (e.g., fish populations and fish use, fish habitat, water temperature, water quality); and, (3) Facilitating meetings.

MONITORING OF HANSON PERMANENTE CEMENT COMPANY’S QUARRY OPERATIONS, WITH REGARD TO POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON STEELHEAD (Hanson Permanente Cement Company, Cupertino, CA)

According to the terms of a lawsuit filed against Hanson Permanente Cement Company (Hanson) by the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA), AAR was selected by CSPA to monitor and report on Hanson’s quarry operations for a year. At issue were the potential impacts of the quarry operations on the steelhead in Permanente Creek in Cupertino, south of San Francisco.
A.A. Rich and Associates

RECLAIMING THE SIERRA-GOLD COUNTRY COMMUNITY SUMMIT ON MINING IMPACTS, NEVADA CITY, CALIFORNIA (Sierra Fund, Nevada City, CA)

Dr. Alice A. Rich facilitated a discussion on Best Management Practices and stimulating new technologies for mining clean-up and reclamation at the first conference on Reclaiming the Sierra-Gold Country Community Summit on Mining Impacts in November 2011. Discussions included: (1) Fate and transport of contaminants in a watershed with abandoned mines and their potential impacts on the aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem; (2) New technology for removal of mercury from sediment in Nevada Irrigation Districts’ Combie Reservoir; and, (3) The Regional Water Quality Control Board’s responsibility to protect and preserve water quality in watersheds with abandoned mines, as well as challenges and needs.

PHOSPHATE MINE EXPANSION EVALUATION IN DRY VALLEY CREEK, IDAHO (FMC Corporation, Soda Springs, ID)

AAR was involved in a phosphate mine expansion project in Dry Valley Creek (part of the Blackfoot River Watershed) in Southeastern Idaho. The main issue of concern that AAR was responsible was the potential impact of the project on the Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Tasks performed by AAR included: (1) Fish habitat and population surveys; (2) Heavy metal impact analysis, including bioaccumulation of heavy metals by fishes; (3) Macro-invertebrate sampling and analysis; (4) Food-growth relationships; and, (5) Sediment impacts.

GOLD MINE EXPANSION EVALUATION OF THE EAST FORK OF THE SOUTH FORK OF THE SALMON RIVER, PAYETTE NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO (Maxim Technologies, Boise, ID)

AAR was responsible for conducting the fishery resources analysis for an EIS being prepared for a gold mine expansion on a tributary to the Salmon River in the Payette National Forest, Idaho. Of particular concern were the potential toxic impacts of the project on the threatened spring-run Chinook salmon, proposed Federally-threatened steelhead trout, bull trout, and westslope cutthroat trout. Issues of concern included food-growth relationship, sedimentation impacts, heavy metal impacts, macro-invertebrate impacts, and a risk analysis of potential fuel and chemical spills.

ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION OF GOLD MINE FAILURE IN THE MIDDLE FORK BOISE RIVER WATERSHED, IDAHO (Monarch Greenback, Boise, ID)

In connection with a catastrophic failure of a gold mine tailings impoundment, AAR designed a Fishery Resources Risk Evaluation. Of particular concern were the potential toxic impacts on the Federally-listed threatened bull trout and other sensitive salmonid fishes. Issues of concern included toxicological impacts, food-growth relationships, sedimentation impacts, and macro-invertebrate impacts.
A. A. RICH AND ASSOCIATES

GOLD MINE EXPANSION EVALUATION STUDIES IN THE HUMBOLDT RIVER WATERSHED, NEVADA
(Maxim Technologies, Helena, MT)

AAR completed the fishery resources portion of the EIS for the expansion of a gold mine in the Humboldt River Basin in Nevada. Tasks included: (1) Reviewing information on the water quality and thermal impacts of the expansion of the gold mine on fishery resources; (2) Identifying thermal requirements of each life stage of the key fish species; (3) Evaluating the potential impacts of heavy metals and other potentially polluting agents to the fishes; and, (4) Identifying the cumulative impacts of this and other mining activities (past, present, and proposed) on fishery resources.

LEEVILLE GOLD MINE EIS, HUMBOLDT RIVER WATERSHED, CARLIN, NEVADA (Maxim Technologies, Helena, MT)

The Leeville Gold Mine EIR that involved cooling water from the mining operations discharged into the Humboldt River in Nevada. AAR was responsible for addressing potential impacts on fishery resources, including: (1) Identifying life stage requirements of key fish species affected by the project; (2) Evaluating the potential impacts of heavy metals and other pollutants to the fishes; (3) Evaluating the potential impacts of de-watering on the fishery resources and riparian habitat; and, (4) Identifying the cumulative impacts of this and other mining activities (past, present and proposed) on fishery resources.

A VARIETY OF RIVER AND STREAM CHANNEL PROJECTS INVOLVING THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS, CALIFORNIA

AAR has been involved in over 20 river and stream projects in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River System and in the Bay Area (including estuarine systems) involving maintenance dredging, bank stabilization, de-watering of channels, collecting and relocating fishes, and streamside house and deck repairs. With each of these projects, AAR was responsible for assisting clients with the permitting process for threatened and endangered fish species with the Federal (including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) and state agencies, writing Biological Assessments, and salvaging and relocating fishes.

IMPACTS OF DREDGING ON THE FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE PETALUMA RIVER RELATED TO THE BAHIA PROJECTS, NOVATO, CALIFORNIA (Bahia Homeowners Association, Novato, CA)

AAR assisted the Bahia Homeowners Association with the fishery resources issues connected with their dredging project. Tasks included: (1) Section 7 Consultations with the Federal agencies to assess the potential impacts of the project on Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, and Sacramento splittail; (2) Consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game the Regional Water Quality Control Board to identify their concerns; (3) Preparation of an Environmental Assessment, regarding the Federally-listed fish species; and, (4) Design of post-project monitoring.
LAGOON BREACHING (DREDGING) IMPACTS AT THE MOUTH OF THE CARmel RIVER (Carmel Point and Lagoon Preservation Association, Carmel, CA)

Mechanically breaching (dredging) the Carmel River Lagoon is eroding a road on Carmel River Point. AAR assisted the Carmel Point and Lagoon Preservation Association (Association) to determine the best breaching methodology for steelhead while protecting the road and homeowners’ property. Project Tasks included: (1) Analyzing existing biological and chemical data for adult or juvenile steelhead inhabiting the lagoon or passing through it; (2) Working with the Federal, state, and local agencies to identify solutions; and, (3) Providing written reports and oral and written testimony on behalf of the Association by Dr. Alice Rich.

IMPACTS OF A SEASONAL GRAVEL DAM ON AQUATIC RESOURCES IN LAGUNITAS CREEK AND TOMALES BAY IN MARIN COUNTY (North Marin Water District and Giacomini and Sons, Marin County, CA)

As part of the California State Water Board Hearings for raising Kent Lake, AAR assisted both the North Marin Water District and the Giacomini Dairy Cuttle Ranch with regard to fishery resources issues. AAR’s Tasks included: (1) Studies on salmonid smolt trapping; (2) Water temperature monitoring and analysis; (3) Neomysis (opossum) shrimp studies; (4) Salmonid predation studies; (5) Analysis of the potential impacts of the summer dam on salmonids, sturgeon, tidewater goby, and opossum shrimp; and, (6) Expert Witness Testimony by Dr. Alice Rich at the State Water Resources Control Board Hearings for the raising of Kent Lake.

IMPACTS OF A DREDGE DISPOSAL SITE ON FISHERY RESOURCES, GRAYS HARBOR, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, OR)

AAR collected and analyzed data on fishery resources and fishery resource user activities in the vicinity of potential U.S. Army Corps of Engineers dredge disposal sites near Grays Harbor, Washington. Data were obtained from trawling and creel census surveys, personal interviews with local fishermen, and reports from state and Federal agencies. The data were used in the evaluation and selection of disposal sites.

IMPACTS OF A DREDGE DISPOSAL SITE ON FISHERY RESOURCES, WILLAPA BAY, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, OR)

AAR documented existing information on fishery resources and fishery resource user activities in the vicinity of Willapa Bay, Washington. These data were used, in conjunction with other biological and physical data, to evaluate the suitability of the site for continued use as a dredge disposal site by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
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In connection with a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Navigation Project, a fishery resources analysis was required. AAR documented and analyzed existing fishery resources data including: (1) Description of existing conditions; (2) Identification of the impacts of regular disposal of dredged material at an open water site; (3) Assessment of the impacts of continued disposal at an island (formed from past dredged material) that had recently been recognized as an important wildlife habitat area; and, (4) Analysis, report of results, and recommendations.
ESTUARINE AND MARINE FISHERY RESOURCES PROJECTS

- Age and Growth Studies
- Biological Assessments and Monitoring
- De-Watering, Fish Salvage and Relocation
- Dredging and Pile Driving
- Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultations
- Endangered Fish Species Surveys
- Expert Witness Testimony
- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Fishing - Bycatch Analyses

- Herring Mapping and Analyses
- Lagoons
- Marinas, Boat Activity, and Piers
- Marine Protection Areas (MPA's)
- Mitigation Plans
- Oil Rig Platforms
- Rehabilitation Plans
- Water Quality and Water Temperature Studies
ATTACHMENT 5
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EFFECTS OF RE-SUSPENDED SEDIMENTS DUE TO DREDGING AND DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT ON SENSITIVE FISH SPECIES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY ESTUARY (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco, CA)

Concern has been raised over the level of suspended sediments caused by dredging and dredging operations on fishes in the San Francisco Bay Estuary. The potential impacts of suspended sediment caused by dredging activities in the San Francisco Bay Estuary are compounded by the fact that there is a high degree of uncertainty associated with the distribution of many fish species, both spatially and temporally. The Corps has contracted with AAR to conduct an analysis of the effects of dredge-related suspended sediments on the sensitive fishes in the Bay. The information will be used to design specific research to address the issue.

TOOLS FOR ASSESSING AND MONITORING FISH BEHAVIOR IN RELATION TO DREDGING ACTIVITIES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY ESTUARY (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco, CA)

The potential behavioral effects of dredging and dredging material placement on fishes in the San Francisco Bay Estuary have been a source of environmental concern for decades. Exposure of fishes to dredging operations may result in detrimental effects that are often mediated by behavioral responses. The San Francisco Bay Long-term Management Strategy (LTMS) members are interested in better understanding the behavioral responses of fishes to environmental effects of dredging operations. The Corps has contracted with AAR to conduct an analysis of the methods used to assess behavioral effects of dredging activities on fishes. The overall goal is to provide the Corps and the San Francisco Bay LTMS agencies with a firm technical basis upon which to design and implement studies on the behavioral effects of dredging activities on sensitive fish species in the Bay.

DREDGING AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN SAN FRANCISCO BAY (Port of San Francisco, CA)

As part of an on-call contract with the Port of San Francisco, AAR provided services related to aquatic resources, including: (1) Fishery resources evaluations including impacts of polluted sediments on fishery resources; (2) Eelgrass surveys; and, (3) Assistance with permit applications.

IMPACTS OF DREDGING ON THE FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE PETALUMA RIVER (Bahia Homeowners Association, Novato, CA)

As part of the environmental assessment for the dredging out of the Bahia Lagoon, a fishery resources analysis was required. AAR conducted a fishery resources assessment that included: (1) Section 7 Consultation with the agencies to assess the potential impacts of the project on Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, and Sacramento splitetail; (2) Consultation with the CFG and the Regional Water Quality Control Board to identify their concerns; and, (3) Preparation of an Environmental Assessment, regarding the federal-listed fish species, including the design of pre- and post-project monitoring.

PIER 39 AQUARIUM EIR, SAN FRANCISCO (EIP Associates, San Francisco, CA)

As part of a general environmental assessment for the Pier 39 Aquarium in San Francisco, AAR provided the following: (1) Assessed the potential impacts of the Aquarium discharge on the marine organisms in the area; and, (2) Provided mitigation measures to offset negative impacts.
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Impacts of Lagoon Breaching on Steelhead in Carmel Lagoon (Carmel Point and Lagoon Preservation Association, Carmel, CA)

The mechanical breaching of the Carmel River Lagoon is eroding a road on Carmel River Point. AAR assisted the Carmel Point and Lagoon Preservation Association (Association) to determine the best breaching methodology for steelhead while protecting the road and homeowners' property. Project Tasks included: (1) Analyzing existing biological and chemical data for adult or juvenile steelhead inhabiting the lagoon or passing through; (2) Working with the Federal, state, and local agencies to identify solutions; and, (3) Providing written reports and oral and written testimony on behalf of the Association.

Vallejo Fishing Pier Replacement (Greater Vallejo Recreation District, Vallejo, CA)

In response to a Negative Declaration for the reconstruction of the Vallejo fishing pier, AAR completed the following tasks: (1) Assessment of existing fishery resources conditions, particularly with regard to winter-run chinook salmon; (2) Assessment of the potential impacts, particularly with regard to pile driving, of the proposed project on the fishery resources in the area; and, (3) Responded to agency concerns.

Richardson Bay Fishery Resources Survey (Martin Jarvis, Attorney, San Francisco, CA)

In response to issues connected with the "Anchor Out" houseboats off of Sausalito, AAR was contracted to conduct fishery resources surveys. Specific Tasks included: (1) Assessment of existing fishery resources conditions, particularly with regard to herring and herring spawning areas, and juvenile salmon and steelhead; (2) Assessment of the potential impacts of the "anchor out" houseboats on the fishery resources in the area; and, (3) Dr. Rich provided expert witness on behalf of the "Anchor Out", with regard to the beneficial impact of the houseboats, which provided habitat on which herring spawned.

Fisheries Issues Within Marine Protected Areas in the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, Santa Barbara, California (Iison W. New, Attorney, San Francisco, CA)

In connection with a case involving fishing in the Santa Barbara Channel, AAR assisted the fishermen, with regard to the interpretation of scientific studies of the fisheries in the area. Tasks undertaken by AAR included: (1) reviewing and analyzing scientific studies demonstrating the need for MPAs; (2) reviewing and analyzing scientific studies demonstrating the effects of Marine Protected Areas (MPA) on abundance, size, biomass, and diversity of fishes; (3) analyzing information on fishing pressure in the area; and, (4) reviewing the pros and cons of MPA's, with regard to the fishing needs of the community.

TOMALES BAY DOCK AND BOAT HOUSE REPLACEMENT (The Draper Family, Inverness, CA)

AAR assisted owners with the repair of a boat dock and boat house in Tomales Bay. The project included repair and replacement of the existing boat dock and boat house. As part of the project a biological resources assessment was required. AAR conducted a fishery resources assessment that included: (1) Assessment of existing biological resources conditions in the vicinity of the dock and boat house; (2) Writing a Biological Resources Assessment of existing biological conditions, potential impacts, and mitigation for the project; and, (3) Assisting the owners with the necessary permits from the Federal, state, and local agencies.
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Marsh Restoration/Fish Monitoring Project in Coyote Creek in South San Francisco Ban (Zentner & Zentner, San Francisco, CA)

To determine the extent to which larval and juvenile fishes and other aquatic organisms were using a recently-constructed tidal embayment, AAR conducted herring and Neomysis shrimp surveys.

A Variety of River and Estuary Projects Involving Dredging, Permitting for Threatened and Endangered Fish Species, Fish Collection, and Relocation of Fishes

AAR has been involved in over numerous Bay Area Estuary projects involving maintenance dredging, bank stabilization, and house and deck repairs. With each of these projects, AAR has been responsible for assisting clients with the permitting process for threatened and endangered fish species with the Federal (including the Corps of Engineers) and state agencies, writing Biological Assessments, and salvaging and relocating fishes.

Spot Prawn Bycatch Analysis, California Coast (Commercial Spot Prawn Fishermen, Santa Barbara, CA)

In connection with a case involving the bycatch of fishes as a result of spot prawn fishing along the California coast, AAR assisted the fishermen, with regard to scientific studies of the fisheries in the area. Tasks undertaken by AAR included: (1) Analysis of reports and raw data; and, (2) Expert witness testimony provided by Dr. Alice Rich at the California Fish and Game Commission Hearings.

Quantitative Mapping of Herring Spawn, Puget Sound, Washington (Kiewit Construction Company, Bellingham, WA)

In connection with a proposed oil rig platform construction site, AAR provided a quantitative assessment of the relative abundance of herring spawn along nine miles of shoreline in northern Puget Sound. This information was then used to determine the impacts of the proposed oil rig platform on the herring fishery in the area.

Oil Rig Platform Construction Site EIS, Bellingham, Washington (Kiewit Construction Company, Bellingham, WA)

In connection with the construction of a proposed oil rig platform in northern Puget Sound, AAR collected and analyzed fishery resources data including the following: (1) Assessing existing conditions, with regard to herring and salmon; (2) Assessing impacts of the proposed project, including those related to oil spills; (3) Mitigating for loss of habitat that would result from the proposed project; and, 4) Incorporating the results of the fishery resources analysis into an EIS for the project.
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IMPACTS OF A DREDGE DISPOSAL SITE ON FISHERY RESOURCES, GRAYS HARBOR, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, OR)

AAR collected and analyzed data on fishery resources and fishery resource user activities in the vicinity of potential U.S. Army Corps of Engineers dredge disposal sites near Grays Harbor, Washington. Data were obtained from trawling and creel census surveys, personal interviews with local fishermen, and reports from state and federal agencies. The data were used in the evaluation and selection of disposal sites.

IMPACTS OF A DREDGE DISPOSAL SITE ON FISHERY RESOURCES, WILLAPA BAY, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, OR)

AAR documented existing information on fishery resources and fishery resource user activities in the vicinity of Willapa Bay, Washington. These data were used, in conjunction with other biological and physical data, to evaluate the suitability of the site for continued use as a dredge disposal site by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

NAVIGATION PROJECT IN EVERETT HARBOR, PUGET SOUND, AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, OR)

In connection with a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Navigation Project, a fishery resources analysis was required. AAR documented and analyzed existing fishery resources data including: (1) Description of existing conditions; (2) Identification of the impacts of regular disposal of dredged material at an open water site; (3) Assessment of the impacts of continued disposal at an island (formed from past dredged material) that has recently been recognized as an important wildlife habitat area; and, (4) Analysis, report of results, and recommendations.

EAGLE HARBOR MARINA EIS, CYPRESS ISLAND, PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON (Shapiro and Associates, Seattle, WA)

As part of the environmental analysis for an EIS for a Marina in Puget Sound, a fishery resources analysis was required. AAR collected and analyzed marine fishery resources data including: (1) Assessment of existing conditions; (2) Assessment of impacts of the proposed project; and, (3) Mitigation measures for loss of habitat resulting from the proposed project. The results of the analysis were included as a Technical Appendix to the EIS.
TIMBER HARVEST FISHERY RESOURCES PROJECTS

- Adaptive Management Plans
- Biological Assessments and Monitoring
- CESA and CEQA Permitting
- De-Watering, Fish Salvage, and Relocation
- Endangered Fish Species Surveys
- Endangered Species Section 7 Consultation
- Expert Witness Testimony

- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Macro-invertebrate Studies
- McNeil Substrate Sampling Surveys
- Mitigation Plans
- Rehabilitation Plans
- Water Quality and Water Temperature
WATERSHED PROTECTION AND RESTORATION COUNCIL (WPRC) SCIENCE PANEL (The Resources Agency and National Marine Fisheries Services, CA)

Dr Alice Rich was appointed to the Science Panel of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Council (WPRC). To establish a program to protect and enhance steelhead and coho salmon populations in northern California, the National Marine Fisheries Service signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the State Resources Agency and the California Department of Fish and Game. A key element of the MOU was the creation of an Independent Science Panel who would review the California Forest Practices Rules to determine the adequacy for the protection of salmonid species. The Science Panel completed a report so that any potential rule changes could be considered and implemented. Tasks for the Science Panel included: (1) Reviewing the Forest Practices Rules; (2) Reviewing Timber Harvest Plan review and approval processes; and, (3) Interviewing over 25 panels representing government agencies, landowners, and other resources professionals.

