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1. INTRODUCTION

This is Napa County’s Sixth Cycle Housing Element, which provides a policy framework and implementation plan for addressing housing needs in Napa County over the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element planning period. The Housing Element is a required component of the County’s General Plan and must be completed in accordance with requirements under State law, and is also a reflection of local needs and priorities related to housing.

Napa County’s Housing Element functions within the context of the broader San Francisco Bay Area and North Bay setting, where a dynamic economy and robust job growth create strong demand for housing, while a constrained supply of land, high construction costs, and other factors constrain the supply of housing. This creates challenges for providing an adequate supply of housing that is accessible to all economic segments of the community.

Public Participation

Overview

California Government Code (Section 65583[c][7]) requires that local governments make diligent efforts to solicit public participation from all economic segments of the community, especially low-income persons, in the development of the Housing Element. As part of the community outreach and stakeholder engagement effort for Napa County’s Housing Element, the County engaged the public and key stakeholders in several dialogues about the Housing Element.

This section summarizes the County’s public engagement activities, with Appendix A containing a more detailed compilation of the outreach plan developed for this project, the materials provided at each meeting, and meeting recaps for each outreach event, including the community workshop and the Housing Element Advisory Committee (HEAC) presentations. During the preparation of this Housing Element update, public input was actively encouraged in a variety of ways. At each meeting, the County discussed the purpose and contents of the Housing Element, state requirements, and initiated dialogue regarding specific housing needs to gather stakeholder public input on issues, housing sites, and potential policy solutions. The feedback received from each outreach and engagement process is incorporated into the Housing Element update and is used to guide new policies and programs for housing in Napa County. This public participation summary outlines the methods used to engage with community members and representatives as part of the Housing Element Update process, as well as provide a narrative of the feedback received and how it was incorporated. The topics covered in this summary include an overview of the County’s participation with:

- The Napa Sonoma Collaborative
- Housing Element Advisory Committee Meetings
- Community and Stakeholder Engagement including:
Napa Sonoma Collaborative
The Napa Sonoma Collaborative (NSC) is a shared effort among the region’s jurisdictions to help address the region’s housing challenges. As part of an Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG/MTC) effort, participating jurisdictions are able to work together collaboratively as part of a Regional Housing Technical Assistance program and save money, time, and resources by sharing information. The overall goal of the NSC has been to maintain and facilitate relationships with non-profits, affordable housing advocates, and key governmental organizations to solicit and gather input throughout the Housing Element Update process. The NSC is made up of staff from Napa County and Sonoma County jurisdictions to work together on addressing housing policy. For this Housing Element update, Napa County engaged with NSC to utilize a more extensive form of regional outreach by working together and creating a “Let’s Talk Housing” effort. The goal of this effort is to expand who is heard in the community, and to hear from as many people as possible so that the final planning process for Housing Elements can adequately match the housing needs of all community members. Participation by Napa County via the NSC provided resources and community input at a regional level as well as for use within Napa County and the Housing Element update process. This includes participation by Napa County with the Equity Working Group (EWG) as an advisory group organized by the NSC to provide a direct connection between underserved communities, trusted community partners, and jurisdictional representatives in Napa and Sonoma Counties. Over the course of six sessions the EWG discussed barriers, obstacles, and constraints to providing affordable housing within the Napa-Sonoma region as well as developed recommendations for how to address these issues. The findings of the EWG meetings and other regional AFH analysis documents prepared as part of the NSC can be found in Appendix A.