IMPACTS OF TIMBER HARVEST ON FISHERY RESOURCES, MENDOCINO COUNTY (Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, Samoa, CA)

AAR conducted a three-year study to assess the impacts of Louisiana-Pacific’s (LP’s) timber harvest practices on the fishery resources of the Navarro River Watershed. The project included: (1) Fishery resources population surveys; (2) Fishery resources habitat (Habitat Typing) surveys; (3) Salmonid spawning population surveys; (4) Salmonid spawning gravel sampling (McNeil sampling); (5) Water temperature modeling and monitoring; (6) Macro-invertebrate sampling and analysis; (7) Participation by Dr. Alice A. Rich at public meetings; and, (8) Annual reports prepared to assist LP with timber harvesting.

IMPACTS OF TIMBER HARVEST ON FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE MATTOLE RIVER WATERSHED, HUMBOLDT COUNTY (Washburn, Briscoe & McCarthy, Attorneys, San Francisco, CA)

AAR worked on a timber harvesting project in Humboldt County, California. Tasks included: (1) Determining the impacts of timber harvest practices on coho and Chinook salmon, steelhead and sea-run cutthroat trout; and, (2) Designing and supervising long-range monitoring studies, including water temperature monitoring, food, habitat and population studies.

IMPACTS OF TIMBER HARVEST ON FISHERY RESOURCES, HUMBOLDT COUNTY (Barnum Timber Company, Eureka, CA)

AAR assisted Barnum Timber Company (BTC) with timber harvest/fishery resources issues in the headwater streams of the Mattole River Watershed in Humboldt County, California. The project consisted of assessing salmonid habitat, using Habitat Typing, and Spawning Gravel Sampling (McNeil sampling). The results of the surveys were analyzed and a report prepared to assist BTC with timber harvest plans. In addition, AAR collaborated with the California Department of Fish and Game in the preparation of salmonid mitigation measures for timber harvesting in Baker Creek, a tributary of the Mattole River.
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IMPACTS OF TIMBER HARVEST ON FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE EEL RIVER, HUMBOLDT COUNTY
(Barnum Timber Company, Eureka, CA)

AAR provided assistance, with regard to fishery resources issues, to Barnum Timber Company on the South Fork Eel River in Humboldt County. Tasks included: (1) Fishery resources population surveys; (2) Fishery resources habitat (Habitat Typing) surveys in Sprout Creek, a tributary to the South Fork Eel River; and, (3) Collaborated with the California Department of Fish and Game in the preparation of salmonid mitigation measures for timber harvest.

IMPACTS OF TIMBER HARVEST PRACTICES ON FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE MOKELUMNE RIVER WATERSHED, AMADOR COUNTY (East Bay Municipal Utility District, Oakland, CA)

AAR conducted studies to assess the impacts of Georgia Pacific's timber harvest practices on the fishery resources in the upper Mokelumne River Watershed. The project included: (1) Fishery resources population surveys; (2) Fishery resources Habitat (Habitat Typing) Surveys; (3) Trout spawning gravel (McNeil sampling) surveys; (4) Analysis of the results of the field studies; and (5) Expert witness testimony by Dr. Alice A. Rich.

POSSIBILITY THAT COHO SALMON WERE NOT NATIVE TO THE CREEKS AND RIVERS SOUTH OF SAN FRANCISCO, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY (Big Creek Lumber Company, Davenport, CA)

AAR contracted with Big Creek Lumber Company to review, analyze and comment on the scientific evidence of whether or not coho salmon were native to the creeks and rivers south of San Francisco. The results of the analysis were ambivalent. While coho salmon that originated from other areas of California had been planted extensively in the creeks and rivers south of San Francisco during the 19th and 20th centuries, there was no scientific proof that there had never been a remnant coho salmon population and, hence, there was no scientific proof that coho salmon were not native south of San Francisco.

IMPACTS OF TIMBER HARVEST PRACTICES ON STEELHEAD AND COHO SALMON IN WADDELL CREEK, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY (Big Creek Lumber Company, Davenport, CA)

AAR assisted Big Creek Lumber with salmonid issues in connection with a lawsuit regarding potential impacts of timber harvest practices. AAR's tasks included: (1) Salmonid habitat analysis in logged and non-logged areas; (2) Review and analysis of other scientists data and reports; and, (3) Expert witness testimony by Dr. Alice A. Rich.
SIERRA NEVADA AND LAKE TAHOE FISHERY RESOURCES
PROJECTS

- Biological Assessments
- Dewatering, Fish Salvage, and Relocation
- Endangered Species Section
- 7 Consultations
- Endangered Fish Species Surveys
- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Macro-invertebrate Studies
- Mitigation Plans
- Rehabilitation Plans
- SCUBA and Snorkeling Surveys
- Water Quality and Water Temperature Studies
- Marinas, Boat Activity, and Pier
LAHONTAN CUTTHROAT TROUT SALVAGE AND RELOCATION IN DONNER CREEK (TRUCKEE RIVER TRIBUTARY), TRUCKEE, CALIFORNIA (Kinder Morgan, Orange, California)

SFPP, L.P., operating partnership for Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P., maintains a pipeline that transports petroleum products from Colfax to Woodchopper, California. During a re-analysis of the pipeline, an anomaly was found that required inspection and repair within the stream channel of Donner Creek, a tributary to the Truckee River. The federally-threatened Lahontan cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki henshawi*) was known to occur within the stream channel. As part of the California Department of Fish and Game's Stream Alteration Agreement, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Avoidance/Mitigation Measures for this project, AAR collected and relocated fishes and amphibians within the project area prior to the de-watering of the channel. Following the field work, Dr. Alice Rich submitted a biological report to the client.

BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT FOR A BREAKWATER ON FISHES AND FISH HABITAT (D. G. Menchetti, Ltd., Attorney, Incline Village, Lake Tahoe, NV)

AAR analyzed the fishery resources and fish habitat in connection with a breakwater which was installed by a landowner in Incline Village, Lake Tahoe. The project included: (1) Habitat (SCUBA and snorkeling) surveys to determine existing substrate conditions; (2) Monitoring of thermal conditions; (3) Monitoring of water quality conditions; (4) Assessing whether or not the breakwater was impacting fishery resources; and, (5) Expert testimony provided by Dr. Alice A. Rich.

BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE CONVERSION OF BOAT RAMP TO PIER, (Chaplinsky Family, Incline Village, NV)

AAR assisted a homeowner with the conversion of a boat ramp to a Pier in Lake Tahoe. Tasks included: (1) Habitat surveys to determine existing environmental conditions; (2) An assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed project; (3) Analysis, report of results, mitigation measures; (4) Fish habitat restoration plan for the project; and, (5) Biological Assessment for the Project.

FISHING ACCESS BOAT RAMP IMPROVEMENT MASTER PLAN REVIEW (Tahoe City Public Utility District, Tahoe City, CA)

AAR provided fisheries resources services for the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) for a Master Plan developed by the TCPUD. Under the California Environmental Quality Act, TCPUD must certify an environmental document which discloses the environmental consequences of the Master Plan improvements. As part of this environmental process, AAR conducted a fishery resources assessment, that included: (1) Habitat surveys to determine existing environmental conditions; (2) An assessment of the potential impacts of the project; (3) Analysis, report of results and, mitigation measures for the project; and, (4) Biological Assessment for the Project.
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ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF FISHERY RESOURCES AND WILDLIFE STUDIES FOR PIER EXTENSION (Croom Family, Crystal Bay, Lake Tahoe, NV)

AAR assisted a homeowner with a pier extension at Crystal Bay in Lake Tahoe. Tasks included: (1) SCUBA and habitat surveys to determine existing environmental conditions; (2) An assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed project; and, (3) Biological Assessment for the Project including, analysis, report of results, and mitigation measures.

FISHERY RESOURCES AND WILDLIFE STUDIES FOR PIER CONSTRUCTION (McClean Family, Meeks Bay, Lake Tahoe, CA)

AAR assisted a homeowner with a pier construction project in Meeks Bay, Lake Tahoe, California. Tasks included: (1) SCUBA and habitat surveys to determine existing environmental conditions; (2) An assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed project; and, (3) Biological Assessment, including analysis, report of results, and mitigation measures for the project.

FISHERY RESOURCES HABITAT CONDITIONS FOR BOAT DOCK (Jerome Emerson, Incline Village, NV)

AAR assisted a homeowner with a boat dock project in Incline Village, Lake Tahoe. Tasks included: (1) Habitat surveys to determine existing environmental conditions; (2) An assessment of the potential impacts of the project; (3) Analysis, report of results and, mitigation measures for the project; and, (4) Rehabilitation measures.

IMPACTS OF TRANS-SIERRA TRANSMISSION LINE INTERTIE (ESA, San Francisco, CA)

In connection with the EIR for the Trans-Sierra Transmission Line Intertie, AAR conducted a fishery resources assessment of over 400 square miles of streams along proposed alternate routes. Riverine systems included the American, Bear, Truckee, Carson, and Yuba rivers; Prosser, Dry, Wolf, Auburn Ravine, Weber, and Alder creeks; and, Dutch Flit, Rollins and, Camp Far West reservoirs. AAR'S Tasks included: (1) Developing criteria for assessing the fishery resources values of each water course; (2) Assessing the effects of erosion and sedimentation on fishery resources; and, (3) Providing mitigation measures for fishery resources.

ASSESSMENT OF FISHERY RESOURCES CONDITIONS IN PINE AND MILL CREEKS, INYO COUNTY (Pacifica Development Inc., Bishop, CA)

AAR completed the fishery resources section for an EIR for a housing development project near Bishop, California. The project involved the Pine and Mill Creek watersheds. The fish species of special concern included Owens pupfish, speckled dace, Owens tui club, and Owens sucker. Project Tasks included: (1) Fishery resources habitat surveys; (2) Fishery resources population surveys; and, (3) Analysis of data and submission of report describing existing conditions, potential impacts of the proposed project, and measures to mitigate potential impacts.
PACIFIC NORTHWEST FISHERY RESOURCES PROJECTS

- Age and Growth Analyses
- Biological Assessments and Monitoring
- Dredging and Mining
- Endangered Species Surveys
- Expert Witness Testimony
- Fish Habitat and Fish Population Studies
- Herring Mapping and Analyses
- Instream Flows
- Mitigation Plans
- Oil Rig Platforms
- Use of Physiological Salmonid Smolt Indicators
- Water Quality and Water Temperature Studies
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SALMONID FRY STRANDING STUDY IN THE SKAGIT RIVER, WASHINGTON (R.W. Beck and Associates, Seattle, WA)

As part of a Seattle City Light project to assess the significance of salmonid fry stranding as a result of pothole formation, AAR conducted studies to identify which physiological indicators of smoltification (e.g., lunar cycle, photoperiod) could be used to predict the severity of fry stranding.

SALMONID REHABILITATION PROJECT IN BIG SOOS CREEK, KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON (Richard Carothers Associates, Seattle, WA)

As part of the King County Park Master Plan, AAR assisted a landscape architecture firm with an analysis of the fishery resources in an urban creek near Seattle, Washington. AAR's tasks included: (1) Habitat assessment for coho salmon and cutthroat trout; and, (2) Analysis, report of results, and recommendations for restoration to be used in conjunction with the construction of the park.

AGE AND GROWTH STUDIES OF MARINE AND FRESHWATER FISH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND THE YUKON TERRITORY (Dames and Moore, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada)

AAR determined the age composition for populations of a number of different fish species (e.g., starry flounder, Arctic grayling, prickly sculpin, mountain whitefish, etc.) collected in the Kitimat River Estuary in northern British Columbia and in several lakes and creeks in the Yukon Territory. To determine age, otolith and scale analysis were used, together with data on lengths and weights of the fishes.

WATER QUALITY EVALUATION FOR USE IN THE DESIGN OF A SALMONID HATCHERY WATER TREATMENT FACILITY IN WHATCOM CREEK, BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON (Callen Construction Company, Bellingham, WA)

AAR evaluated existing water quality conditions for use in the design of a water treatment facility for a salmonid hatchery in Bellingham, Washington. AAR's tasks included: (1) Assessment of water quality requirements for steelhead and rainbow trout; (2) Assessment of existing water quality conditions; and, (3) Analysis, report of results, and recommendations.

IMPACTS OF A DREDGE DISPOSAL SITE ON FISHERY RESOURCES, GRAYS HARBOR, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland)

AAR collected and analyzed fishery resources data on fishery resources and fishery resource user activities in the vicinity of potential U.S. Army Corps of Engineers dredge disposal sites near Grays Harbor, Washington. Data were obtained from trawling and creel census surveys, personal interviews with local fishermen, and reports from state and federal agencies. The data were used in the evaluation and selection of disposal sites.
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IMPACTS OF A DREDGE DISPOSAL SITE ON FISHERY RESOURCES, WILLAPA BAY, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, OR)

AAR documented existing information on fishery resources and fishery resource user activities in the vicinity of Willapa Bay, Washington. These data were used, in conjunction with other biological and physical data, to evaluate the suitability of the site for continued use as a dredge disposal site by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

NAVIGATION PROJECT IN EVERETT HARBOR, PUGET SOUND, AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, Oregon)

In connection with a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Navigation Project, a fishery resources analysis was required. AAR documented and analyzed existing fishery resources data including: (1) Description of existing conditions; (2) Identification of the impacts of regular disposal of dredged material at an open water site; (3) Assessment of the impacts of continued disposal at an island (formed from past dredged material) that had recently been recognized as an important wildlife habitat area; and, (4) Analysis, report of results, and recommendations.

OIL RIG PLATFORM CONSTRUCTION SITE EIS, BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON (Kiewit Construction Company, Bellingham, WA)

In connection with the construction of a proposed oil rig platform in Northern Puget Sound, AAR collected and analyzed fishery resources data. Tasks included: (1) Assessment of existing conditions, particularly with regard to herring and salmon; (2) Assessment of impacts of the proposed project, including those related to oil spills; (3) Mitigation for loss of habitat that would result from the proposed project; and, (4) Incorporating the results of the fishery resources analysis into an EIS for the project.

QUANTITATIVE MAPPING OF HERRING SPAWN, PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON (Kiewit Construction Company, Bellingham, WA)

In connection with a proposed oil rig platform construction site, AAR provided a quantitative assessment of the relative abundance of herring spawn along nine miles of shoreline in northern Puget Sound. This information was then used to determine the impacts of the proposed oil rig platform on the herring fishery in the area.

EAGLE HARBOR MARINA EIS, CYPRESS ISLAND, PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON (Shapiro and Associates, Seattle, WA)

As part of the environmental analysis for an EIS for a Marina in Puget Sound, a fishery resources analysis was required. AAR collected and analyzed marine fishery resources data including: (1) Assessment of existing conditions; (2) Assessment of impacts of the proposed project; and, (3) Mitigation measures for loss of habitat resulting from the proposed project. The results of the analysis were included as a Technical Appendix to the EIS.
A.A. Rich and Associates
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RÉSUMÉS
June 20, 2014

William McGuire
2125 Ranch Court
Napa, CA 94558

RE: Salvador Channel Stability Assessment at the Proposed Napa Creekside Apartment Project, 3700 Valle Verde Drive, Napa, CA

Dear Bill,

At your request, Clearwater Hydrology (CH) has completed a hydraulic and geomorphic analysis of channel and bank stability for the reach of Salvador Channel adjacent to the proposed Napa Creekside Apartments project. CH obtained and reviewed the City of Napa Planning Commission Staff Report, dated June 6, 2013, and all of the project documentation attached therein. This report describes the methodology and results of our analysis and our professional opinion as to both the stability of the western streambank that parallels and adjoins the western property boundary and the potential Project impacts on future channel conditions.

Overview

According to the Planning Commission Staff Report, the Napa Creekside Apartment project 3700 Valle Verde, Napa, CA would provide 57 units of affordable housing, including the construction of one new three-story building and renovation of an existing three-story apartment building and surrounding driveway and parking areas. The existing three-story structure and its rear parking area are the principal focus of the present hydraulic and geomorphic analysis of channel and bank stability.

Field Inspection, Channel Cross-Section Survey and Hydrogeomorphic Conditions Assessment: Salvador Channel

Total Station Channel Survey and Channel Bank Soil Sampling

CH staff completed a site inspection and cross section topographic survey using our Leica total station on May 23, 2014. Survey control points were set in the parking lot at the rear of the Creekside Apartments building establishing a local vertical datum, and building corners and curb locations were surveyed as spatial reference points. CH surveyed one cross section of the Salvador Channel located near the upstream end of the building, as shown on Figure 2, as well as several thalweg (i.e. channel flow line) points upstream and downstream of the cross section. We also extracted two soil samples from the west bank of Salvador Channel, one located along the cross-section selected for hydraulic scour analysis and the other 50-60 ft. downstream, on another earthen bank section just downstream of a segment of heavily riprapped bank. The soil samples were sent to a geotechnical lab for hydrometer and/or mechanical (i.e., sieve) analysis of particle size distribution and textural characteristics.
Hydrogeomorphic Conditions Assessment

CH inspected the reach of the Salvador Channel extending from the pedestrian foot bridge upstream of the project site to just downstream of the vacant Sunrise assisted living facility building. The pedestrian bridge lies just upstream of the Project boundary, although it has been proposed for partial removal in association with Project implementation. Concrete bridge abutments support the pedestrian bridge, and a 2-3 ft. high grouted rock wall constructed just downstream of the bridge serves as a local grade control to protect the bridge piers and east abutment from excessive channel scour (Photo 1, see attached Photo Log). As can be inferred from Photo 1, the rim of rough grout visible around the piers coincided with the original level of the bridge undercrossing, which probably consisted of a grouted concrete lining that deteriorated and failed at some point in the past. The photo also depicts the severity of the cracking of the east abutment. Downstream of the grade control, both the east and west banks are lined with large 1-3 ft. diameter rip-rap (Photo 2), the placement of which may have been concurrent with the bridge construction, or it was necessitated by increased scour downstream of the concrete armored bridge crossing.

While the actual chronology of the stabilization efforts at and downstream of the bridge are unknown, the downstream extent of the riprap placement (roughly 100 ft. in length) strongly suggests that the riprap was placed in response to local bank failures. This patchwork of riprap installation is typical of incised stream channels in the Bay Area that have undergone significant urbanization since the 1950-60s. Based on the level of the rough ring of grout around the bridge piers, the downstream channel has likely incised 3-4 feet over that time period.

It appears that a portion of the rip-rap placed downstream of the bridge has dislodged and fallen into the center of the channel. Some of this dislodged rock was subsequently transported downstream during major floods and has formed the skeletal elements of a roughly longitudinal and discontinuous mid-channel bar that extends downstream past the northern boundary of the abandoned assisted living building parcel (Photo 3). The larger boulder-sized elements have forced low flows to bi-furcate to either side of the bar.

Immediately downstream of the main riprap installation, portions of the east bank have been severely eroded (Photo 4). West bank erosion is also evident in this reach, which extends onto the channel reach adjoining the vacant Project building. The west bank is higher than the east bank and the erosion that has occurred has produced a more precipitous near-vertical slope. Several trees have been undermined and have fallen into the channel within this section of bank.

The channel cross-section selected for the present stability analysis was taken through this short reach, as shown in Figure 2. Photos 5 and 6 show the local west bank condition. Photo 5 is an oblique view of the west bank that depicts the steep local slope (approx. 0.5:1 H:V) and the proximity of the top of bank to the asphalt parking area. The total station visible at the upper left of the photo was set atop the asphalt adjacent to the curb, about five feet from the fence. The cross-section extended directly across the channel from the set-up position. Photo 6 is a close-up of the bank immediately downstream of the analyzed cross-section, which was unvegetated, but of similar composition to the bank at the section location. The photo shows the low and mid-bank region, including a lens of fine grained sediment infused with gravel and cobble. This lens
likely represents a low terrace deposit of alluvium that with incision has been eroded, along with the finer-grained material that overlies it further upslope. The thickness of this lens is approximately 3-4 feet and is underlain by a more resistant claystone. The claystone layer was also observed further downstream where the local west bank is vertical and overlain by similar fine-grained material, as well as across the channel where it forms stable low terraces. The tree rooting evident in Photo 6 is an extension of one of the dead trees visible in Photo 5, and has been lending some stability to the low bank zone. However, as these trees are sufficiently undermined and collapse during significant flood events, the root systems can also be upended and create local obstructions to flow and diversion of these flows onto the exposed banks, resulting in substantial bank erosion and/or slump failures.

Rip-rap has been placed along a 40-50 ft. long section of the right bank, adjacent to and just downstream from the unrocked section that encompasses the analyzed cross-section (Photo 7). It appears that this rock was haphazardly dumped in response to localized bank erosion. Whereas the west bank riprap installed downstream of the bridge was placed with some attention to three-point bearing, a more stable method of placement, this downstream rock revetment is more uneven and no subgrade keying of the revetment is evident. Both lobes of the dumped rock extend out into the low flow channel.

Immediately downstream of the west bank riprap shown in Photo 7, the channel bed form transitions from a very roughened riffle, with a local slope of 2.4 percent, to a long pool (Photo 8) with a milder slope. The pool extends downstream for a distance of 150-200 ft. before the channel enters a bend toward the southern property boundary. Within the pooled reach, the west bank is unarmored and vertical to nearly vertical. Non-native, invasive vines (e.g. ivy) are the dominant vegetal cover, where such cover exists. Some smaller concrete rubble was observed along the channel bottom through the pool reach. The second west bank soil sample was taken in a bare area toward the head of this reach.

Downstream of the pool reach, the west bank forms the outer radius of a channel bend, which is typically more prone to bank erosion. The local west bank has experienced significant erosion through this bend and has undermined the iron property fence, as shown in Photo 9.

Bank Stability Analysis

Methods

CH obtained the 7.5 minute, topographic quadrangle map for Napa, CA from the USGS National Map. The portion of the Salvador Channel watershed tributary to a concentration point located at approximately the downstream property corner was delineated based on the USGS map using Autodesk AutoCAD Civil3D 2014, and is shown on Figure 1.

Peak discharge calculations for the 2-yr. and 100-yr. storm events were performed following the flood frequency analyses as described by Rantz (1971) to determine the peak discharge values used for hydraulic analysis. Discharge calculations included an adjustment of peak flow values to account for the level of urbanization in the watershed. The degree of development within the delineated watershed was based on visual interpretation of the aerial imagery included in the USGS map. It was
estimated that 50% of the watershed is urbanized and 10% of channels in the watershed are sewer or lined. Peak discharge calculations are included in the attached Technical Appendix.

The station and elevation of points along the field-surveyed cross section were exported to the FlowMaster hydraulic program (Ver. 6.1, Hausted Methods 2000) for hydraulic analysis. The FlowMaster results were used to calculate the mean bed and bank shear stresses and mean flow velocities at the surveyed cross section for the 2-yr. and 100-yr. storm peak discharges.

The shear stress exerted on the channel bed by the conveyed flow was estimated using the simplified shear stress equation:

\[ \tau_b = \gamma y S \]

where, \( \tau_b \) = bed shear stress, lb/ft\(^2\)
\( \gamma \) = specific weight of water, 62.4 lb/ft\(^3\)
\( y \) = normal depth, ft.
\( S \) = water surface slope, ft/ft

Bank shear stresses in unreinforced, earthen channels designed by the US Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation water conveyance are generally equal to 0.75* \( \tau_b \) (Henderson 1966). However, such earthen channels are designed with stable bank angles, typically 2:1 H:V. For the present west bank, the composite slope is 1:1, and is near vertical over the upper 8 feet. Thus, the proportion used for the bank shear was 0.50, instead of 0.75 to reflect the lesser flow depths and the resulting local shear stress distribution.

The computed flow velocities and bank shear stresses for the 2-yr. and 100-yr. peak discharges were then compared to permissible shear stress and velocity values published in the research literature on river mechanics and sediment transport to determine the vulnerability of the unreinforced sections of the west bank through the Project reach. A graph of the surveyed cross section and the results of the hydraulic analysis are also included in the attached Technical Appendix.

Results

CH estimated the relevant watershed area to be 5.1 mi\(^2\) and peak discharges for the 2-yr. and 100-yr. storm events to be 281 cfs and 2,041 cfs, respectively. Hydraulic parameter values applied in the normal depth flow computations presented in the Technical Appendix included a local channel bed slope of 2.4 percent (0.024 ft/ft) and a Manning’s roughness of 0.05 for both assessed discharges. The higher Manning’s “n” value of 0.05 reflects the strong influence of irregular channel cross-sections, deep pools and widely varying form roughness, which is in part due to the large boulder arrays affecting the hydraulic behavior of floodflows through the Project reach.
Calculated bank shear stresses for the surveyed cross section are 1.9 lb/ft\(^2\) and 4.8 lb/ft\(^2\) for the 2-yr. and 100-yr. storm events, respectively. Corresponding flow velocities for the 2-yr. and 100-yr. peak discharges were computed to be 6.3 and 12.1 ft/sec (fps), respectively. The computed 2-yr. mean velocity is representative of an incised, moderately steep channel. The computed 100-yr. mean velocity could be higher than the actual velocity, even with the relatively high channel roughness (i.e. Manning’s “n”) value assumed (0.05), given the likelihood of channel backwater effects extending upstream from the Big Ranch Road crossing.

Estimated movable particle sizes for the west bank during the 2-yr. and 100-yr. storm events, were based on the mobile particle size vs. shear stress relationship of (Leopold 1994 and Leopold et al. 1964, see Tech. Appendix). The mobile bank sediment sizes computed for the associated peak discharges were 8 in. (210 mm) and 39+/- in. (1,000+/- mm), respectively. The tested shear stress range for the Leopold relationship extends to approximately 3.0 lb/ft\(^2\). Thus, the 100-yr. mobile sediment sizes for both the bed and bank shear stresses computed for the 100-yr. event discharge must be considered approximate. However, we have personally observed several instances in steep to moderately steep channels wherein less than 100-yr. discharges have instigated dislodging and downslope (via rolling) and/or downstream movement of 2-3 ft diameter boulders. Thus, the extrapolation of the relationship is supported by field evidence on CH-restored stream reaches in the SF Bay Region (e.g. Codornices Creek in Berkeley, Wildcat Creek in Richmond).

The particle size distribution curves for bank sediments subjected to lab hydrometer and/or sieve analysis are attached in the Technical Appendix. Hydrometer analysis, which enables distinction between silt and clay sub-fractions within the fine material fraction that passes through the #200 sieve, was performed only on the bank sample taken at the analyzed channel cross-section site (i.e. per Figure 2). At the upstream site (at the analyzed cross-section), the sampled soil was categorized as a clayey sand with gravel (SC designation under the Unified Soil Classification System). At the sampled downstream site, the soil was described as a lean clay (CL).

Permissible shear stresses and flow velocities for channels composed of various bed-bank materials, including vegetated and bare native soils, rock reinforcing and bioengineering treatments (e.g. wattles, brush mattresses, live willow stakes, etc.), are listed in Fischenich (Table 2, USAE 2001). For the sampled SC and CL soil types established for the local west bank of Salvador Channel, the corresponding boundary types (i.e. boundary between the flowing water and a confining bed or bank) are “graded loam to cobbles” and “stiff clay”, respectively. Table 1 lists the permissible shear and velocity values for these soils/boundary types, as well as a couple of other types presented for purposes of comparison.
Table 1: Permissible Shear Stress and Flow Velocities for Sampled Bank Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil/Boundary Type</th>
<th>Permissible Shear Stress psf</th>
<th>Permissible Velocity fps</th>
<th>Reach Values (XSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC (graded loam to cobbles, unvegetated) @XSI</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.9 (2-yr.) 6.3 (2-yr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL (stiff clay, unvegetated)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3.0-4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live brush layering (initial/grown)</td>
<td>0.4-6.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap (18-in, d50)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shear and velocity values for unvegetated bank soils were used, due to the observed conditions at the sampled bank sites, which were devoid of vegetation. At the XSI site, some hydrophilic grass was present along the low bank, but the mid-bank region was bare. Likewise, at the downstream sample site some invasive ivy was present atop the undercut ledge at the upper end of the mid-bank zone, but no vegetation was observed on the low and mid-bank zones just downstream of the dumped riprap slope protection. The listed values in Table 1 clearly indicate that even for the much lower 2-yr. peak discharge, the unvegetated west bank is vulnerable to future hydraulic scour and erosion.

Conclusions

Based on our review of the available Project documentation and the above hydraulic and geomorphic assessment for the Project reach of the Salvador Channel, CH concludes the following:

- The observed existing conditions along the Project reach of Salvador Channel, downstream of the pedestrian bridge crossing, suggest a general geomorphic condition of instability. This instability results from progressive urbanization of the watershed over the past 60 years which has increased peak flow rates, accelerated both the delivery to and conveyance of stormwater runoff in the Channel, and caused both vertical incision and lateral expansion of the flow cross-section. In addition, the combined effect of floodplain fills and channel incision and enlargement has limited overbank floodplain flows to the most severe floods. This has increased the erosivity of floodflows conveyed in the constrained channel.

- The incised channel conditions have created a highly erosive and unstable channel. The response of homeowners and government entities during the last half of the 20th century to this channel instability was the installation of spot stabilization measures that favored a hard, structural approach (e.g. unvegetated riprap revetments), rather than the currently favored biotechnical approach. The discontinuous patchwork of channel stabilization is
represented by the concrete grout and riprap treatments through and downstream of the pedestrian bridge.

- As suggested by the values cited in Table 1, the unvegetated soils at two unreinforced sites along the Project reach are vulnerable to future bank erosion, because their permissible shear stresses and flow velocities are significantly lower than those derived for the 2-yr. and 100-yr. peak discharges on Salvador Channel. This vulnerability is greatest in areas adjacent to or opposite riprapped banks, as fully evidenced along the Project channel reach. The erosion risk is heightened by abrupt changes in the pattern of flow and local turbulence between very roughened and resistant (i.e. riprapped) bank segments and unroughened earthen ones.

- Large-scale bank erosion (i.e. bank slumping) is most likely to occur as drawdown failures following the passage of higher recurrence interval floods (e.g. ≥ 10 yr.), during which prolonged, elevated stream levels produce strong reverse seepage into the bank soils. Relatively rapid recession of stream levels after rainfall tapers off can lead to excessive porepressures within the soil mass, resulting in bank failure. Based on other CH bank stability evaluations assisted by geotechnical modeling under similar conditions, vehicular loading in the vicinity of the top of bank greatly increases the risk of such slump failures. Thus, the maintenance of parking and truck access in the vicinity of the top of the near vertical banks for the Project’s renovated structure would present a high risk to local bank instability along the Project reach.

- Maintenance of the existing west bank conditions along the portion of the Project reach that parallels the now vacant assisted living facility would result in periodic bank failures that would trigger requests from the Project owners for emergency permits to install spot riprap stabilization measures— the same discredited measures that have actually exacerbated urban stream instability and riparian corridor degradation during the past 60+ years.

- Instead of implementing a biotechnical approach, including bridge removal, only along the currently undeveloped northern portion of the Project property, CH recommends that biotechnical measures be applied to stabilize the west bank of Salvador Channel throughout the Project reach. This could be done, if the Project parking were accommodated in a different configuration, providing a setback corridor for biotechnical stabilization and riparian corridor enhancement.

I trust that this bank stability risk assessment will assist the homeowners, the City and the Project managers in deriving a Project that works for the principal Project objectives as well as the integrity of the Salvador Channel and its riparian environs.

Yours truly,

William Vandivere, M.S., P.E.
Principal

Steven McNeely, M.S., P.E.
Water Resources Engineer
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Photo 1: Downstream oblique view of Salvador Channel at the pedestrian bridge crossing and the severely cracked east abutment. Note the remnant ring of grouted rock on the bridge pier, approximately two feet above the ponded water level.

Photo 2: Upstream view along the Channel reach immediately downstream of the Pedestrian bridge, which is visible behind the tree foliage. The 2-3 ft. high grouted rock wall/grade control structure crosses the channel at the shaded center of the photo.
Photo 3: Downstream view along the roughly longitudinal and discontinuous mid-channel bar formed by collapsed boulders transported a short distance downstream from the upstream riprap revetments.

Photo 4: View looking upstream from the analyzed cross-section. Note the severe erosion along the east bank (at right), immediately downstream of the riprapped banks.
Photo 5: Oblique upstream view of the west bank- the analyzed cross-section extended as a straight line along the line-of-sight of the total station at top left.

Photo 6: A close-up of the low to mid-bank zone of the west bank, immediately downstream of the analyzed channel cross-section location. Note the patch of still-intact bank soil infused with large gravel and cobble at mid-left under the tree root. Erosion of this lens of material produced the loose gravel and cobble on the lower terrace. The larger gravel-cobble component is absent in the mid-bank soils.
Photo 7: Downstream view along 40-50 ft. riprap treatment of the west bank adjoining the vacant Project building’s rear parking area. Note the boulders encroaching on the active flow zone of the channel.

Photo 8: Downstream view of lower end of the long riffle and the transition to the long pool that extends downstream from the lower end of the riprap zone in Photo 7 to roughly the southern property boundary.
Photo 9 (Courtesy of W. McGuire): Upstream view of the eroded west bank through a failed section of the existing property fence.
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This worksheet presents peak discharge calculations for the 2 and 100 year storm events for the watershed tributary to Salvador Creek at the Creekside Apartments in Napa, CA, as shown on the "Figure 1: Watershed Map". We performed calculations following the flood frequency analyses as described by Rantz, 1971 to determine the peak discharge values used for hydraulic analysis.

Watershed 1 - Salvador Creek at Creekside Apartments

Rantz Flood Frequency Analysis

Given:

\[
A = 5.13 \text{ mi}^2 \quad \text{Drainage area.}
\]

\[
P = 25 \text{ in.} \quad \text{Mean annual basinwide precipitation. (WRCC, Napa State Hospital Station)}
\]

Degree of development was based on visual interpretation of aerial imagery from the USGS.

(50% of basin urbanized; 10% of channels sewer or lined.)

Preparation of Flood Frequency Curve:

\[
Q_2 = 0.069 \times A^{0.913} \times P^{1.905} = 167 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_5 = 2.00 \times A^{0.925} \times P^{1.206} = 433 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{10} = 7.38 \times A^{0.922} \times P^{0.928} = 652 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{25} = 16.5 \times A^{0.912} \times P^{0.797} = 943 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{50} = 69.6 \times A^{0.847} \times P^{0.511} = 1430 \text{ cfs}
\]

Unurbanized Discharge Values:

Peak discharge values under unurbanized conditions read from the flood frequency curve.

\[
Q_2 = 165 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_5 = 445 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{10} = 705 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{25} = 1050 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{50} = 1310 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{100} = 1570 \text{ cfs}
\]

Peak Discharge Values:

Peak discharge values under urbanized conditions adjusted based on Fig 3, page 16 of Rantz.

\[
Q_2 = 281 \text{ cfs}
\]

\[
Q_{100} = 2041 \text{ cfs}
\]
Particle Size Distribution Report

![Graph showing particle size distribution](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% +3&quot;</th>
<th>% Gravel</th>
<th>% Sand</th>
<th>% Fines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LL</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>D85</th>
<th>D50</th>
<th>D30</th>
<th>D15</th>
<th>D10</th>
<th>Cc</th>
<th>Cu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6581</td>
<td>1.9193</td>
<td>0.6307</td>
<td>0.0258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material Description
- ○ CLAYEY SAND WITH GRAVEL (SC), brown, some organics, dry.
- □ LEAN CLAY (CL) brown, some organics, dry.

Project No.: Napa Creekside Apts
Client: Clearwater Hydrology

Remarks:
- ○ High level of organics within sample made removing them very difficult. Not all organics were able to be removed.
- □ Same comment as Sample 1.

A3GEO

Tested By: FO
Creekside Apartments, Napa, CA
29-Jul-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Section</th>
<th>Slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>ELEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>96.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>96.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>94.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>90.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>88.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>88.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>87.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>87.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>87.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>87.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>87.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>86.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>86.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>86.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>87.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.16</td>
<td>90.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>90.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>93.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.24</td>
<td>96.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.64</td>
<td>98.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>100.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: Creaskele Apartments, Napa</th>
<th>Date: 05/29/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Movable Particle Sizing**

This worksheet calculates bank shear stress (lb/ft²) for the selected Salvador Channel cross section from the tabular results from Flowmaster.

Bank shear stress ($\tau_b$) is estimated to be 50 to 75% of the computed bed shear stress, where $\tau_b = \gamma S_r$ is the bed shear stress eqn. (e.g. Henderson 1966).

For X81, with a composite, w. bank slope of 1:1, but locally much steeper, assume bed to bank shear conversion factor of 0.5.

Minimum particle size (mm) is read from Figure 6-11A, "Laboratory and field data on critical shear stress required to initiate movement of particles", Fluvial Processes in Geomorphology, page 170, by Leopold et al., 1964; updated in Leopold's A View of the River (1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Section 1 - Q2</th>
<th>Cross Section 1 - Q100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross Section 1 - Q2

Bank Shear Stress, $\tau_b = \gamma S_r = \gamma \text{normal depth} \times S_r \times 0.5$

where $\gamma = 62.4$ lb/ft²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Size</th>
<th>Element Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$S_r$ = friction (w.s.) slope; $S_e$ = bed slope; neglecting backwater effects and assuming subcritical flow, $S_r = S_e$

**Upper limit of Leopold empirical relationship is approx. 3.0 lb/ft², therefore, extrapolation to 39-in. mobile size is uncertain.**
Figure 11.4  Laboratory and field data on critical shear stress required to initiate movement of grains (Leopold, Wolman, and Miller 1964, p. 170). The solid line is the Shields curve of the threshold of motion transposed from the $\theta$ versus $K_s$ form into the present form, in which critical shear stress is plotted as a function of grain diameter.
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Dana Codron
Banbury Ct
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jennifer Palmer
519 Wilson St
Napa, CA 94559
Subject: FW: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

From: Reed Onate <reedonate@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2019 5:02 PM
To: Patricia Baring <pbaring@cityofnapa.org>
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Carol Poole <Carol.Poole.258876248@p2a.co>
Date: Mon, Dec 2, 2019 at 4:58 PM
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
To: Reed Onate <reedonate@gmail.com>

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Carol Poole
1745 Soruce St
Napa, CA 94559.
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,

Terri Smith
1262 Pear Tree Lane
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,

Steven Boyd
1100 Lincoln Ave., #108
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As a Napa resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative.