Housing Element Advisory Committee (HEAC) Meetings
In 2021, County staff established the Housing Element Advisory Committee. This working group was formed to vet and gather feedback throughout the Housing Element update process on housing-related planning and policy projects. The HEAC is comprised of 12 individuals representing a wide range of perspectives, including the real estate industry, housing advocacy groups, housing developers, Planning and Design Commissioners, and local non-profits. A total of six (6) HEAC meetings have been conducted or have been identified to occur over the course of the Housing Element update schedule beginning in autumn of 2021 through summer 2022. In response to COVID-19 and the shelter-in-place orders, the Countytransitioned all in-person meetings related to the Housing Element to virtual meetings, which is how all HEAC meetings have been conducted with members of the public. In addition, the County provided notification
to members of the public about the meetings and informed potential attendees about on-demand Spanish translation services being available upon request for the first four HEAC meetings, with the last two HEAC meetings having scheduled Spanish translation services available by default. The following section provides a summary of the topics covered at each HEAC meeting, and the feedback received from both HEAC members and members of the public.

**Summary of HEAC Meeting Feedback**

Discussion and feedback received during HEAC meetings are summarized by topic below. The feedback received at each HEAC meeting has been incorporated into the relevant chapters of the Housing Element for reference. The meeting recaps for each HEAC meeting and recordings can be found at the project website, in Appendix A, and can also be accessed from the following link: https://www.countyofnapa.org/3250/2022-Housing-Element-Update.

### Table 1: HEAC Meeting Feedback Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Feedback Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/26/21</td>
<td>HEU Intro</td>
<td>- Attendees made note of the unique challenges that Napa County faces in comparison to other counties in California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendee feedback focused on clarification for the constraints and environmental considerations as well as comments on the need to consider housing and jobs growth in association with the site selection process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendees also advised staff on public outreach strategies and provided input on specific community-based organizations for the County to reach out to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/15/21</td>
<td>RHNA / Sites</td>
<td>- Attendee feedback pertained to general clarifications on the State Housing Element requirements and how water and utility availability is considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendees provided commentary and questions on the types of housing that are counted towards a jurisdiction's RHNA, the RHNA transfer process, and provided discussion on specific sites and development projects occurring in Napa County. Feedback on site selection considerations was provided and clarification was requested on the property owner outreach process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendees commented on suggestions for specific sites and requested clarification on requirements for housing types and programs, including preservation of affordable housing stock, incentivizing housing development, redevelopment of government owned sites, and rebuilding housing after natural disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03/15/22</td>
<td>Goals, Policies, and Programs; Site Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendee feedback was provided on which goals, policies, and programs should be included as part of the Housing Element update and the overall areas of focus to consider. Areas of focus for goals, policies, or programs that were mentioned by HEAC members, and the public, included those listed below which were incorporated into the Housing Element update:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Local employee preference for rent or workforce housing (possible ordinance).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Further addressing a better jobs and housing balance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Facilitate opportunities for farmworker housing and workforce housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Improved tracking of progress with regards to meeting housing goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Specific and inclusive polices to directly address AFFH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Improved marketing of affordable housing developers/opportunities for affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendee feedback pertained to the methodology of the sites inventory and requests were made as to which information and justifications would be incorporated into Housing Element’s sites inventory analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04/20/22</td>
<td>HNA and AFH; Goals, Policies, and Programs; Site Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendee feedback was provided on the draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) and Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) documents. Areas of focus are listed below and were incorporated into the analysis:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Review current and future areas of proposed annexation by LAFCO; including Browns Valley areas and other County islands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Demographic statistics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Opportunity areas and low resource areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Information related to CalEnviroScreen data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Displacement issues related to mobile home parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Proximity to services and amenities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendee feedback pertained to the methodology behind the sites inventory and how the County’s RHNA will be addressed using estimates for single family housing units and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as well as discussion on farmworker housing. Areas of focus are listed below and were incorporated into the analysis:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o ADUs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community and Stakeholder Engagement
The process for preparing the County’s Housing Element update included a multifaceted approach to obtain input from the community, a broad range of stakeholders, and County decisionmakers. Community focused engagement opportunities are summarized in the sections below which included a virtual community workshop, stakeholder interviews, and general public outreach activities.

Community Workshop
In addition to the HEAC meetings used as virtual meetings for public engagement, the County also conducted a virtual community workshop for general members of the public in January of 2022 using an online platform to provide an interactive and informational summary of the Housing Element process and to provide background and gather public input on housing issues within the County. The workshop was conducted in English, with Spanish translation, and a recording was provided of the workshop and posted to the Housing Element webpage. During the interactive workshop, members of the public were asked about what they like about housing in their community, what housing challenges they have faced in their community, and what the County could do to meet the community’s housing needs. Attendance for the workshop was consistent with attendance at other County public events, with roughly 40
participants. In response to COVID-19 and the shelter-in-place orders, the County transitioned all in-person workshops with members of the public to virtual workshops. In order to receive additional feedback, County staff added a recording of the interactive webinar to the County website along with County contact information to allow for members of the public to provide additional input.

The County made several changes to the outreach strategy during the Housing Element update process in January 2022 to solicit more participation. For the originally planned hybrid approach to the meeting format was adapted to utilize the County’s Zoom platform, which emerged as the most popular meeting platform during the COVID-19 pandemic. The change to Zoom made providing live Spanish interpretation at the community workshop easier as well as via an on-demand Spanish Translation option at HEAC meetings. The County advertised these workshops through the County Housing Element listserv and website, and in partnership with Community Based Organizations and the HEAC. Instead of the originally planned in-person stakeholder interview process (scheduled to occur in parallel with the community workshop). the County switched to an emailed questionnaire format to allow for more participation and to give stakeholders time to consider the questions being asked and provide their feedback. These changes to the outreach strategy resulted in increased participation; there were 48 attendees at the January 20, 2022, workshop and an average of eight attendees at the HEAC meetings; with 10 out of 12 responses to the questionnaires provided. The County posted a recording of the workshop and the presentation materials, with the feedback received during the workshop incorporated live into the presentation slides in response to the workshop questions. The workshop included an education component to cover Housing Element basics, an interactive component using discussion questions to obtain feedback on housing constraints and needs, and opportunities for questions and answers.

What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Napa County?

- Lack of Affordability Factor/Affordable Housing, affordable rental units
- Need for Workforce Housing
- Transitional Housing for homeless population
- Housing near urban areas/goods and services/public services and facilities
- Permit Streamlining
- Missing Middle Housing, Apartments, Co-housing, ADUs and JADUs
Summary of Feedback
The feedback gathered from the participants at the community workshop included responses to guiding discussion questions designed to help solicit participation and engage attendees. While there were a variety of opinions and experiences shared during the workshop, the following summary provides an overview of those main topics addressed and how they were incorporated into the Housing Element update process.

As part of the community engagement effort, the virtual community workshop was used as an opportunity for public feedback on the main housing needs within the County as well as identification of any opportunities or constraints for housing production. Participation in the virtual community workshop included representatives from regional and local organizations, housing advocates, as well as government officials and general members of the public.

Table 2: Community Workshop – Feedback Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Question</th>
<th>Feedback Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>Feedback considered in Goals, Policies, and Programs section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Policy/action items for property owner outreach, retention, and preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of low income/affordable units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of affordable housing for workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rent stabilization and preservation of mobile homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider farmworker housing to accommodate changing workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider land use and policy changes for affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think are the most critical</td>
<td>Feedback considered in Constraints section:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
housing issues in Napa County?

- Preservation of agricultural and open space and building in the more densely populated areas.
- Lack of rental units. Balance between affordable rental units, below market rate housing units, and market rate housing units.
- Limited residential zoning set for large, single family residential zones.

What do you think Napa County should do to address housing needs or goals?

Feedback considered in Housing Needs section:
- Affordable dwelling units for large employer development approval.
- Financial incentives/programs to preserve existing low-income units.
- Public health priority/goal(s) for housing.
- Rehabilitate and reuse sites not formerly utilized for housing.
- Consider land use and policy changes for affordable housing and developer accountability.
- Unincorporated islands within city limits as sites.
- Additional infrastructure to areas that could be developed.
- Mixed use conversion, higher density, co-op housing, tiny homes, and incentives.

What characteristics do you want to see in housing over the next 10 years?