Having attended two neighborhood outreach meetings, I have witnessed fear and concern from the current residents of the neighborhood near the project site. As a resident of a south-east Napa neighborhood not far from the State Hospital, my family regularly encounters and interacts with people in drug addiction recovery, people who are homeless, and people who are recent immigrants. Over the twenty six years in our neighborhood, we have not had a single dangerous encounter.

I believe that many of the current residents who oppose the project are responding out of fear of change and that once the project is completed, they will forget their concerns and recognize that their new neighbors are just people striving for a second chance at life.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Hugh Linn
975 Liberty Dr
Napa, CA 94559
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As a City of Napa resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. The majority of individuals who become homeless are older adults aged 55 or older, who often have concurrent medical and behavioral health conditions. Homeless individuals have five times the emergency room visits and double the hospitalizations, compared with someone who is housed. Homeless people have life expectancies 30 to 40 years less than those who are housed.

I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. The Napa County community is as healthy as our most vulnerable residents. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Karen Relucio
2160 Unbridled Ct
Napa, CA 94559
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Grania Lindberg
1515 Laurel St
Napa, CA 94559
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jenna Bolyarde
221 Reed Cir
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,

Teresa Zimny
1050 Hilton Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

 Regards,
Victoria Greenslate
413 Brown St
Napa, CA 94559
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Anthony Townsend
231 Reed Cir
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Caryn Green
1675 Santiago Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,

Delos Green
1675 Santiago Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my IPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Andrea Lieber <Andrea.Lieber.258885879@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 6:08:58 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Andrea Lieber
2434 Trower Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my IPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Loraine Stuart <Lorraine.Stuart.258883303@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 5:50:15 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Loraine Stuart
22 S Crane Ave
St. Helena, CA 94574
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Robert Palmer
1981 Mt Ave
Yountville, CA 94599
--- Forwarded message ---

From: Laurie Cavagnaro <Laurie.Cavagnaro.258886184@p2a.co>
Date: Mon, Dec 2, 2019 at 6:10 PM
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
To: Reed Onate <reedonate@gmail.com>

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.

Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Laurie Cavagnaro
2434 Trower Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.

Thank you for your support!

Regards,

Joshua Cavagnaro
2434 Trower Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
David Whitmer
2137 Euclid Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jennifer Henn
75 S Newport Dr
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ed FARVER <Ed.FARVER.258904417@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 8:54:22 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Ed FARVER
1075 Ross Cir
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Susan Okun <Susan.Okun.258904985@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:00:55 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am a member of the Napa Valley Unitarian Universalist congregation in Napa, and am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and a chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these types of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Susan Okun
PO Box 1637, Benicia
Benicia, CA 94510
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Linda Dietiker-Yolo <Linda.DietikerYolo.258907423@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:35:13 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Linda Dietiker-Yolo
141 Riordan Lane
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Katherine Fleming <Katherine.Fleming.258906965@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:26:56 PM PST
To: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As a Napa resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. These are our friends, sisters, brothers, and children.

We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Katherine Fleming
952 School Street, 184
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nicole Collins <Nicole.Collins.258908503@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:52:05 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Nicole Collins
1463 Rubicon St
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

[EXTERNAL]

Begin forwarded message:

From: Daniel Leonie <Daniel.Leonie.258908495@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:52:03 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Daniel Leonie
35 Regatta Way
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_nvig@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kathleen Zimmermann <Kathleen.Zimmermann.258908602@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:53:45 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Kathleen Zimmermann
14 Tiburon St.
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Andrea Clarke <Andrea.Clarke.258908567@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:53:15 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Andrea Clarke
109 Willowbend Court
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Angela Salva <Angela.Salva.258908675@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:54:32 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Angela Salva
4307 Malaga Ct
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kelly Patterson <Kelly.Patterson.258908657@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:54:24 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.

Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Kelly Patterson
640 Maplewood Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Chitra Samanta <Chitra.Samanta.258908620@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:54:04 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Chitra Samanta
1040 Valley View St
St. Helena, CA 94574
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paulo Marcelino <Paulo.Marcelino.258908738@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:55:43 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Paulo Marcelino
4307 Malaga Ct
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lisa Stevenson <Lisa.Stevenson.258909016@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 9:59:05 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Lisa Stevenson
6468 Washington St
Yountville, CA 94599
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lenore Hirsch <Lenore.Hirsch.258910771@p2a.co>
Date: December 2, 2019 at 10:51:21 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I urge your support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. Please help concerned neighbors to understand there will be on-site support services for those in need.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. Please don’t let political concerns or NIMBYism keep you from supporting this project.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you.

Regards,
Lenore Hirsch
4427 Stillson St.
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Douglas Skelton <Douglas.Skelton.258924631@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 5:16:36 AM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: [Redacted]

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Douglas Skelton
2564 Rollingwood Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kelsey.miller.258912751@p2a.co
Date: December 3, 2019 at 12:31:38 AM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Kelsey miller
3320 Stratford Ct
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bonnie Richardson <Bonnie.Richardson.258926891@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 5:41:02 AM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Bonnie Richardson
127 OLD VINE WAY
Napa, CA 94558
From: Cara Wooleadge
Date: December 3, 2019 at 2:02:50 AM PST
To: Mike Murray
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Cara Wooleadge
2881 Hilltop Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kimberly Alves <kimberly.alves.258911185@p2a.co>
Date: 12/2/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Kimberly Alves
535 Coombsville Rd
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray  
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC  
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular  
MikeM_NVIG@me.com  
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mary Palmer <Mary.Palmer.258938456@p2a.co>  
Date: 12/3/2019  
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>  
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,  
Mary Palmer  
1981 Mount Avenue  
Yountville, CA 94599
Begin forwarded message:

From: Jessica Rainey <Jessica.Rainey.258939112@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jessica Rainey
750 Marsh Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Erin Burns <Erin.Burns.258940309@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Erin Burns
2153 Patton Ave
Napa, CA 94559
From: Cristy Cowell <Cristy.Cowell.258939374@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Cristy Cowell
3542 White Cliff Circle
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Juan Cisneros <Juan.Cisneros.258941461@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Juan Cisneros
439 Devlin Rd
Napa, CA 94558
From: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 7:53 AM
To: Patricia Baring
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

[EXTERNAL]

Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Juan Carlos Buller <JuanCarlos.Buller.258941290@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Juan Carlos Buller
109 Willowbend Ct.
Napa, CA 94559
Patricia Baring

From: Michael Murray <mixem_nvig@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 7:53 AM
To: Patricia Baring
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

[EXTERNAL]

Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Allesanda Tolomei <Allesanda.Tolomei.258941191@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Allesanda Tolomei
3124 Soda Canyon Rd
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Susan Napoliello <Susan.Napoliello.258937402@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Susan Napoliello
2412 Foothill Blvd
Calistoga, CA 94515
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alicia Hardy <Alicia.Hardy.258956672@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and these concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Alicia Hardy
1141 Pear Tree Ln
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Michele Grupe <Michele.Grupe.258955853@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Michele Grupe
103 Randolph Street
Napa, CA 94559
From: Melissa Blonigen <Melissa.Blonigen.258955817@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Melissa Blonigen
2841 Soscol Ave
Napa, CA 94558
From: Leslie Downs <Leslie.Downs.258955394@p2a.co>  
Date: 12/3/2019  
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>  
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Leslie Downs  
321 Brown St  
Napa, CA 94559
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Luis G <Luis.G.258954331@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Luis G
956 Pueblo Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Daniel Rainey <Daniel.Rainey.258953927@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Daniel Rainey
750 Marsh Dr
Napa, CA 94558
From: Dale Weide <Dale.Weide.258953350@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing because I strongly support the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As a nurse working at QVMC's Community Outreach, I see first hand every day how the lack of subsidized housing is adversely impacting our low income residents. I believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Dale Weide
757 Vista Tulocay Ln, #307
Napa, CA 94559
From: Kerry Ahearn <Kerry.Ahearn.258953198@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Kerry Ahearn
1546 1st St
Napa, CA 94559
From: Georgina Espinosa <Georgina.Espinosa.258952063@p2a.co>  
Date: 12/3/2019  
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>  
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Georgina Espinosa  
3448 Villa lane  
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Claudia Hanna <Claudia.Hanna.258949247@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Claudia Hanna
1240 Orchard Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Robin Sisemore <Robin.Sisemore.258947087@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Robin Sisemore
150 Camino Dorado
Napa, CA 94558
From: Patti Frey <Patti.Frey.258946970@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Patti Frey
3190 Stuart Way
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Sally Seymour <Sally.Seymour.258945872@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Sally Seymour
3305 Hagen Rd.
Napa, CA 94558
From: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 9:31 AM
To: Patricia Baring
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jessica Alcazar <Jessica.Alcazar.258945683@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jessica Alcazar
2482 Claret Ct
Napa, CA 94534
From: Kathleen Reynolds <Kathleen.Reynolds.258945160@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Kathleen Reynolds
150 Camino Dorado
Napa, CA 94558
From: Kate Moon <Kate.Moon.258963278@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Kate Moon
154 Hartson St.
Napa, CA 94559
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: James Featherstone <James.Featherstone.259016962@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As a expert in behavioral health, housing and an area resident, I believe that the answer to homelessness is simply housing. This project provides housing and so much more. Supportive health services are available to these residents to ensure successful outcomes for them and their families. Having worked and lived in Napa over 40 years I can assure you that success comes from being apart of the community, not isolated to some mental illness ghetto or institution. These are residents of Napa and we have a opportunity to bring them back into our social structure. This is how recovery is sustained.

The old refrain of "not in our neighborhood" should not be supported We needs strong leadership to take advantage of this unique partnership of resources. This project can impact the significant health challenges faced by these residents.

People with substance use and mental health issues will be a danger to themselves without adequate housing and access to health services. These resources are most effective when they are welcomed by the recipient. This strategy has worked well in a variety of programs I placed in our neighborhoods over the last 30 years.
I urge the City of Napa to take advantage of this opportunity to make a difference and approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.

Thank you for your courage

Regards,
James Featherstone
1414 Meek Avenue
Napa, CA 94559
Begin forwarded message:

From: Madeleine Buller <Madeleine.Buller.259014171@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Madeleine Buller
109 Willowbend Court
Napa, CA 94559
From: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 12:26 PM  
To: Patricia Baring  
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

[EXTERNAL]

Michael Murray  
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC  
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular  
MikeM_NVIG@me.com  
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Brian Tremain <Brian.Tremain.259010139@p2a.co>  
Date: 12/3/2019  
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>  
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,  
Brian Tremain  
2757 Old Sonoma Rd  
Napa, CA 94558
From: Patricia Baring
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 12:29 PM
To: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

---

[EXTERNAL]

Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rebecca Webster <Rebecca.Webster.259008015@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Rebecca Webster
4403 Rockwood Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Mimi Adams <Mimi.Adams.259006756@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Mimi Adams
208 Jane Way
Napa, CA 94558
From: "Sandra. Staulcup" <Sandra.Staulcup.259004442@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_NVIG@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Sandra. Staulcup
1242 Tamalpais St
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Brian Mantz <Brian.Mantz.2590037222@p2a.co>  
Date: 12/3/2019  
To: Mike Murray <mikem_NVIG@me.com>  
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,

Brian Mantz  
2536 Old Sonoma Rd.  
Napa, CA 94558
From: Glenn Gibson <Glenn.Gibson.259002291@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_NVIG@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Glenn Gibson
2268 Las Flores Dr
Napa, CA 94558
From: Jeni Olsen <Jeni.Olsen.258999413@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jeni Olsen
18 Riverton Ct
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tameeka Hall <Tameeka.Hall.258996740@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Tameeka Hall
2330 Lakepark Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Samantha Meldrum <Samantha.Meldrum.258996227@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Samantha Meldrum
2025 Appolco Ct
Napa, CA 94559
[EXTERNAL]

Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alan Healy <Alan.Healy.258985490@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Alan Healy
127 Valley Oak Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Margaret Ingalls <Margaret.Ingalls.258977903@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, and a member of Napa Valley Unitarian Universalist church, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I would like to point out that adding housing in Napa will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, since low income people often have to live far away to afford housing, and then they have to drive to Napa to work. Also, housing homeless people will reduce stress on the environment caused by people who don’t have access to toilet facilities. Having people who live along our creeks and streams is a health hazard and contributes to the degradation of our waterways.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Margaret Ingalls
124 Carlisle Way
Benicia, CA 94510
Attorney 5

From: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 12:35 PM
To: Patricia Baring
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

[EXTERNAL]

Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sheila Telle <Sheila.Telle.258977246@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

 Regards,
Sheila Telle
2556 Vine Hill Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lauren Holster <Lauren.Holster.258977075@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Lauren Holster
1580 Cinnamon St
Napa, CA 94559
From: Heather Martin <Heather.Martin.258967797@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

 Regards,
Heather Martin
538 Brown St
Napa, CA 94559
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Justine Leonie
Regatta Way
Napa, CA 94559
Begin forwarded message:

From: Edward Tcheleshe <Edward.Tcheleshe.259020976@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Edward Tcheleshe
3200 Soscol
Napa, CA 94558
From: Sophia Doss <Sophia.Doss.259029896@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Sophia Doss
162 Homewood Ave
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sue Brooks <Sue.Brooks.259030155@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 1:31:58 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To:  

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Sue Brooks
3808 Rohffs Way
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Dwayne Johnson <Dwayne.Johnson.259031415@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <MikeM_NVIG@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Dwayne Johnson
491 RANDOLPH ST, Apt. #2
Napa, CA 94559
Michael Murray  
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC  
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular  
MikeM_NVIG@me.com  
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dorothy Northey <Dorothy.Northey.259031540@p2a.co>  
Date: 12/3/2019  
To: Mike Murray <MikeM_NVIG@me.com>  
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,  
Dorothy Northey  
6946 Yount St  
Yountville, CA 94599
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jeanne Cervone <Jeanne.Cervone.259033369@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jeanne Cervone
2757 Indiana St
Napa, CA 94558
Begin forwarded message:

From: Brittnie Sigamoney <Brittnie.Sigamoney.259034269@p2a.co>
Date: 12/3/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Brittnie Sigamoney
25 Belvedere Ct.
Napa, CA 94559
From: Mary Kennelly <Mary.Kennelly.259037365@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 2:17:36 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Mary Kennelly
1800 Atrium Pkwy
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rainer Hoenicke <Rainer.Hoenicke.259059064@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 4:23:16 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing again in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. I am a neighborhood resident and strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and the housing crisis is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents. Homelessness is a public health issue and directly and indirectly affects all of Napa’s residents. This is a critical issue which continues to get worse every year.

I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible as much as the residents that live in the established neighborhood near the proposed Valle Verde Housing project. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions that have far worse consequences than those that advocate against this project.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Rainer Hoenicke
4433 Eastwood Ct
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dale Craig <Dale.Craig.259044204@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 3:36:48 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Dale Craig
1501 East Avenue
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Doug Hawker <Doug.Hawker.259043818@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 3:36:48 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Doug Hawker
23 Summerbrooke Cir
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cindy Guentert-Baldo <Cindy.GuentertBaldo.259069964@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 5:30:51 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Cindy Guentert-Baldo
2205 Carol Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Howard Siegel <Howard.Siegel.259104135@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 6:43:35 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Howard Siegel
3685 Montana Drive
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lily Blumberg <Lily.Blumberg.259118482@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 8:19:48 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Lily Blumberg
23 Valley W Cir
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jane Bledsoe <Jane.Bledsoe.259120588@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 8:38:55 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As a resident of Napa (at Napa Creek Manor), I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Jane Bledsoe
1300 JEFFERSON ST., APT. 318
Napa, CA 94559
From: Christy Mantz <Christy.Mantz.259123413@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 9:11:18 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I have worked as a social worker in a variety of capacities and believe that Housing First is the best model to provide for the physical needs of people as they get help with mental illness, joblessness, addictions, and other social issues. Dehumanizing then and teaching our children to fear them is not the way to help our community or be responsible citizens. As a resident near the old HHS campus, I can say confidently that when the time comes to develop that land for affordable housing or shelters, I will support that initiative, too.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Christy Mantz
2536 Old Sonoma Rd
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,

Ellen Patterson
613 PORT S
Calistoga, CA 94515
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ellen Wood <Ellen.Wood.259127699@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 10:41:25 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Ellen Wood
3400 Jefferson St,#113
Napa, CA 94558
Patricia Baring

From: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 5:56 PM
To: Patricia Baring
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

[EXTERNAL]

Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Julie Webb <Julie.Webb.259068668@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 5:21:37 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident and religious leader, I pastor a congregation (Napa Valley Lutheran Church) which strongly believes that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. In fact, we have put our money where our mouth is, by participating in Common Ground's work on housing issues, and by working with the late Harry Price on a project using the church's land.

But while the Emmanuel Eco-Village project is still in the planning stage under Linda's guidance, this Heritage House-Valle Verde project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents. We simply cannot wait to begin providing housing justice to those members of our community who are most vulnerable. Our community must not lose this chance!

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home, and a chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support the types of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I live in a neighborhood (McPherson) which provides low-income and subsidized housing options—and it has been a great experience. I love my responsible, hard-working neighbors. Some folks are just afraid of that which they haven’t yet experienced.
I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your commitment to housing justice in Napa!

Regards,
Julie Webb
2222 Adrian St
Napa, CA 94558
City of Napa Planning Commission
Napa, CA 94559

SUBJECT: Valle Verde and Heritage House Projects
Public hearing December 5, 2019

Dear Planning Commissioners:

The Napa Chamber of Commerce continues to be supportive of housing that is affordable to all economic segments of our community. Housing is a fundamental human need, and we cannot have a healthy and thriving community if housing is not attainable for all.

The Valle Verde and Heritage House projects are vital to addressing the needs for our workforce whose incomes fall into the low- and very low-income levels, of which there are many, or who may currently be homeless. While we don't have specific figures, we would all be surprised how many of our local workers are couch surfing, living in crowded conditions or sleeping in their cars because they cannot afford a home or apartment in Napa. Our businesses are impacted, some have even closed, because they cannot attract and retain workers. If this trend continues, our thriving economy will certainly pay a hefty price and the multiplier effect to local government and public services could be detrimental.

Our housing shortage is real, and it requires the community to respond differently than ever before. NIMBYism and lawsuits put a major strain on our local resources, and meanwhile the housing problems continue to expand. Having a local development team as reputable and capable as the Gasser Foundation and Burbank Housing is a blessing to our community, and their housing product speaks for itself. Also, Abode Services is an established and well-regarded housing manager/operator and service provider with a primary mission to end homelessness. As a community, we should consider ourselves fortunate to have these resources committed to helping Napa address its homeless and housing needs at the very low-income end of the spectrum.

Financing affordable housing projects is no easy task, and every delay adds to the price tag. And we need this housing yesterday. So we urge the Planning Commission to take actions to support the Valle Verde and Heritage House projects, despite the objections of some of the neighbors.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Travis Stanley
President & CEO
Napa Chamber of Commerce

John Evans
Chairman
Napa Chamber of Commerce
November 26, 2019

SUBJECT: Valle Verde and Heritage House Support

Dear City of Napa Planning Commissioners:

Visit Napa Valley (VNV) and its members have been supportive of increasing the supply of housing that is affordable to all residents of our community - particularly for Napa's workforce. In 2018, VNV spearheaded the initiative to add a one percent tax to all lodging overnight stays throughout Napa County to provide a steady funding stream for affordable and workforce housing. While this is an important step, funding is not the only solution.

Our partner businesses continue to pay close attention to what our local government is doing to address the dire housing needs in Napa County. In the past year, we have seen businesses close due to their inability to attract and retain workers who can afford to live and work here - a trend that, unfortunately, is expected to worsen over time.

The Valle Verde and Heritage House projects are extremely important to filling very important income categories within the continuum of housing needs.

The Valle Verde project will provide 24 homes to families earning at or below 60 percent of the median income -- earnings that do not make ends meet. Yet a large swath of our community - including teachers, hospitality workers, laborers, farmworkers, and many others - would meet the requirements for this housing. The development partners, Gasser Foundation and Burbank Housing, have proven track records for building quality housing, as can be seen by the Stoddard West project in south Napa.

The adjacent Heritage House project would provide permanent homes for 33 qualifying members of our homeless population. We are aware that many of Napa's workers have either been homeless at one time or another, or are living paycheck to paycheck, and on the verge of being homeless.

The "housing first" approach seems fundamental to helping to solve the homeless problem in our community. The supportive services and on-site management will go a long way to providing the residents with a strong foundation for success. As we have seen in nearby Bay Area communities, homelessness can grow into an insurmountable problem that affects the entire community. It's time to take a bold step for the betterment of the community at large.
Visit Napa Valley commends the City of Napa for its determination to address the affordable housing problem and the strides it has made over the last few years. The housing crisis requires a multi-tiered approach with private, public, and non-profit sectors all working together, and we hope neighbors will set their fears and resistance aside to be part of the solution.

Please support the Valle Verde and Heritage House development projects.

Sincerely,

Erik Burrow  
Board Chair

Don Shindle  
Past Board Chair

Linsey Gallagher  
President & CEO
Valle Verde Homeless Apt. Bad for Neighbors

We selected the Silverado Creek neighborhood to buy our Napa home. It was a newer, moderately priced group of homes close to medical services and various markets. We’ve enjoyed living here and knowing our neighbors. We keep our home in good condition and most others who live here do the same.

In recent weeks we learned that the old Sunrise senior citizen home, on Valle Verde, is to be changed into a homeless facility with additional new buildings added to the complex.

During the last city election, we supported the new changes in the Napa City council makeup. We had hoped that the newly elected council members would better represent the people who comprise Napa. Unfortunately, this has not occurred. As is so often the case, the city takes care of the tourists, people with money and their own projects even when the citizens are against the projects.

The Heritage House Valle Verde project, for people who have been homeless, have mental and substance abuse problems, was brought to the City Planning group. The group faithfully took the project in hand and then hired an organization to build and manage the facility. Months later the city decided they ought to let some local people in the area know about the project. The order of the process was backwards. The very first action the City should have taken was to immediately notify those living in the affected area about the project. Notices should have gone out to all residents/businesses within a mile of the projects’ location.

We do not want the Gasser Foundation project in our neighborhood!

The proposed new project for the Heritage House Valle Verde complex will just bring more people into our community who are likely to cause problems. In addition, students walk Valle Verde between home and school. They won’t be safe. This will devalue our property. We do not want the project. A better place for the project would be behind the Gasser Foundation Offices, on Soscol Ave. It would be closer to the troubled homeless facility on Hartle Court.

The best use of the Gasser money for the Sunrise/Heritage House building and additional buildings would be to house an estimated 1100+ senior citizens in need of a home.

Sincerely, Richard and Carolyn Cady

r.cady@sbcglobal.net
Napa Housing Coalition Supports Heritage House and Valle Verde

Napa has an amazing opportunity to provide critical housing and services to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. **Heritage House Apartments** and the adjacent **Valle Verde Apartments**, thoughtful and carefully designed housing developments, will go a long way to addressing Napa’s need for affordable, supported housing for individuals and families. Napa Housing Coalition wholeheartedly supports these new developments.

Napa is a world-class wine and dining destination. However, this is not what gives Napa its special feeling; it’s about community, it’s about our people. The people who live and work here make all that is Napa possible. A community is only as vital and thriving as its people are healthy and able to contribute to society. Chronic stress from housing insecurity leads to higher risk of chronic disease. Everyone in a community is impacted in some way when others of us suffer from preventable chronic disease. Available affordable housing is essential for Napa’s prosperity. **Housing is health.**

Heritage House Apartments restores a facility that has sat vacant for a number of years into a new apartment complex that will have amenities such as a community room, computer lab, and outdoor courtyard that will foster a sense of community within the complex. There will also be onsite property management, 24/7 staff presence and a significant level of service including case management, job counseling, and health and wellness programs. Onsite management and services will be provided by the partnership of Abode Services and Burbank Housing, a collaboration that has a proven track record in which 95% of their residents stay housed.

Both properties will operate under the **Housing First** philosophy, an evidence-based approach that connects individuals and families to housing as quickly as possible. The premise is that people cannot recover from medical, or mental health, or substance abuse disorders without a stable place to live. Multiple studies have shown that this supported housing approach allows tenants to live independently and improve outcomes. In other words, this can work!

There are many paradigms embedded in housing policy. Housing as a **human right** contends that adequate, safe and affordable housing is critical to proper human development. Such housing enables members to be healthy, to take advantage of educational opportunities, to be productive members of the workforce, and to form nurturing families. Housing is fundamental to human flourishing. In a community such as Napa, with an enviable quality of life that all residents are worthy of, shouldn’t housing as human right be our guidepost for housing policy?

We support Heritage House Apartments and Valle Verde Apartments and ask Napans to open their minds to the possibility of a community without chronic homelessness. We also urge the City of Napa Planning Commission to approve these desperately needed housing developments.

Joelle Gallagher  
Teresa Zimny  
Co-Chairs, Napa Housing Coalition
September 5, 2019

Michael Allen
Senior Planner
City of Napa
955 School Street
Napa, CA 945

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Mr. Allen

The purpose of this letter is to inform you formally that I believe that the EIR draft for the above listed project is flawed and am questioning why it does not address the significant environmental impacts that I brought to your attention as required by Section 15064 of the California Environmental Quality Act that are also considered a public nuisance\(^1\) by the City of Napa.

More specifically, I am referring to indirect physical changes in the environment which is not immediately related to the project but are reasonably expected to occur as the result of activities associated with its proposed use\(^2\). Examples of these indirect changes in the environment I am referring to as the result of this project include loitering, public intoxication, public drug use, begging, visual blight caused by littering, the improper disposal of needles and syringes, etc.

I understand that an indirect physical change in the environment can be considered only if that change is a reasonably foreseeable impact which may be caused by the project\(^3\). I believe that the pictures attached to this letter taken over the last several weeks demonstrate this standard has been met.

\(^1\) Napa Municipal Code Title 8 Health and Safety, Chapter 8.16 Public Nuisances, Section 8.16.200 Definitions, "Nuisance factors: which means any conditions which causes one or more of the following: a detriment to the health or safety of surrounding persons or property; a harborage for rodents or pests; an attractive nuisance; substantially interferes with the reasonable enjoyment of property by neighbors; visual blight from public streets; reduces the aesthetic appearance of the neighborhood from public streets; is offensive to the senses from public streets; or detrimentally affects property in the surrounding neighborhood.

\(^2\) CEQA Section 15064, (2)
\(^3\) CEQA Section 15064, (3)
I also believe that the draft EIR does not consider the economic and social changes that will result from this project and the significant negative environmental effects on the South Vintage Neighborhood. While economic and social changes from a project are not normally treated as significant effects on the environment-economic and social impacts may be used, however, to determine that a physical change shall be regarded as a significant effect on the environment\(^4\). As previously stated I believe that the indirect physical changes/public nuisances caused by this project will negatively impact property values and the aesthetic appearance of the neighborhood and will be offensive to the senses.

Sincerely,

*Philip D. White - Donna E. White*

Philip & Donna White  
9 Blackberry Drive  
Napa, CA 94558

\(^4\) CEQ Section 15064, (e)
South Napa Homeless Shelter
100 Hartie Court, Napa CA 94559

Pictures Taken on August 6, 2019
Who is going to Pick up the Garbage?
Onsite Security?
Public Intoxication/Loitering
Homeless Encampments
Shopping Carts
Sleeping in the Rough
Public Urination/Defecation
Once again, my wife and I are voicing our objection to approving this project as proposed. Our objections have been cited to you in previous communication from our Neighborhood organization, the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association.

While we support the need for this type of housing, we don't believe the current plans as outlined provide for enough safeguards for the surrounding community. We are deeply disturbed that the City is disregarding the wishes and needs of homeowners who pay significant taxes to the City in favor of a fringe group who could better receive their services elsewhere in the City without jeopardy to our neighborhood.

Also, we are deeply concerned about the traffic impact on Villa and surrounding streets from the additional vehicles who will be a part of this project. The current Villa traffic flow will soon be significantly negatively impacted by the already approved Sierra extension which will dump high traffic volume onto an already crowded and dangerous road.

Thank you for your consideration and voting NO to approving this proposal.

Paul & Laura Kaump
10 Summerbrooke Circle
Napa, CA. 94558
707-637-4221
Erin Morris

From: William McGuire [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2019 11:14 AM
To: Erin Morris
Subject: Heritage House Project
Attachments: Rebuttal to 12-5-19 Planning Commission.docx

Warning:
The sender of this message could not be fully validated. The message may not be from the sender/domain displayed.

[EXTERNAL]

Erin,

Attached you will find a list of my concerns with the Staff report on the Gasser Foundation’s plans for the Heritage House. I think the Staff report is very deficient in many ways and numerous items need to be addressed and corrected before the Planning Commission considers sending any recommendations to the City Council to proceed with this project as described.

Thank you for distributing this to the members of the Planning Commission before the special meeting on Thursday, December 5.

Sincerely,

Bill McGuire
2125 Ranch Court
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT - DECEMBER 5, 2019

Questions and Comments on various sections of the report

William J. McGuire
2125 Ranch Court
Napa

Page 3:

- Right-of-Way Abandonment: As part of a separate action to be considered by the City Council, the Applicant has requested the City to abandon a 0.39-acre City owned public right-of-way, located at the terminus of Valle Verde Drive.
  According to City of Napa records, up to 22 vehicles use that section to park on a regular bases – where will they go?

Page 4:

The project site is adjacent to Salvador Creek. A portion of the existing pavement at the rear of the proposed Heritage House site is experiencing erosion. In order to address the erosion, without impacting the Salvador Creek riparian corridor, the Project proposes to insert a stitch wall (metal plates) below surface in two segments within the existing drive aisle of the Heritage House site. One segment would be 85-feet long and the second segment would be 100-feet long. This stitch wall will stabilize the existing pavement area behind the Heritage House by stopping the erosion along the drive aisle.
  Both a licensed hydrologist and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife recommended that the creek bank be terraced back towards the Heritage Building. As the natural creek bank continues to erode, will the stitch wall eventually become the creek bank?

Onsite support programs will be provided for the 33 supportive units in Heritage House.
  Given the allowance that two persons could share each unit, that number could increase significantly.

Page 5:

Staff will be onsite 24/7 and the front counter will be staffed at all times during the transition period, which will be at least a year in length.
  Only the manager and a desk clerk will be on duty 24/7. The supportive staff will only be on duty 9 until 5 five days a week. What happens after the transition period? Who will be monitoring the NPLH tenants when they go out into the neighborhood?

Page 6:

Under the Act, a city may only disapprove or condition approval of an affordable housing development in a manner that renders the development infeasible, for one of the following reasons:
3. The Project would cause "a significant quantifiable, direct and unavoidable impact" on public health or safety, based on objective identified written public health or safety standards, policies or conditions, as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low income households.

There is one way to satisfactorily mitigate the potential adverse effects of the NPLH tenants – do not utilize this building for housing chronically homeless individuals with serious mental issues.

Page 7:

One of the fundamental goals of the Land Use Element is "to preserve and enhance the residential character of existing neighborhoods"

By no stretch of the imagination does this proposal (the NPLH part) enhance the residential character to our neighborhood.

*LU-4.1 The City shall encourage the development of housing for the elderly, disabled, and low-income households*

We have no issues with any of these segments of our population.

Page 9-10:

The Zoning Code normally requires one parking space per sleeping room for SRO residential units. Therefore, Heritage House would normally require 66 parking spaces. However, because this is a 100 percent affordable project, the Applicants have indicated that vehicle ownership will be very low.

With the allowance that more than one person may occupy each SRO unit, should that be factored into the parking space requirements?

Recognizing this, the Planning Commission has the authority to reduce the parking requirement to 0.5 spaces per unit when:

a. Development is within ¼ mile of a food market and regularly scheduled public transit stop;

The nearest food markets are well beyond ¼ mile of the Heritage House. Both Nob Hill and Lucky Markets are 6/10 a mile away – at least a 15-minute walk in the rain or heat each way.

While the Project is slightly over the ¼ mile requirement, the site is within 1,560 feet of services, and the Applicant is requesting a concession pursuant to State Density Bonus law to allow a slightly greater distance.

The Project is over twice as far away as the ¼ mile requirement!

As a result, the following is proposed:

(66) SRO units @ 0.50 spaces per unit = 33 spaces

This does not account for the fact that each SRO unit could house 2 people.

TOTAL REQUIRED (Heritage House and Valle Verde) = 77 spaces
TOTAL PROVIDED = 79 spaces
The parking layout plan prepared for the Project provides a total of 79 uncovered parking spaces which exceeds the minimum requirement by two spaces.

Once again, this does not account for each of the 66 SRO units supporting more than one tenant.

Roughly 22 on-street parking spaces would be removed with the abandonment of a portion of Valle Verde Drive.

What provision is being made to accommodate the vehicles that currently utilize the 22 on-site parking spaces?

Page 11:

the Applicant is required to improve the sidewalk to an eight-foot multi-use trail to provide ongoing connection past the project site

Several mature oak trees would need to be removed to accommodate the new trail. Mitigation is identified in the EIR/EA consistent with the requirements in the BRSP including 5:1 tree replacement.

The removal of mature oak trees along the west edge of the existing path will eliminate the screening the visually hides the 3-story apartment building.

G. RIPARIAN SETBACK
The Project site is located directly adjacent to the Salvador Channel. The proposed new construction portion of the project (Valle Verde Apartments) incorporates a 50-foot riparian setback from the top of bank of Salvador Creek, the location of which was determined in a field consultation by project engineers with a representative of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in November 2018.

According to documents submitted by the CDFW in the DEIR, their recommendation is that the western bank of the Salvador Creek Channel be terraced towards the west as did the hydrologist we hired to survey the Salvador Creek Channel.

Page 12:

As a condition of approval, the Applicant would be required to remove a portion of the Zerba Bridge (deck, piers, and western abutment).

In addition to the western abutment, the eastern abutment is unstable and will have to be addressed. The mature oak trees on the eastern bank will become vulnerable to erosion damage with the removal of the eastern abutment and retaining wall. This will need to be coordinated with the property owner on the eastern side of the creek.

Page 79 of the Draft EIR/EA identified a moderate potential for Steelhead fish (salmon) in Salvador Creek. If bridge removal occurs, work within the stream channel would require mitigation (MM BIO-2.1 and MM BIO-1-3, MM BIO-4.1) including coordination with applicable regulatory agencies for permits, to ensure that impacts to fish are avoided including debris containment and minimizing work within the channel, and requirements to minimize light intrusion into the riparian corridor.

River otters also live in Salvador Creek.

Page 15:
Heritage House has an interior landscaped courtyard that would be retained and enhanced with new landscaping and amenities for residents (e.g., benches, tables, lighting) inside of the former Sunrise building. These landscaped areas add livability and value to the proposed development. Further, benches will be placed on the southeast end of the project site adjacent to the riparian corridor.

To suggest that the limited interior open space will be sufficiently spacious to accommodate the minimum of 66 residents is not realistic. The tenants will have to find open space outside of the boundaries of the project.

Private open space is not proposed as part of the project.

There is no open space available.

Page 17:

the Applicant invited community members, elected officials, and others to tour existing supportive housing communities in Fremont. Main Street Village Apartments in Fremont is the home of 110 adults and children, including 67 who had been homeless. It was funded by a predecessor program to the No Place Like Home Program, and therefore, is very similar to the proposed Project.

There is no program similar to the NPLH program which requires that the tenants have pre-existing serious mental issues. There are no other state programs that don't allow the serious mentally challenged tenants to accept treatment nor be tested for alcohol or drug use. Also, it was noted that the Fremont facility is not in the middle of a residential neighborhood.

The Heritage House project will be funded in part by the No Place Like Home Program (NPLH).

Page 18:

Key features of the program include:

• Funding for permanent supportive housing must utilize low barrier tenant selection practices that prioritize vulnerable populations and offer flexible, voluntary, and individualized supportive services.

These are precisely our concerns—low barrier tenant selection practices and voluntary supportive services.

The City received 430 comment letters on the Draft EIR/EA.

Although they were mostly form letters, they were almost exclusively negative.

As indicated in the Final EIR/EA Master Response to Comments 4, these types of social issues, while certainly worthy of consideration in the project approval process, are not cognizable as "environmental" impacts under CEQA.

The Planning Commission should, in its planning, account for the impact of any project on the safety and well-being of those to be affected by a significant change to the character of the neighborhood.

A Final EIR/EA has been prepared which responded to the comments submitted and included minor text changes and updated hydrological and biological information.
Obviously given the strong opposition to the NPLH portion of this project, the Planning Commission is not responsive to the concerns of the people who will be affected by this project.

CEQA also requires that, if an EIR has identified potential significant environmental impacts from the project, the lead agency must make certain findings relating to those potential impacts.

A potential (and probable) significant environmental impact has been identified which will adversely affect the Salvador Creek channel as the western bank continues to erode and undercut the asphalt area behind the Heritage Building which, as our hydrologist report concludes, will collapse into the creek channel.

Page 21:

The Project's EIR/EA determined that the Project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise and Transportation and Circulation, which would be significant without the implementation of mitigation measures, but would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

We do not believe that the issues of removal of mature oak and other trees, covering more of the property with buildings and pavement, and bringing a substantial population to the edge of Salvador Creek and its endangered fish population has been mitigated to less than significant.
From: Rosemarie Vertullo
Date: 12/3/2019
To: arthurroosa@symedcorporation.com, gh@gordonhuether.com, paul@paulkeleyarchitecture.com, mikenavig@me.com, reedonate@hotmail.com
Subject: Heritage House Valle Verde Project

Dear Planning Commission Members,

I am speaking for myself and the members of the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association who are in opposition of the Heritage House Valle Verde Project as it is currently being presented to the Planning Commission.

We have submitted over 400 letters to the planning commission in opposition to this project as well.

In addition, I am sending you all the statements and photos/videos that I have presented to the City Council at several of their meetings.

Please take this opposition into consideration when voting on this project.

Thank you,

Rosemarie Vertullo, Chair
Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 3034
Napa, CA 94558
I'm a resident of city of Napa and I want to speak with you about the proposed Heritage House and Valle Verde Housing Project.

Here are some of the concerns of mine and I also speak on behalf of many of my many neighbors in my community:

Traffic on Villa Lane, Valle Verde, and Firefly will be immensely increased and this will pose a safety risk to the following people:

- Children who live in the housing development across the street
- Elderly who live at senior living facilities like the Springs who often walk on Villa, Valle Verde, and Firefly
- Children who walk to and from Vintage High School
- Joggers, runners, and bicyclists on these streets
- The jogging path that exits onto Valle Verde will be blocked by the parking spaces at the end of the street. Many joggers, runners, and bicyclists exit on Valley Verde to Trancas to meet up with the Trancas Crossing River Path. How will this be handled?

Parking on Firefly and Valle Verde is already crowded and this project will add to more crowding.

Has the City Council and Gasser measured the impact to other proposed projects in this area?