Feedback considered in Goals, Policies, and Programs section:
- Inclusive housing at a mix of income levels.
- Walkability, access to services, and cultural elements.
- Environmentally sensitive design – water resources.
- Innovative housing types – cohousing and especially multigenerational housing.
- Co-housing, aging in place.
- European model/Communal space.

What do you think Napa County should do to protect existing renters and homeowners?

Feedback considered in Goals, Policies, and Programs section:
- Rent stabilization/control, ownership.
- Private rehabilitation loans.
- Essential workforce development/retention/aging population retention.
- ADUs as a tool for protecting housing.
- Homeowner assistance/information.
- Rent stabilization/Control and preservation for mobile homes.
- Zoning changes to preserve mobile home parks.
- Collaboration with cities and the County/private sector to help people understand the home improvement process (i.e., window retrofit programs).
- Permit Streamlining.
- Implement and strengthen workforce retention program.

Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Feedback considered in Goals, Policies, and Programs section:
- Indigenous involvement/cultural considerations – cultural easement.
- Consider all demographic and housing needs – North Napa County and South Napa County.
- Housing Impact Funds for rural property owners to support ADU development.
- ADU housing impact fund information sharing.

**Stakeholder Interviews**

An important part of the Housing Element process is gathering adequate and inclusive feedback that includes a variety of opinions and experiences, especially those of traditionally underrepresented populations. As part of the community engagement effort, targeted stakeholder interviews were conducted in addition to the community workshop and HEAC meetings. Participation in the virtual stakeholder survey process involved twelve (12) regional and local organizations identified by the County, including organizations suggested by participants in the first HEAC meeting. These stakeholder representatives include professionals from the building industry, non-profit organizations, and advocacy groups, that are actively involved in addressing key housing issues such as housing development and management of affordable housing, housing advocacy, and organizations working directly with disadvantaged communities. The identified organizations and stakeholder groups are actively conducting work that serve as a bridge between the diverse populations in Napa County and their contributions to this Housing Element process. The input gathered has not only been incorporated into the Housing Element update process but has also been used to inform stakeholder groups and the public of the Housing Element update while working to gather targeted input on strategies to promote housing production in the County. Organizations selected as part of this process are detailed in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Stakeholder Interviews – Selected Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>Abode Services has been working in Napa County since 2017. Services include operating an emergency shelter and providing outreach, housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>Support, and rental assistance. Abode Services also creates and manages affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckelew Programs</td>
<td>Buckelew Programs is a provider of comprehensive mental health and addiction services in the North Bay. Main areas of impact include: Counseling, Recovery, Service Navigation, Suicide Prevention and Supported Housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbay Realtors</td>
<td>Professional association to support realtor success, promote community impact, and advocate for property rights and a sustainable housing economy in the North Bay Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puertas Abiertas</td>
<td>Founded in 2005, Puertas Abiertas Community Resource Center provides a variety of all-encompassing services to Napa’s most vulnerable communities by the following: education and self-sufficiency, legal and immigration navigation, CalFresh, Medi-Cal, EDD, Social Security and other services and referrals, as well as mental health services, informational workshops, food, and emergency/disaster relief rental assistance, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UpValley Family Center</td>
<td>UpValley Family Centers takes a prevention-focused, community-responsive approach to providing support and resources to the community. UpValley Family Centers serves children, youth, adults, and seniors who live and/or work in the rural communities of Calistoga, St. Helena, Deer Park, Angwin, Pope Valley, Lake Berryessa, Oakville, and Rutherford.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stakeholder interview questions included a set of general questions that were applicable to each stakeholder and unique questions that were created for each stakeholder organization as identified by Napa County Staff. The following general questions were asked of all organizations to prompt this discussion:

1. What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Napa County?
2. What do you see as the biggest challenges to housing production in Napa County?
3. What do you think Napa County should do to address housing needs or goals over the 2023-2031 time period?
4. What characteristics do you want to see in housing over the next 10 years?
5. What do you think Napa County should do to protect existing renters and homeowners?
6. Can you identify any specific actions that Napa County could take to remove barriers to housing production and equitable access to housing for all socio-economic segments of the population within the unincorporated area?

Responses were received from ten (10) out of the twelve (12) organizations that were provided questionnaires. The feedback received from each interview is incorporated into the Housing Element Update and will be used to guide new policies and programs for housing in Napa County. Participants have been added to the project interest list and will be included on
publicity efforts and project updates. The feedback received via targeted stakeholder interviews is included as an attachment to this summary and the feedback received is summarized below.

**Summary of Feedback**
The following is a summary of the major themes identified by participants and general conclusions drawn from the comments:

**Vision.** Overall, participants expressed the desire to see the following housing characteristics in Napa County over the next ten years:

- Mixed income and multi-generational housing opportunities in the community
- Sustainable construction practices such as zero net energy, or alternative energy sources
- Integration with transit centers, bicycle trails, foot trails, mass transit
- Proximity to food/grocery stores and services
- Connectivity and proximity to the places where residents live and where they work
- Additional opportunities for affordable housing
- Access to housing resources for all segments of the community, including opportunities for Spanish speaking communities

**Land Use, Zoning, and Regulatory Changes.** Participants suggested that the County explore removing regulatory barriers to housing development, including allowing higher density development, rezoning of commercial and industrial land, fee waivers for affordable housing developers to contain the cost of development, and allowing a mixture of land uses and zoning designations in the unincorporated area. Participants generally understand that there is limited land in the unincorporated area that is available for development, the existence of development standards within the Rural Urban Limit line, and the lack of utilities that service the unincorporated area. See Section 8 on Constraints and Section 3 on Goals, Policies, and Programs.

**Housing Affordability.** Participants expressed concerns regarding a lack of affordable housing in the unincorporated areas of Napa County for low-income families and individuals. In order to allow for housing affordability for different demographic groups, stakeholders identified the need for a variety of multifamily housing types that will allow people of all demographics to live and work in Napa County and fit the shifting needs of the community. One solution identified the rehabilitation of existing farmworker housing. Specific populations identified include the elderly, the individuals experiencing homelessness, low-income families, low-income individuals, teachers, hospitality workers, and farmworkers. See Section 3 on Goals, Policies, and Programs.
Public and Private Partnerships (Schools, Churches, and Visitor Serving Entities).
Participants suggested that the County engage with local public and private entities, such as schools, churches, nonprofit organizations, and resorts, to determine if property owners would be interested in redesignating and rezoning land for multifamily residential uses. Another solution suggested that Napa County learn from other destination and resort communities on how to effectively address workforce challenges so that more workers can become part of the community instead of commuters who pay with their time. Finally, stakeholders identified specific available resources produced by their respective organizations that the County could leverage in order to provide information to its constituents.

Funding Programs. Federal, state, and local programs stakeholders recognized that the County could leverage opportunities in areas such as rental assistance, housing rehabilitation, and affordable housing development. Some examples mentioned include:

- USDA federal rental assistance
- State and federal tax credits
- Farmworker tax credit set asides

Overall, participants expressed that there should be greater visibility of available funding sources for affordable housing development, as well as more rental assistance programs and protections available to those renters facing eviction due to income loss. See Section 3. Goals, Policies, and Programs.

Meeting with Spanish-Speaking Community Members
In addition to collecting feedback from community organizations representing various constituencies from Napa County and beyond, the County also engaged directly with residents who requested an opportunity to meet and give input. On May 9, 2022, County Staff held an informal meeting including translation services for five attendees of Hispanic origin who live and work in Napa County. This five-member group had reached out to County staff at the conclusion of the 4th HEAC meeting requesting translation assistance in understanding the proposed programs of the Housing Element Update and to speak with staff concerning the housing needs/constraints of the Napa County Hispanic community with limited English language proficiency.