- Proposed 67 homes that will be built on the Vintage Farm property
- Garfield Park Project
- Sierra Avenue Extension through to Villa Lane making the dead-end at Villa Lane non-existent and creating more traffic on Villa Lane

Although there will be some services offered on premises, the residents at Heritage House will not be close to social services offices or other services that they will require and which are located in downtown Napa. Accessing these services by car or other transportation will add to the already congested streets in this part of Napa.

We agree that there is a need to serve this population. However, the project, in the middle of a residential community and the mix of 24 affordable housing units for families mixed in with 66 units that will house recovering alcohol and/or substance abusers seems to be unfair to families with children to be subject to living with people who are in need of psychological counseling for alcohol and substance abuse. This along with the fact that there are families in the Affordable Housing development directly across the street does not give these residents and children the safety and environment that they should have.

At the August 20, 2018 meeting, the presenters stated that there would be a traffic study. It was stated that the study would look at traffic at peak morning and evening hours. This will NOT be a sufficient or accurate view of current traffic problems and congestion. There is considerable traffic on Villa, Valle Verde, Firefly, as well as
Trancas Street **ALL DAY LONG** since a huge proportion of the medical community has offices in this area. A traffic study needs to be conducted during **ALL** business hours of the weekdays. To date we have not seen the results of this study and request that this be submitted.

There are two suggestions for the use of this property that we urge the Gasser Foundation and the City Council to consider:

**Assisted-living housing for low-income seniors.** If this property is utilized for this group, there will be less of an impact on traffic, safety, etc. since many of the seniors will not have automobiles nor are they recovering alcohol and/or substance abuse. They will have minimal need of social services that are located downtown. Has the Gasser Foundation considered utilizing this property for this group of people?

**Playground and/or park.** It would be a great source for the children who live in the Affordable Housing Project that is across the street as well. Has the Gasser Foundation considered utilizing this property for this?

I wrote to the city council and the mayor about this on May 25 and received a response from Ms. Luros and Mr. Sedgley so thank you very much for your response. We would appreciate your addressing these issues when considering the proposed Heritage House and Valle Verde Housing Project. Thank you and we await your responses.
August 6, 2019
Public Comment to Napa City Council

I am Rosemarie Vertullo and I am a resident of 103 Summerbrooke Circle here in Napa. We are speaking for myself, Earle Craigie who is also a resident of 103 Summerbrooke Circle as well as others in my neighborhood.

First I want to say that we support projects such as the Heritage House/Valle Verde Project. What we do not support is the location of this project. Additionally some of the requirements or lack thereof for the residents of this projects are not optimal.

This facility is going to be a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents."

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the "No Place Like Home Grant Program," THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE, NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY. This situation sets up the residents of this facility for failure.

There are many elderly who reside in this area and children who walk to school every day in this area. There is concern that our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.

Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with 66 assisted single-occupancy living units for residents with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs.

We are also very concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem and traffic congestion in an already traffic-congested area.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as homeless seniors, low-income seniors, or young adults graduating from the foster care program.

The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Thank you,

Rosemarie Vertullo & Earle Craigie
103 Summerbrooke Circle
Napa CA 94558
August 15, 2019
Public Comment to Napa City Planning Committee

I am Rosemarie Vertullo and I am a resident of 103 Summerbrooke Circle in Napa and Chairperson of the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association. I am speaking on behalf of our neighborhood association and myself.

I want to stress that we support our community in caring for the homeless with projects such as Heritage House/Valle Verde Project and we support the 24 extra low-income apartments that are part of this project.

I also want to stress that it is equally important and a responsibility of our city leaders and city government to assure protection from harm to residents, families, children and businesses in this neighborhood. For this and many reasons, we do not support the location of this project. Additionally some of the requirements or lack thereof for the residents of this project are not optimal.

According to the requirements of "No Place Like Home," this facility is going to be a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents." While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the grant program, there is no requirement that these services be provided on site or for residents to participate. Nor can access to or continued occupancy be conditioned on a resident's sobriety. This situation sets up the residents of this facility for failure.

I read and listened to the news this week and was horrified about the incident in San Francisco of a woman who was accosted by an assailant outside her residence. The residence is right next door to the proposed Navigation Center. The suspect was released on "assertive case management" and was free to go. There was no mention of the future safety of the woman who was attacked.

What guarantee do we have of protection when there is minimal security in the Heritage House Project? How does someone call 911 while being attacked? What guarantee do we have that suspects will not be released like the suspect in San Francisco?

There are many elderly who reside in this area, children who walk to Vintage High School every day, Little Leaguers who play in nearby baseball fields. There is concern that they will no longer be able to safely access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrates that these concerns are not unfounded.

Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families, which we support, mixed in with 66 assisted single-occupancy living units for residents with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who have no requirement to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs.
We are also very concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem and traffic congestion in an already traffic-congested area.

Our Napa community is in need of housing for low-income seniors, low-income families, farm workers, transition housing for foster children as well as playgrounds and parks for the many children who live and visit this area. Has the city or Gasser Foundation considered utilizing this property for any of these groups?

The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Thank you,

Rosemarie Vertullo
Chairperson, Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association, Napa CA
Residence: 103 Summerbrooke Circle
Napa CA 94558
August 20, 2019
Public Comment to Napa City Council

I am Rosemarie Vertullo and I am a resident of 103 Summerbrooke Circle in Napa and Chairperson of the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association. I am speaking on behalf of our neighborhood association and myself.

I addressed the city council at the last meeting. I also addressed the Planning Commission Draft EIR Meeting for Valle Verde and Heritage House Project along with many other residents of our neighborhood and want to express more concerns to the City Council as well.

I want to stress that we support our community in caring for the homeless with projects such as Heritage House/Valle Verde Project and we support the 24 extra low-income apartments that are part of this project.

I also want to stress that it is equally important and a responsibility of our city leaders and city government to assure protection from harm to residents, families, children and businesses in this neighborhood. For this and many reasons, we do not support the location of this project. Additionally some of the requirements or lack thereof for the residents of this project are not optimal.

According to the requirements of "No Place Like Home" which you are all aware of, this facility is going to be a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents." Supportive services are required to be provided by the grant program. However, there is no requirement that these services be provided on site or for residents to participate. Residents cannot be evicted if they don't remain sober or drug free. This situation sets up the residents of this facility for failure.

I read and listened to the news last week and was horrified about the incident in San Francisco of a woman who was accosted by an assailant outside her residence. The residence is right next door to the proposed Navigation Center. The suspect was released on "assertive case management" and was free to go. There was no mention of the future safety of the woman who was attacked.

What guarantee do we have of protection when there is minimal security in the Heritage House Project? How does someone call 911 while being attacked? What guarantee do we have that suspects will not be released like the suspect in San Francisco?

There are many elderly who reside in this area, children who walk to Vintage High School every day, Little Leaguers who play in nearby baseball fields to name a few. There is concern that they will no longer be able to safely access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrates that these concerns are not unfounded.

Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families, which we support, mixed in with 66 assisted single-occupancy living units for residents with serious
mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who have no requirement to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs.

We are also very concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem and traffic congestion in an already traffic-congested area. The traffic study that was part of the EIR is seriously flawed. The study was done during peak AM and PM hours and done during Memorial Day holiday weekend on May 23 the Thursday before Memorial Day and May 27, which is the actual Memorial Day Holiday. Additionally, there is traffic on Valle Verde and Villa Lane all day long during weekdays because of the number of doctors’ offices where patients are coming and going. There was mention that cars can park on Firefly Lane. Anyone can see that Firefly Lane is already greatly congested during the day, evening, and weekends.

Our Napa community is in need of housing for low-income seniors, low-income families, farm workers, transition housing for foster children as well as playgrounds and parks for the many children who live and visit this area. Has the Napa City or Gasser Foundation considered utilizing this property for any of these groups? This location would be more ideal for any of these populations.

The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Thank you,

Rosemarie Vertullo
Chairperson, Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association, Napa CA
Residence: 103 Summerbrooke Circle
Napa CA 94558
September 3, 2019
City Council Meeting
Input by Rosemarie Vertullo
Rosemarie Vertullo, Chair
Residence: 103 Summerbrooke Circle, Napa
Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association

Addressing Flooding Issues in the Draft EIR. This was all sent to the Planning Commission but want the City council to be aware of this as well

- Flooding – It was said water and flood plain only goes up a foot. It can go higher during the rainy season. When was study done? If done in the summer or after the rainy season, there is a flaw in this study. What does the city plan to do about flooding of the surrounding area as a result of the cumulative effects of development?
- How will the elevation of the West side of Salvador Creek affect those who live on the East side or those downstream of this site?
- Zerba bridge deck removal puts piers and retaining wall stability on the east shore of Salvador creek at risk of collapse into the creek. What does the city plan to do to deal with this situation?

I have videos and photos of overflow of Salvador Creek taken during rainy season and not flood years.
Napa City Council Meeting
Tuesday September 16, 2019

Heritage House Valle Verde Project

I would like to address the issues of flooding and show some photos and video of
flooding of Salvador Creek during the time of year when we have rain.

The addition of another building so close to the creek is of concern to the people
who live in this area. It seems that it would add to more stress on Salvador Creek
and this has to be looked into during the time of year when Napa has heavy
rains.

The photos and videos were taken at three different times and different years:

01-2019
01-2017
12-2014

Photos and videos were given to the City Clerk yesterday.

I have photos attached and lead image of each video.

Thank you,

Rosemarie Vertullo, Chair
Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 3034
Napa, CA 94558
12-2014 Summerbrooke Circle

Footpath Flooded
01-2019 Area around Summerbrooke and Sunrise Property Flooded
Concerns are:
- Family safety
- Environmental impacts regarding litter and noise
- Parking
- Acute psychiatric issues
- Security
- Traffic issues on Valle Verde and Villa Lane

We have these concerns since the population that is served by the No Place Like Home Program are the following:
- Persons with serious mental illness including symptoms of violence or psychosis
- Persons at risk of requiring acute psychiatric inpatient care
- No restrictions
- No supervision off premises
- Residents cannot be evicted if they refuse treatment
- Residents cannot be evicted if they don’t maintain sobriety
- Residents can refuse drug testing

This makes for a potentially unsafe environment both for the residents of the low-income family housing in Valle Verde Apartments, which is on the same grounds as Heritage House as well as the neighboring communities.

This project will also add to the already dense housing that exists in the neighborhood and there will be an area the impact on traffic, parking, litter, noise.

Abode/Burbank Housing mailed correspondence that contained misleading information.

The letter stated that they held several neighborhood meetings to listen to questions about Heritage House when in fact there was only one meeting and this meeting took place before NPLH grant funds were received.

The letter stated, “Only eligible applicants identified through the county’s screening process as capable of living independently are offered the opportunity to live at Heritage House.” NPLH guidelines differ – “it states that all persons must have a serious mental illness and in need of mental health services. “

The letter also stated that last years Point in Time (PIT) count of the number of homeless individuals in Napa is 151. The number of low income/Section 8 individuals on waiting lists for housing is over 1,200 and the waiting lists are closed. There are more individuals waiting to get on waiting lists. It would seem that there is more of a need to serve this population rather than the homeless population.
11/5/19
Public Comment to Napa City Council
Rosemarie Vertullo
103 Summerbrooke Circle

Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association Chairperson
P.O. Box 3034
Napa CA 94558

I am speaking for myself and as the chairperson representing the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association. I along with over 50 concerned residents of Napa, attended the community meeting on October 21 regarding the Valle Verde and Heritage House Continuum Housing Project PL 17-0114. We were very disappointed and perplexed as to why no one from the Mayor’s office or any member of the city council attended this very important meeting. Have you made your decisions already?

I want to stress that we support our community in caring for the homeless and low-income people. I also want to stress that it is equally important and a responsibility for you, as our city leaders and government, to assure protection from harm to residents, families, children and businesses in this neighborhood. For this and many reasons, we do not support the location of this project.

Many people voiced their objection and concerns about this project and asked many questions that were not addressed. We need answers to the following:

1. What are the qualifications of the onsite full-time manager? Will this person have credentials of a behavioral health professional or any credentials at all?
2. Has the city received funding for the 24 Valle Verde affordable housing apartments? If not, what will the city do with this part of the project.
3. What are the exact mental health services available at Heritage House for residents who qualify for the No Place Like Home Program? How often will these services be available?
4. Why was the community not informed that the 33 SRO units could house more than one person per unit? The first we heard of this was at the October 21 meeting.
5. The Final EIR will be prepared including response to comments by November 21. Does the community have any opportunity to question or comment on this final document?
6. The tour of the Fremont Facility was held today. However, this facility does not have No Place Like Home residents. It is also in a commercial area not in a residential area. Why is this facility being used as a comparison when there are many blatant differences?

Additional questions are:

1. Why was the Sunrise location chosen? There are other locations in the city that would be more conducive to this housing project and that would be closer to services that the residents need.
2. Is the city council and planning commission aware that drug and alcohol rehabilitation services offered by Ole Health are referred to the county? These services are at Napa Valley Corporate Drive which is a 45-minute bus ride with 12 stops.
3. One of the stipulations of NPLH is that the residents can refuse treatment. These services will be critical to the success of residents and the travel time and location will create a barrier.

Many others and I have spoken at the city council meetings and at the community meetings. We have had these and many other questions that go unanswered. We, as taxpayers and residents of Napa, deserve answers. Thank you.
11/19/19
Public Comment to Napa City Council
Rosemarie Vertullo
103 Summerbrooke Circle

Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association Chairperson
P.O. Box 3034
Napa CA 94558

I am speaking for myself as well as a representative of the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association. We want to emphasize that we are not against the Sunrise property being used for low-income housing, Section 8 housing, or workforce housing. Our objections are that we do not see this location as beneficial to the tenants of the No Place Like Home Program nor to the safety and security of the surrounding neighborhood.

We do recognize and we stress that we support our community in caring for the homeless. It is equally important and a responsibility for you, as our city leaders and government, to assure protection from harm to residents, families, children and businesses in this neighborhood. It is also your responsibility to enter into programs for homeless people that are set up for success. For these reasons, we do not support the location of this project for tenants eligible for the No Place Like Home Program.

This is a new program that has not been in existence for very long. It has never been implemented in Napa either.
- One of our questions is what evidence do you have that it is going to be successful?
- Why was this location chosen when it is not convenient to the needed services of the tenants of the No Place Like Home Program?

Some of our neighbors have toured the Fremont Facility and you have suggested that this facility be used as a comparison. The Fremont apartments are funded by Mental Health Services Act and NOT No Place Like Home. These are two different programs. The comparison of the Fremont apartments with the proposed Heritage House is not a true comparison.

The Fremont apartment complexes are very new modern buildings that are centrally located near 2 bus stops, Fremont BART station with a new station in Fremont soon to open, ample sidewalks, bike lanes, many nearby shopping strip malls, fast food, etc. This is not the case for the location of the proposed Heritage House. Again, we want residents to be set up for success and the Sunrise location does not have these conveniences.
- How will the participants be set up for success - specifically regarding ease of access and transportation to mental health, drug, and alcohol support services?
- We understand that these Fremont sites have Resident Service Coordinators. Is the same as the on-site manager that is proposed for Heritage House?
- What is offered for Heritage and what is excluded?
Regarding tenant selection in Fremont, Abode does not do the tenant selection, MidPen does the selection and “the most stringent” rules apply in this selection.

- First, what does “most stringent” actually mean?
- Second, it is our understanding that the No Place Like Home rules are the rules that apply to these tenants which states that tenants must be severely mentally ill. How are you going to manage this?
- Tenants do not have to maintain sobriety or be drug free and they can refuse treatment and still not be evicted for these reasons. This makes for a potentially unsafe environment for the surrounding neighborhood which has a dense population including families with young children as well as elderly persons. How do we as residents of the surrounding neighborhood manage this?
- What is the City of Napa going to do to assure us of safety?
Good afternoon council members,

My name is Lisa Reifers and this is my mom, Sally Tiedemann. We live at 3475 Valle Verde Drive.

We are here today to share our feelings about the Heritage House/Valle Verde Project.

But first, we chose to live in North Napa because of the culture in our neighborhood. There are many adult and retirement communities in this corner of the city. There is the ‘Bel Air Village’, ‘The Springs’ on Villa Lane and ‘The Reserve’ on Trancas St., just to name a couple. When you drive through our neighborhoods there are always people walking their dogs or with each other, kids going to and from school, people just strolling about. It is a nice safe neighborhood.

Our concern is not with the Heritage House/Valle Verde project itself.... But, rather with the location. Our neighborhood is not equipped to service the needs of the residents who will permanently reside there.

The No Place Like Home guide lines clearly state that “all persons must have a serious mental illness and be in need of mental health services.” The nearest Clinic Ole is 2-3 blocks away and does not offer mental health services. The guidelines also say that mental health services be provided by the NPLH grant program, but there is NO requirement that these services be provided on site OR that the residents have to participate. IF, the residents chose to participate, they would have to travel down town to seek therapy, counseling, meetings, ect...

NPLH, also may not discriminate against sobriety or drug use. People who suffer from addiction need programs readily available to them to help control their decease. From what I’ve read about NPLH, it sounds more like ENABLING than helping.
When you combine mental health issues with drug and alcohol abuse, I wonder how safe our elderly and children will be, outside their own homes? I mention them first because they will be the most at risk and vulnerable!

There are numerous Doctor Offices on Valle Verde that dispense medications, making them a target for theft that wasn’t there before. The patients may not feel so safe anymore either, coming and going to appointments.

I’m also concerned about drug paraphernalia, needles, syringes, ect. That could be introduced to our environment, causing health concerns.

We, as a family, want to contribute to our homeless community needs, perhaps a Low-Income Senior Housing Program would fit in better at this location.

Thank you for your time,

Lisa and Sally

FYI, I read on line at https://www.dsh.ca.gov>Napa
How the State Hospital has developed a partnership with various community based organizations and currently leases several buildings to support community and mental health services on the grounds.
Hi Rosemarie –

The document written by the Corporation for Supportive Housing which you attached to your earlier e-mail discusses the relationship between Housing First principles and other specific laws that may restrict occupancy to subsidized housing. What restrictions apply will depend on the particular funds that a housing development is receiving. Regardless, the NPLH Guidelines do require compliance with the restrictions imposed by all other federal or state funding sources of a housing development.
Heritage House will be receiving federal funds for rental assistance from the Housing Authority of the City of Napa. I have reviewed the Housing Authority’s Administrative Plan, and in accordance with federal requirements, the project can restrict occupancy to individuals based on their past criminal history if such history poses a threat to health and safety or the rights of others as tenants or neighbors of the property. One example of this is the ban on the receipt of Section 8 rental assistance by persons who are registered sex offenders.

In other instances where past criminal or other behavior affecting a person’s ability to be successful in housing may be an issue, federal and state laws also require that the project have a process in place to consider requests for reasonable accommodations on the basis of a person’s mental health or other physical disability so that a person can access housing or remain in housing in a manner that will continue to protect the health and safety of others and the peaceful enjoyment of housing.

I do not have any concerns with Heritage House being able to operate consistent with federal law and NPLH requirements.

Christina DiFrancesco, Specialist
916-263-0415

On Wed, Dec 4, 2019 at 3:07 PM Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com> wrote:
Thanks for the clarification.

Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 4, 2019, at 2:51 PM, cass walker <casswalkerco@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Mike

The Management Plan will be in place for the entire life of the project; it was review by City Staff and the Police Department who provided input. Exhibit 5 to the Staff report is the Management Plan - Exhibit F the Management Plan is the resident selection
process and criteria. First we will get residents referred through the County of Napa’s Coordinated Entry System (CES). They will be vetted by CES to determine the best housing opportunity for them - just need a few months rent (rapid re-housing), diversion to a treatment program or medical care at the Queen, or shelter and then supportive housing. Once in CES they will also be assisted to get whatever resources/benefits apply whether it is Veterans benefits, social security, disability, etc. If determined they fit Heritage House by the CES, residents will be sent to Burbank to fill out an application. Burbank will screen them. This is where it gets a little confusing because there are 11 different funding sources - some are in place like No Place Like Home - three others we will be applying for: Tax credits, Multi-Family Housing Program, and the Housing Authority Project Based Vouchers. Each has a similar but some overlapping tenant selection criteria. The PBV have the most stringent which are no registered sex offenders, no one convicted of recent violent or drug-related crimes. We anticipate getting PBV as both Stoddard West and Valley View received them. Lark can answer any questions you have on that. We would apply for them if City Council approves the project.

I will forward a letter from HCD related to our project process that may be helpful. Molly will be at the meeting to talk about CES as well.

We set up the Security Plan so that it would be reviewed after six months with the City, then again at 1 year, and then every year thereafter. The "transition period" was meant to reflect this "start-up period" when we will adjust the security plan as needed with input from the City and Police Department. It was not meant that security would be in place for only a short period of time, but there would be a commitment to look at the security on a regular basis as we start-up operations.

I hope this is helpful.

Cass

On Wed, Dec 4, 2019 at 2:26 PM Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com> wrote:
Cass, thank you for the additional info. My key area of focus is the management agreement, eligibility requirements and intake process. I would like to know how individuals are chosen and who makes that decision. Also, an explanation on why the security plans seems to exist for a transition period versus permanently. I might have more tonight but you can respond during the public hearing on this areas.

Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 4, 2019, at 1:42 PM, cass walker <casswalkerco@gmail.com> wrote:
Mike

I am reaching out to you to see if you have any last minute questions. I know you have received a lot of information to absorb, as well as materials this week. I do not want to interrupt your review. Based on your previous questions here some responses.

Below you will find a link to a "almost final" 3D model fly over. Beth and Erin have decided we can show this on a loop at the back of the chambers, but want us to keep our presentations short.

Please download the latest video demo through the following Dropbox link:

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/zptu7x1vr6lsbun/AAAJrW_t5fTGeo9Rj-z7SK4da?dl=0

I hope the full size plan set have been able to answer you question on project details including: railings, colors and materials.

A quick response to some of your other questions which will be covered in the meeting.
1) Parking permits will be assigned. ADA spaces are available for residents and can be assigned a permit. Guests spaces are open for visitors.
2) Depending on resident needs we will use a variety of transit options from those available from NVTA - paratransit, taxi script, shared van we have access to, bus and other individualized needs if they come up.
3) We will be presenting some of statistics from the County's last January Point in Time count. I have attached the full report.
4) I believe you have a full copy of the Management Plan and Erin has constructed the COA for regular review of it.

We are committed to building and operating a project everyone is proud of and is a good neighbor. If I can provide any additional information prior to the meeting, please let me know.

Cass

--

Cassandra Walker
Mobile: 707 889 6222
Email: casswallercco@gmail.com
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Dina Greenberg
19 Glen Ct, 19 Glen Ct
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Janice Houglan <Janice.Houglan.259125790@p2a.co>
Date: December 3, 2019 at 9:53:40 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Janice Houglan
3000 Rohlfis Way #202, Napa
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joanne o'callaghan <joanne.o'callaghan.259274344@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 11:26:53 AM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To:

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Joanne o'callaghan
2550 Merced St
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Randi Storm <Randi.Storm.259225131@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 10:32:25 AM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: [Redacted]

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Randi Storm
3685 Montana Drive
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marilyn Knight-Mendelson <Marilyn.KnightMendelson.259213710@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 10:11:01 AM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Marilyn Knight-Mendelson
2995 Silverado Trail
Napa, CA 94558
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular
Mikem_nvig@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rebecca King <Rebecca.King.259202316@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 9:52:32 AM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Rebecca King
1600 Sierra Ave
Napa, CA 94558
From: Michael Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2019 11:57 AM
To: Patricia Baring
Subject: Fwd: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

[EXTERNAL]

Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
(707) 656-9223 home/cellular
MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from iCloud

Begin forwarded message:

From: Diane Slade <Diane.Slade.259195135@p2a.co>
Date: 12/4/2019
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Diane Slade
15 Belvedere Ct.
Napa, CA 94559
From: Rev Powers <Rev.Powers.259330864@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 1:24:18 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Rev Powers
1050 Tamarisk Dr
Napa, CA 94559
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Leslie Chamberlin
5 Hennessy Dr
Napa, CA 94559
Thanks,
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group, LLC
707 656-9223 home/cellular

MikeM_NVIG@me.com
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Keith Calara <Keith.Calara.259337650@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 1:46:13 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Keith Calara
1040 Shetler Ave
Napa, CA 94559
From: Patricia Davis <Patricia.Davis.259344157@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 2:13:32 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Reply-To: murray@californiahousing.org

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Patricia Davis
210 Daphne Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Deborah Stevens <Deborah.Stevens.259464398@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 8:20:07 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.

Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Deborah Stevens
4493 Tanglewood Way
Napa, CA 94558
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Pablo Zatarain <Pablo.Zatarain.259458944@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 7:51:35 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Pablo Zatarain
1804 Soscol Ave, Ste 203
Napa, CA 94559
From: Janice Geren <Janice.Geren.259425616@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 5:44:54 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Janice Geren
1631 Georgia St Napa
Napa, CA 94559
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Noel Robinson <Noel.Robinson.259416175@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 5:29:29 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As a family member of a loved with mental illness - I see the need for solutions to supporting and housing the vulnerable and challenged residents of our community. I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents. It is a well-thought-out plan that deserves approval.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Noel Robinson
364 Minahen St
Napa, CA 94559
From: Michael Robak <Michael.Robak.259407652@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 4:51:42 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Michael Robak
1011 Woodlawn Dr
Napa, CA 94558
From: "Olivia Andersen" <Olivia.Andersen.259470238@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 8:58:53 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Olivia Andersen
1511 King Ave
Napa, CA 94559
Michael Murray
Napa Valley Investment Group
707 656-9223

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sharon Lavender <Sharon.Lavender.259473523@p2a.co>
Date: December 4, 2019 at 9:28:02 PM PST
To: Mike Murray <mikem_nvig@me.com>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.

Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Sharon Lavender
1033 Petra Dr
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Juliane Poirier
1507 King Ave
Napa, CA 94559

Begin forwarded message:
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

From: Krystal lelea <Krystal.lelea.258940697@p2a.co>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Date: December 3, 2019 at 7:30:26 AM PST
To: Beth Painter <beth@bnpapa.com>

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Krystal lelea
121 Banbury Way
American Canyon, CA 94503

Begin forwarded message:
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Begin forwarded message:

From: Barbara Thompson <Barbara.Thompson.259037716@p2a.co>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Date: December 3, 2019 at 2:20:23 PM PST
To: Beth Painter <beth@bpnapa.com>
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Barbara Thompson
733 Pueblo Ave
Napa, CA 94558.
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mary Stephenson <Mary.Stephenson.259033170@p2a.co>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Date: December 3, 2019 at 1:53:35 PM PST
To: Beth Painter <beth@bprnapa.com>
Reply-To: Mary.Stephenson.259033170@p2a.co

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project.
Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Mary Stephenson
2683 Chablis Ct
St. Helena, CA 94574.
Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Lauran Hawker
23 Summerbrooke Cir
Napa, CA 94558.
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!

From: Tanya Healy <Tanya.Healy.258940516@p2a.co>
Subject: Support Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing!
Date: December 3, 2019 at 7:29:43 AM PST
To: Beth Painter <beth@bpnapa.com>
Reply-To: 

Dear Napa City Council & Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. As an area resident, I strongly believe that finding solutions to homelessness and housing instability is a moral imperative. This project will provide 33 permanent supportive housing units with on-site supportive services and 57 affordable very low-income housing units for our most vulnerable residents.

Homelessness and inadequate housing are critical issues in Napa, and those concerns continue to grow each year. I believe everyone in our community deserves a safe place to call home and chance to live the healthiest life possible. We must work together to support these type of projects in our community that invest in affordable, permanent housing for those who would otherwise be living on the streets or in unstable housing conditions.

I strongly urge the City of Napa to approve the Heritage House-Valle Verde Housing project. Thank you for your support!

Regards,
Tanya Healy
127 Valley Oak Drive
Napa, CA 94558.
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system, and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, development mental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ON SITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCY BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, discarded drug paraphernalia (needles/syringes), increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods and the presence of registered sex offenders.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: L. DAVIDSON

Address: 38 Fountain Ave

Napa 94558
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation’s plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless, a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT’S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the "staff", we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

**We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program.** The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: Karl E. Biemiller, D.D.S.
Address: 3448 Villa Lane, Ste. 104
            Napa, CA 94558
August 8, 2019
Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the "staff", we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with 66 assisted living units for residents with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not have to suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location will negatively affect our quality of life.

**We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program.** The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: [Signature] Julie Hickman

Address: 3445 Hacker St.

Napa, CA 94558
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Bonnie Marshall

Name: Bonnie Marshall
Address: 1910 Trancas St., Apt 101
         Napa, CA 94558
August 8, 2019
Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE, NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: [Signature]
Address: 862 E. 1st Street
Napa, CA 94558 1984
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, Institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Valerie Walker
3589 Cascade St.
Napa, CA 94558-2422
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation’s plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current “uses” and would negatively impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder " or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE, NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT’S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the ‘staff’, we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: Ludovic x Keely DERVIN
Address: 38 Summerbrooke Creek
NAPA CA 94558
August 8, 2019
Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder " or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ON SITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE, NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCY BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: Jessica Valenzuela
Address: 31 Wild Rye Way
          Napa, CA 94558
August 8, 2019
Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I strongly oppose the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation’s plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negatively impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or " Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, there is no requirement that these services be provided on-site or for residents to participate. Nor can access to or continued occupancy be conditioned on a resident’s sobriety.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the staff, we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe for children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location would be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: Romas LaRue, Jeanne LaRue
Address: 3657 Parrett Ave
NAPA, CA 94558
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the staff, we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: Luis Rangel
Address: 48 Firefly Ln.
Ghiss Napa CA.
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation’s plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project’s inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE, NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCY BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT’S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with 66 assisted living units for residents with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not have to suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature:

Name: Strikerlben

Address: 3624 Shelter Creek Dr.

24574 A 94558
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing faculties, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, development center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

*We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program.* The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: Philip Gumm
Address: 4423 Tanglewood way
78200 94558
Ps. I vote!
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation’s plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current “uses” and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;

2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.

3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE, NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT’S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with 86 assisted living units for residents with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not have to suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location will negatively affect our quality of life.

**We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program.** The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: **Paula Tsepco**
Address: **350 A Shelter Creek Drive**
**NAPA, CA 94558**
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, development center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: David Gibson

Address: 220 Ranch Lane

Napa, CA 94558
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

[Signature]

Name: MARY ANN SEXTON

Address: 63 Fountain Grove Circle

NAPA, CA 94558
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder" or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do no currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program. The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

[Signature]

Name: Paul L. Kamps

Address: 10 Summer Breeze Cir

Napa, CA 94558
August 8, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Heritage House-City Project File No. PL17-0114

Dear Members of the Planning Commission

As a resident of the South East Vintage neighborhood, **STRONGLY OPPOSE** the plans of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Napa City Council and the Gasser Foundation's plans to convert the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living facility at the end of Valle Verde to become a residence for persons at high-risk of long term or intermittent homelessness as defined by the No Place Like Home Program. The basis for my opposition is that if approved, this project is inconsistent with current "uses" and would negative impact the quality of life for those who live and/or work in the area.

As you know this facility is intended to provide a permanent housing solution for adults or older adults with a "Serious Mental Disorder "or "Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children or Adolescents" who meet one or more of the criteria below.

1. Persons exiting institutionalized settings, such as jail or prison, hospitals, institutes of mental disease, nursing facilities, or long-term residential substance use disorder treatment, who were Homeless prior to admission to the institutional setting;
2. Transition-Age Youth experiencing homelessness or with significant barriers to housing stability, including, but not limited to, one or more evictions or episodes of homelessness, and a history of foster care or involvement with the juvenile justice system; and others as set forth below.
3. Persons, including Transition-Age Youth, who prior to entering into one of the facilities or types of institutional care listed herein had a history of being Homeless: a state hospital, hospital behavioral health unit, hospital emergency room, institute for mental disease, psychiatric health facility, mental health rehabilitation center, skilled nursing facility, developmental center, residential treatment program, residential care facility, community crisis center, board and care facility, prison, parole, jail or juvenile detention facility, or foster care.

While supportive services such as mental health care, crisis counseling, individual and/or group therapy are a required to be provided by the No Place Like Home Grant Program, **THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THESE SERVICES BE PROVIDED ONSITE OR FOR RESIDENTS TO PARTICIPATE. NOR CAN ACCESS TO OR CONTINUED OCCUPANCE BE CONDITIONED ON A RESIDENT'S SOBRIETY.**

Besides our concerns regarding confrontations with individuals suffering from chronic or acute psychiatric issues while they are outside the confines of the facility and the supervision of the 'staff', we are also concerned about incidents of public intoxication, public drug use, and discarded drug paraphernalia litter (needles/syringes) and increases in petty crimes in nearby neighborhoods.

Because of the aforementioned our elderly and children who will no longer be able to access and/or benefit from the use of the many walking paths and open spaces unique to our neighborhood. Review of Napa City Police Department crime statistics in the area around the South Napa Homeless Shelter demonstrate that these concerns are not unfounded.
Additionally, the mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families mixed in with residents in the "Heritage House" with serious mental health and substance abuse issues is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who will not be required to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs or may be registered sex offenders. We are also concerned about the negative impacts this intensified use will have on the Salvador Creek ecosystem.

The neighborhoods that comprise the South East Vintage area do not currently suffer from the problems associated with persons who are chronically homeless. By warehousing these people at this location it will negatively affect our quality of life.

**We believe that this location could be put to a better use such as supportive housing for homeless seniors or young adults graduating from the foster care program.** The Heritage House project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents of the project and problems in our area that currently do not exist.

Signature

Name: **Mountain**

Address: **47 Wild Cherry Way**

**24557**
December 5, 2019

Planning Commission of the City of Napa
c/o Erin Morris, Planning and Code Enforcement Division Manager
1600 First Street
Napa, California 94559

Re: Response to letter submitted by Gagen McCoy

Dear City of Napa Planning Commission:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Applicant for the Valle Verde & Heritage House Project in partial response to the letter of December 3, 2019 submitted by the law office of Gagen, McCoy on behalf of the unincorporated neighborhood association known as Neighborhood Coalition to Preserve Salvador Creek.

The Gagen, McCoy letter makes certain claims about the environmental impact of the Valle Verde/Heritage House Project – and specifically the stitch pier wall - on the Salvador Creek and Salvador Creek Channel.

We asked the Project’s civil engineer (Hugh Linn of RSA+ Civil) and geotechnical engineer (Daniel Caldwell of Miller Pacific Engineering Group) to review these claims. They reject the claims and assert that the stitch wall provides the optimum protection of existing infrastructure while minimizing future erosion and sediment into the channel. More specifically, in the professional opinion of Mr. Linn and Mr. Caldwell:

1. The wall will not encroach into the existing bed and bank of the Salvador Channel and therefore will not deflect the stream flow energy to other areas of the channel. See Section F-F from C4.1 of the Design Review Plans.

433 Soscol Avenue, Suite A120, Napa, California 94559
Phone (707) 255-1646   Fax (707) 255-4338
The stitch pile wall will be constructed in conjunction with a biodynamic stream bank project administered by the Napa County Flood Control District. In fact, without the project the existing bank condition will remain at risk of critical failure. This failure will jeopardize the existing driveway and the public sewer line that is located within the driveway. See exhibit below:

2. The proposed stitch pile wall is to be located entirely within what is now a pavement area. No work related to the stitch pier wall needs to encroach into the riparian area, and certainly not into the creek channel. Soil cuttings from the drilled piers, any water pumped from the pier excavations, and construction materials can all be staged and handled on the existing pavement areas. No soil, water, or other materials will be placed or released in the creek channel, and therefore no impacts to water quality in the creek will result. The creek channel will not be modified by the stitch pier wall construction, so no change in stream flow characteristics will result from the stitch pier wall construction (although the proposed concurrent bio-tech improvements to the channel may impact water flow).

3. The stitch pier wall has been positioned and designed so as to have no impact on the creek channel or riparian area. All work is to be done in the existing paved parking/driveway areas. The stitch pier wall, when completed, will be entirely invisible to the public. The entire structure will be underground, buried, and will have no visual impacts.

4. The terracing recommended by Clearwater Hydrology is infeasible in that it would require the removal of the existing driveway and public sewer line that currently exists. The project does provide terracing along the Valle Verde section where existing infrastructure does not create a conflict prohibiting the terracing.

Thank you for your attention to this information.

Sincerely,

Nancy Watt
Chief Executive Officer
PHILLIP M. MILLER, P.E.
DISTRICT ENGINEER

November 13, 2019

Erin Morris
Planning and Code Enforcement Division Manager
City of Napa
1600 First Street
Napa, California 94559

Dear Ms. Morris:

As you may be aware, the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District has entered into an agreement with the Peter A. and Vernice H. Gasser Foundation pursuant to which the Foundation grants funds to the District for the design and construction of certain bank restoration and stabilization activities along Salvador Creek adjacent to property located at 3700 Valle Verde Drive. The District will undertake the restoration and stabilization activities as part of its Stream Maintenance Program.

The District’s Stream and Watershed Maintenance Program enables the District at its discretion to attempt to reduce the potential for flood damage and enhance habitat along the riparian corridors on private and public lands throughout Napa County. The goal of the Program is to have a collaborative approach among local stakeholders to preserve Napa County’s riparian and stream resources while protecting life and property from flood damage.

We understand that the City of Napa will require the Gasser Foundation, as applicant for the development and construction of the Heritage House/Valle Verde project to partially remove the Zerba Bridge over Salvador Creek.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that the District has successfully negotiated the permitting and removal of other bridges over Salvador Creek and is willing and able to work with the Gasser Foundation and its partners on the permitting and removal of the Zerba Bridge.

Thank you for your attention. I hope this information is helpful to the City as it evaluates the Heritage House/Valle Verde Project.

Sincerely,

Richard Thomasser
Watershed and Flood Control Operations Manager
Oppose the Construction

of the

Heritage House

My roots in Napa began in 1975 after I graduated from college. I was the assistant manager at the Jack-in-the-Box on Trancas for a year and half. I enjoyed the location and the city’s friendliness. Some of you may have been in the drive thru on Friday nights after a local football game! Unfortunately, due to some unavoidable reasons, I moved back to Sacramento. This short stint sparked my interest and I began my travels and collection of Napa Valley wines over 35 years ago. Napa became a special destination to visit almost annually and now to live. I mention this as an introduction so you may see why we oppose the construction of the Heritage House which is very close to our home and how it may impact the future of this beautiful neighborhood and discourage ideal residential living.

The primary concern is the location of this facility. Not the intent. On our street of 17 homes, we have a multitude of professionals, business owners and winery employees. There are several families with young children & pets. Presently, we feel safe to be out & about to play and exercise. We do not want to live in a community and have to look over our shoulder or avoid going down our street or accessible area with this type of unsafe facility in close proximity. Added note: If implemented, most likely, more police patrol will dictate longer rounds or higher frequency of calls.