All attendees were very interested in seeing the County promote more multigenerational housing, with all five expressing how important multigenerational housing can be to members of the Hispanic community with limited English proficiency. They also requested that the County not exclude undocumented migrant workers from living in multigenerational housing, which is a policy they mentioned Santa Rosa has in place (Napa County does not have a policy excluding undocumented migrant workers), citing the Generation Housing organization from Sonoma County which developed a project in Santa Rosa with 60 percent federal funding, 30 percent state funding, and ten percent local funding.
Meeting participants noted that some rental assistance programs miss people because of income cut-offs, with one attendee indicating they were excluded from an assistance program due to making $50 more than the program maximum income cap allowed.

Another central theme was the stress and hardship lower income persons experience in locating housing, with participants indicating that “stability of low-income housing is needed to support families,” “economic stress impacts families,” “income can act as modern form of segregation,” and “housing struggles cause trouble within the family unit.” One participant shared a listing of “available rentals” that they had obtained from a local affordable housing developer/operator which indicated units were available in certain complexes where, in fact, no units were available. Participants further shared that searching for housing is very time consuming and expensive, as property managers may charge an up-front application fee just to be placed on a waiting list.

Other concerns relayed by the meeting participants included landlords who raise rents when tenants request repairs and struggles with rents that are too high relative to low wages earned (e.g., with a minimum wage of $15/hour a person living alone would bring home ~$900 a week, for a 60-hour work week, which is not enough for rents in the $3,000 - $4,000 range in Napa).

While one participant was interested in seeing more assistance for single women who are heads of households, another attendee indicated assistance should not be gender-based. The group also discussed policy challenges associated with households that initially income-qualify for affordable housing but then do not move on to market rate housing as incomes rise, limiting availability for other lower-income households to fund assisted units. Feedback from the group indicated that they feel that housing assistance programs in Napa are complicated and it is difficult to find information about the programs, with many questions about what kinds of programs were available and where specific program information could be found.

Participants related how households are in some cases paying costs to rent housing that are as high as a mortgage; however, these same households cannot get a mortgage because their incomes are too low to qualify. Participants felt that this situation was emblematic of a perception that landlords are increasing rents to increase their wealth at the cost of their tenants. Several participants asked if the County could find a way to regulate rents.

Others expressed interest in a homebuyer assistance program that would allow a homebuyer to buy a house with a ten percent down payment and then allow only a modest increase in sale price when the house is sold to another buyer. Others were interested in a rent to own program where the homebuyer would pay according to income.

In terms of feedback on existing programs, participants asked if there is any oversight of housing organizations to grade whether they are doing their jobs or not. Participants felt the existing housing element’s Program 2-i (financial assistance to property owners who will build
deed-restricted ADUs for very low- or low-income tenants) was not very fair, since it is helping people who are already well-off in constructing a second unit for their property. County staff clarified that the financial assistance is only provided when the units are to be occupied by lower-income residents.

Meeting participants provided County staff with some feedback on Housing Element outreach activities. They indicated that information is not reaching the Hispanic community and the community does not feel included, that meetings are not set up to reach them, and that there is a generation gap in terms of who will participate. Second generation Hispanics will tend to be more responsive while older community members will be less likely to participate due to cultural issues (e.g., a perception that people are not really trying to solve their problems, so it is not worth it to put effort into participating). Participants suggested that school is one of the few institutions in the County where lower income and higher income families interact to some extent and that outreach through the schools could provide for more engagement.

**Public Outreach Summary**

The County created a dedicated website for the Housing Element update and provided updates to the public via social media, and email list-serves. Following an established outreach plan for the project, the County’s outreach process for the Housing Element update actively sought input from underrepresented groups and used the outreach plan as a living document that was updated throughout the process to adapt to the various changing needs of the project and community. Efforts to make the outreach process inclusive included either scheduled or on demand translation services during meetings and use of regional resources through the Napa Sonoma Collaborative, as well as via communications to community-based organizations representing non-English speaking communities to increase accessibility to members of the community with limited English proficiency. In addition, those organizations targeted for stakeholder interviews included some organizations that work with non-English-speaking populations, persons with disabilities, persons experiencing homelessness, and seniors. The outreach process also included a range of types of activities, including scheduled meetings and community workshop, County staff attendance at community events to involve members of the public that might not attend a community meeting, and opportunities to provide extensive feedback online. Providing a wide variety of mechanisms for members of the public to provide input was a key focus in the outreach process, with an emphasis on reaching broad segments of the community. Where the formal outreach process did not work well for interested parties, the County made efforts to meet with interested individuals in a setting that was comfortable to them, listened to their concerns and ideas, and solicited feedback on how to improve the outreach process.