Some of my concerns are very personal. I had a friend whom became an addict after high school. He received treatment and relapsed to drugs multiple times and eventually overdosed and died. Another, the parents of an addict had paid thousands of dollars for his recovery and he relapsed multiple times and also eventually passed away.

In my travels we have either lived or observed the decline in cities that promote the chance of this activity in a residential area. These issues have expanded exponentially in the last 40 years. I grew up in Sacramento and worked in downtown at the family’s fast food restaurant. We had all types of addicts in that area both drinking and drugs. Just look from San Francisco to San Jose to Los Angeles to San Diego; growing number of addicts re not the exceptions they are the norm. Sidebar: In San Diego, I was randomly kicked by a drug addict while walking on the sidewalk.

We do not want to see the immediate and surrounding neighborhoods become inflicted with the usual criminal/misdemeanor activity associated with street addict behavior. To list a few: pandering, burglary, assault, public elimination/disorderly conduct, trespassing, etc., This is a
predictable outcome and should not be located in a former senior housing facility (which was not an immediate threat.). With the residences in the area and the unforeseen problems mentioned this is not the proper location for this type of facility. Each of you has to go with your conscious and ask, “Is this in the best interest of the local residents, families, medical offices and patients?”

Sincerely,

Marshall Lovus

December 5, 2019
The recent meeting of the City of Napa Planning Commission to present an EIR for the proposed Heritage House facility on Valle Verde was attended by a number of nearby residents. About 15 people spoke at the meeting to express opinions about the report findings and some issues not addressed in it. A statement was made by the Commission that no consideration of social or economic influences was included in the report. There are, however, several factors which should be addressed and should be included in any findings prior to approval of any direction to proceed with the facility. If the Commission considers projects on a "one-off" basis and not consider the effects that may affect a surrounding area then it is questionable as to the overall care/concern of other residents. The current EIR does consider factors outside the physical property such as distance to the nearest bus stop and asking for a variance for that aspect. Another variance asked for goes against city code in the lack of covered parking and assuming parking can be considered outside the physical property in the neighborhood.

Further, there is no consideration for the safety of existing citizens in the area. Many students go by the property on their way to school and there is an elderly community in the nearby area. There is no mention of their safety given the proposed population of the facility in the report. That is not acceptable and needs a solution prior to proceeding with the development.

There is no mention in the report about the opening of Sierra Avenue from Highway 29 to Villa Lane and increase of traffic there. It is bound to increase, especially with the development of some 60 units in the existing "Vintage Farm". There is only a stop sign at the corner of Valle Verde and Trancas plus one seemingly unmanaged traffic light at Villa Lane and Trancas. How does the city plan to bring acceptable Level Of Service per city standards to those intersections including the Sierra Avenue extension?

The entire EIR is in question given all the factors not considered and should not proceed without total resolution for the issues given by the local community.

Clay Parker
87 Summerbrooke Circle
Chair Painter (via Erin Morris and Patricia Baring):

As my engineering firm worked closely with Ms. Helen Zerba regarding the subdivision of her property in 1986, I thought it important to clarify the genesis of the Valle Verde road right of way that the City proposes to abandon related to the Heritage House project. A Parcel Map was filed in order to create the separate parcel Ms. Zerba then sold such that Heritage House could be built on Parcel “C”. As you can see on the attached Parcel Map, the street right of way dedication, known as Parcel “X”, came from the Zerba property in its entirety. As such, it is completely reasonable and rationale for that right of way to be abandoned back to its parent parcels.

Thank you for your consideration,

Chuck Shinnamon

Charles W. Shinnamon, P.E.
Napa City Planning Commission,

I strongly agree with Mr. McGuire’s comments about Reed Onate. This is very improper for a planning commission member to be actively involved in this matter and he should have recused himself from all consideration of this matter.

Rosemarie Vertullo, Chair
Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 3034
Napa, CA 94558
sevna2345@gmail.com
(707) 363-1577

Begin forwarded message:

From: William McGuire <wingmate@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: Fw: Planning Commission Member bias
Date: December 5, 2019 at 4:02:51 PM PST
To: Rosemarie Vertullo <sevna2345@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded Message ----- 
From: William McGuire <wingmate@sbcglobal.net>
To: Erin Morris <emorris@cityofnapa.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019, 2:59:25 PM PST
Subject: Planning Commission Member bias

Napa City Planning Commission,

In reviewing the agenda for tonight’s Planning Commission meeting, I noticed that a new large batch of emails favorable to the Gasser Foundation’s plans for the Heritage House has just been posted.

The vast majority of these emails are form letters from out of the area residents in response to requests from two individuals. Michael Murray from Napa is the originator of most of the letters but the most disturbing fact is that one of the Planning Commission members, Reed Onate, requested many of the out of the area people to support the Gasser’s plans.
The letters originating from both Michael Murray and Reed Onate are almost all identical suggesting that they are operating in concert to try and offset the concerns of those of us who will be impacted by this project.

I believe it is improper for one of the Planning Commission members to be actively involved in a matter before the Planning Commission. I ask that Mr. Onate recuse himself from all consideration of this matter.

Bill McGuire
2125 Ranch Court
December 5th, 2019

Mayor Techel and Napa City Council
Napa City Hall
955 School Street,
Napa, CA 94558

Mayor Techel and Napa City Council:

I am writing in support of the Heritage House project because housing is a critical need throughout Napa County and throughout the state of California. With a vacancy rate of less than 2.4% in Napa County, the economic vitality of the community is affected by the loss of workers who can no longer afford to live in Napa. And we all have to suffer with the additional traffic because workers are not able to live close to where they work. Valle Verde complex offers housing for wage earners who cannot afford market rate rents in Napa.

In 2016 I voted for and Governor Brown signed SB 1380 into law, officially making California a “Housing First” State. This law requires that all programs and entities receiving State funding adopt a Housing First model into their housing programs by July 1, 2019. Subsequently, in 2018 California voters and 63.7% of Napa County voters voted for Proposition 2 that would issue $2 billion in bonds for California’s No Place Like Home program that funds projects like the Heritage House.

Napa County’s “Housing First” approach to homelessness emphasizes the importance of preparing clients for housing readiness and rapid exits from homelessness to permanent, supportive housing. The Housing First model is guided by the principle that necessities, like a roof over your head and food on the table are critical for success in addressing other needs like employment and health services. The Heritage House would implement the State’s Housing First Program, by proving 33 supportive housing units for Napa’s the formerly homeless. Developers like the Gasser Foundation have been community partners for years, to ensure that the most vulnerable people in our community have shelter and support. We can count on the Gasser Foundation, Burbank Housing and Abode services to provide a quality project and guarantee that any issues are addressed in a prompt and appropriate manner. They will ensure that residents of the Heritage House have support and mental health services so that they can live a healthy productive lives and to mitigate any potential negative impacts to the neighborhood.

I support this project, not only as your state Senator and Napa County resident, but also as a neighbor who just moved a few hundred yards away from the proposed project. And I look forward to walking the many of the trails and paths in the neighborhood with all of my grandchildren. Thank you for the opportunity to share my support for the Heritage House.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Senator Bill Dodd
3rd District
Project Location
Statewide: Lowest income HHs disproportionately affected by CA's housing shortage

California renter households by income vs rental units by affordability:

Households who rent

- Above Moderate: 5.8 M
- Moderate: 1.5 M
- Low: 1.0 M
- Very Low: 1.1 M
- Extremely Low: 1.0 M
- 1.5 M shortfall in affordable & available rental units for very low and extremely low income HHs

Available rental units at 30% affordability

- 6.1 M
- 1.9 M
- 1.9 M
- 1.6 M
- 0.3 M
- 0.5 M

1. From HCD's "California's Housing Future" 2018 report
Source: California HCD Statewide Housing Assessment 2025, 2016 National Low Income Housing Coalition tabulations of 2014 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) housing file
Gap between average median rent for two bedroom units and monthly income for extremely low income (ELI) households continues to grow

Average median monthly rent / income, targeted counties

1. Average of median market rent across Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo & Santa Clara Counties. For years without data, median rent was projected based on average YoY growth rate from 2012-2018. Note: Average persons per household is 2.9 (weighted across counties). Source: US Census Bureau & American Community Survey, Zillow rental listing prices 2010-2018.
Mary,
He is that letter again.
Let me know how the meeting goes.
Thanks,
Jeff

From: Jeffrey Kozody
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 4:56 PM
To: jtechel@cityofnapa.org
Subject: Heritage House / Valle Verde Project

Dear Ms. Techel,

After researching the Gasser Foundation’s plan for a "No Place Like Home" in the vacant Sunrise Building on Valle Verde, I am strongly opposed to this specific location.

Based on the people currently residing in the immediate area, it would be more appropriate for an elderly care facility or lower-cost retirement home to complement The Springs of Napa and to take advantage of the many medical and dental offices associated with the Queen of the Valley hospital that are nearby.

There are many children that live across the street at Silverado Creek Apartments. It may not be a good idea for young, impressionable children to be exposed to older, less-ideal “role models” that are mentally unstable, unemployed or alcohol or drug abusers. If I were a working parent living there, I would be deathly afraid for the safety of my children.

Also this particular area is not very conducive or strategically located to help these NPLH residents to get the regular and consistent social services that they require to successfully improve their lives.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Kozody
Polycarbonates Market Development
Valla Verde-Heritage House Project

My name is Larry Kromann and I serve as president/CEO of Calistoga Affordable Housing. I am here today to support the Valle Verde – Heritage House project.

The reasons for CAH support:

- Over the past 15 yrs. of developing housing for low income families in Napa Valley, our experience is that surrounding property values are increased not decreased because well designed housing projects that add value to the local community. After reviewing the Valle Verde-Heritage House project, we would expect the surrounding property values to increase due to the site improvements. Just review past local projects by Gasser and Burbank that demonstrates their ability to “get the job done”.
- CAH has direct experience with the Burbank Housing management and our observations are their expertise in management will also add value to site’s value as well as the surrounding properties.
- The Gasser Foundation is to be commended for its wise usage of “No Place Like Home” funding program. Though the program does allow tenants with past history of mental illnesses or harmful life styles be able to be tenants without requiring enrollment in treatment programs, it does allow management to consider the merits of each potential tenant regarding what is a good fit for the tenant as well as the community using lawful and reasonable criteria. Burbank has excellent management experience and procedures. The Gasser and Burbank team work very closely with local social service agencies and non profits who deal with homeless and mental illness situations to meet the requirements of HCD policies as well as provide a safe environment for the local community.
- It is a challenge finding suitable locations for low income housing and/or No Place Like Home programs, but the Valle Verde site is close to community services, isolated on two sides with natural barriers with a semi rural atmosphere, and yet with easy access.

My last point is that the City of Napa is very fortunate to have a large pool of foundations and non profits who help find solutions to our city’s problems. And the Valle Verde –Heritage project is one of those solutions. The Gasser/ Burbank Team will do an excellent job in providing a very needed project.
December 5, 2019

Napa Planning Commission

On behalf of the League, I encourage you to approve the Heritage House project based on the conviction that every person and family should have a decent, safe and affordable place to live. The city has been fortunate to have the Gasser Foundation donate the land, as cost of the land makes most projects unattainable. In addition, the abandoned Sunrise Assisted Living Retirement Home lends itself to this type of supportive housing. Living near Valle Verde, I am familiar with the neighborhood of medical offices and attractive apartment buildings and the current eye-sore of the vacant Sunrise building surround by chain-link fencing. How much more of an asset to the neighborhood would be a restored landscaped building?

We understand the neighbors’ concerns about half of the units being designated for people who previously experienced homelessness. This is a very vulnerable part of our population but the onsite supportive services staff, available on site 24/7, can give them the stability they need. Additionally, each potential resident will be screened on criminal background and have to be found capable of living independently. They will sign leases and are required to follow community rules or risk losing their much-needed home. Adobe Services will be managing the project, and in their experience, 95% of residents in supportive housing stay housed or move out and into alternate housing. We urge you to approve this project for the good of our entire community. Thank You.

Joyce Kingery - Action Chair of the LWV of Napa County
Good afternoon council members,

My name is Lisa Reifers and this is my mom, Sally Tiedemann. We live at 3475 Valle Verde Drive.

We are here today to share our feelings about the Heritage House/Valle Verde Project.

But first, we chose to live in North Napa because of the culture in our neighborhood. There are many adult and retirement communities in this corner of the city. There is the 'Bel Air Village', 'The Springs' on Villa Lane and 'The Reserve' on Trancas St., just to name a couple. When you drive through our neighborhoods there are always people walking their dogs or with each other, kids going to and from school, people just strolling about. It is a nice safe neighborhood.

Our concern is not with the Heritage House/Valle Verde project itself.... But, rather with the location. Our neighborhood is not equipped to service the needs of the residents who will permanently reside there.

The No Place Like Home guide lines clearly state that “all persons must have a serious mental illness and be in need of mental health services.” The nearest Clinic Ole is 2-3 blocks away and does not offer mental health services. The guidelines also say that mental health services be provided by the NPLH grant program, but there is NO requirement that these services be provided on site OR that the residents have to participate. IF, the residents chose to participate, they would have to travel down town to seek therapy, counseling, meetings, ect...

NPLH, also may not discriminate against sobriety or drug use. People who suffer from addiction need programs readily available to them to help control their decease. From what I’ve read about NPLH, it sounds more like ENABLING than helping.
When you combine mental health issues with drug and alcohol abuse, I wonder how safe our elderly and children will be, outside their own homes? I mention them first because they will be the most at risk and vulnerable!

There are numerous Doctor Offices on Valle Verde that dispense medications, making them a target for theft that wasn’t there before. The patients may not feel so safe anymore either, coming and going to appointments.

I’m also concerned about drug paraphernalia, needles, syringes, etc. That could be introduced to our environment, causing health concerns.

We, as a family, want to contribute to our homeless community needs, perhaps a Low-Income Senior Housing Program would fit in better at this location.

Thank you for your time,

Lisa and Sally

FYI, I read on line at https://www.dsh.ca.gov>Napa How the State Hospital has developed a partnership with various community based organizations and currently leases several buildings to support community and mental health services on the grounds.
12/5/19

Statement to Napa City Planning Commission
From: Rosemarie Vertullo as Chairperson of the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association
RE: Heritage House Valle Verde Project

We have addressed the Planning Commission at a previous meeting, and we have also addressed the Mayor and City Council on several occasions regarding opposition to the Heritage House Valle Verde Project. Additionally, 410 letters have been delivered to the Napa City Planning Commission opposing this project as it currently proposed.

As a representative of the Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association, we want to emphasize that we are not against the Sunrise property being used for low-income housing, Section 8 housing, or workforce housing. This would be an ideal location for any of this housing. Our objections are that we do not see this location as beneficial to the tenants of the No Place Like Home Program nor to the safety and security of the surrounding neighborhood.

We do recognize and we stress that we support our community in caring for the homeless. It is equally important and a responsibility for you, as our city leaders, city planners, and government, to assure protection from harm to residents, families, children and businesses in this neighborhood.

It is also your responsibility to enter into programs for homeless people that are set up for success.

Here are our concerns:

- No Place Like Home is a new program that has not been in existence for very long nor has it been implemented in Napa. There is no evidence that it is going to be successful.

- This location is not convenient to the needed services of the tenants of the No Place Like Home Program specifically regarding ease of access and transportation to mental health, drug, and alcohol support services.

- Tenants do not have to maintain sobriety or be drug free and they can refuse treatment and still not be evicted for these reasons. This makes for a potentially unsafe environment for the surrounding neighborhood which has a dense population including families with young children as well as elderly persons. How do we as residents of the surrounding neighborhood manage this? What is the City of Napa going to do to assure us of safety?

- There are other locations in the city that would be more conducive to this housing project and that would be closer to needed services of tenants.
• Is the city council and planning commission aware that drug and alcohol rehabilitation services offered by Ole Health are referred to the county? These services are at Napa Valley Corporate Drive which is a 45-minute bus ride with 12 stops. One of the stipulations of NPLH is that the residents can refuse treatment. These services will be critical to the success of residents and the travel time and location will create a huge barrier.

• This project will also add to the already dense housing that exists in the neighborhood and there will be an impact on traffic, parking, litter, noise.

• The mix of 24 affordable housing units for extra low-income families, which we emphasize that we support, mixed in with 33 supportive SRO living units which can ultimately house 66 tenants with serious mental health and substance abuse issues, is a recipe for disaster. It seems unfair and unsafe to subject families with children to be required to live alongside persons who have no requirement to participate in mental health and/or sobriety programs.

Our Napa community is in need of housing for low-income seniors, low-income families, farm workers, transition housing for foster children as well as playgrounds and parks for the many children who live and visit this area. We recommend that Napa City or Gasser Foundation considered utilizing this property for any of these groups. This location would be more ideal for any of these populations.

The current Heritage House Project as sponsored by the County, City and the Gasser Foundation will create problems for the residents and tenants of the project and problems in the surrounding neighborhood that currently do not exist.

I urge the Planning Commission and the City Council to vote NO on this project as it is currently proposed.

Thank you,

Rosemarie Vertullo, Chair
Southeast Vintage Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 3034
Napa, CA 94558
sevna2345@gmail.com
(707) 363-1577
Residence: 103 Summerbrooke Circle, Napa 94558
If possible, please send this message to Beth Painter the Planning Commission Chair. I would love to have a conversation with with Ms. Painter. My contact information:

Andrea Becker
Small Business Owner in Napa since 2000
2151 Big Ranch Rd.
Napa CA 94558
707.732.4070

Dear Ms. Painter:

I attended the meeting last night at the city hall so that I could express my opinion about the housing project going in on Valle Verde. I listened carefully and noted you were the only person to say you spoke to the residents in the neighborhood. We, the homeowners take a much greater interest in the area than a renter or mere resident would take. The northeast end of town has mostly large single family homes. The average value around $1,000,000. Some are more expensive but very few would go for less than that. Thus, the property tax base in this neighborhood is much higher than say the area near the outlet stores.

The people who spoke and specifically Kathy Pease took some measure of glee in informing the audience that California has a law that requires this project be built on Valle Verde specifically. That’s ridiculous of course as the city could put the shelter wherever they want. It does not have to be here.

When I saw how the city blocked all the residents from speaking by putting all of the pro-project people up to speak first I left. After 15 people talking about their history of drug addiction and homelessness spoke along with those who are profiting financially from the project, I determined this was rigged not unlike the way things are done in Sacramento.

I know the answer to my own problem. I need to move and take my company with me. I don’t need to move because a housing project is going in. I need to move because the city doesn’t care at all for the homeowners. All of my neighbors except Bill Dodd, who just moved in a few houses from me, oppose this project. We’ve all mobilized to ask the city to put this thing somewhere else. The city has blatantly blocked our voices per the meeting last night. I wasn’t the only one who walked out. My neighbors are right when they say the city only cares about the restaurants and wineries.
The question I wanted answered was: Is there anything the residents can do to stop this? How is the city going to make this decision?

I’m pretty sure the answer is there is nothing we can do. The city was simply humoring us by inviting us to speak. I honestly think that this is dirty dealing. Senator Dodd, my neighbor, sent a minion to speak because he couldn’t face his neighbors knowing we are all against it. It’s clear there are those benefiting financially from this project and he’s no doubt one of them. This type of corruption is very common now but I honestly believe that what comes around goes around.

I know all of my neighbors because I run the Napa Food Project Green Bag for this area. I’ll be telling them about the meeting and how it was rigged against the homeowners. You seemed like the one person who had a balanced view of the situation so that’s why I’m contacting you. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Andrea Becker

Sent from my iPad