Input from the public participation process was incorporated into the housing needs assessment; assessment of fair housing; analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints on housing; goals, policies, and programs; and sites inventory portions of Napa County’s Housing Element.
Social Media. The County used social media to publicize information about the Housing Element update, including information regarding opportunities for the public to provide input. Social media engagement included Facebook posts publicizing the third and subsequent HEAC meetings, as well as to announce the availability of the Public Review Draft Housing Element Update, and Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings to review and adopt the Housing Element Update.

Email Notifications. The County utilized its “Interested Parties” listserv and its ‘Housing Element Interested Parties’ listserv to send e-mail blasts announcing Housing Element Update activities, including every HEAC meeting, the Community Workshop, availability of the Public Review Draft Housing Element Update, and Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings. These lists include community-based organizations, agencies, and individuals who request inclusion on the lists. As of May, 2022, the County had sent notices to its interested parties list five times to provide notification of HEAC meetings and the community workshop. In addition, the County posted Housing Element update notices two times to its Facebook page.

Housing Element Website. At the outset of the Housing Element preparation process, the County created a website for the Housing Element Update at countyofnapa.org/3250/2022-Housing-Element-Update. The website has been continuously updated throughout the update process for all HEAC meetings to provide the public with Housing Element resources along with recaps of all HEAC meetings and any draft materials for public review. The website also provides information on Housing Element events and opportunities for public engagement. Public comments can be submitted via a community feedback form on the website or via email and enables the public to sign up for emails to receive information about important events and other updates related to the Housing Element update and is available in multiple languages. The County received a total of nine comments via the website leading up to the preparation of the Public Review Draft Housing Element Update.

Planning Commission Meetings. The County’s Planning Commission (PC) is scheduled to review the Housing Element [date to be added as scheduled in the future]. During the PC meeting, an overview of the update process will be given by County staff and the consultant team with information provided to the PC and the general public on the requirements, presentation of the draft goals and policies, and an opportunity for discussion on the draft Housing Element.
Update. The PC meetings are also an opportunity for the general public to comment on the Housing Element update.

**Board of Supervisors Meetings.** The County Board of Supervisors (BOS) addressed the Housing Element Update during meetings held on May 3, 2022; [other dates to be added as scheduled in the future]. During the BOS meetings, County staff provided information to the Board and the general public on the Housing Element update process and requirements, presented draft goals and policies, and discussed the draft Housing Element update. County staff and the consultant team responded to questions and received feedback and direction from the Board with opportunities for the general public to comment.

**NOP Scoping Meeting.** On January 24, 2022, the County held a Public Scoping Meeting to take comments regarding the scope and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Housing Element update. The Scoping Meeting was held in a virtual format due to COVID restrictions.

**Public Review of the Draft and Final Housing Element Update Documents**
The Housing Element update is subject to the public review process, including environmental review in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a process which provides for community input. Opportunities for the public and governmental agencies to review and comment on the public review draft of the Housing Element is scheduled to occur as part of the update process before the document is revised and presented to County decision makers for their formal review and approval. The public review period will be 30 days. In addition, public participation is encouraged during scheduled informational study sessions with the Planning Commission and BOS (prior to the formal adoption) to provide an opportunity for decision makers to receive an update on the project and community engagement. After the public review period has concluded, a revised public draft will be compiled based on feedback received from the public as well as input from HCD, also with the feedback incorporated.

**Organization of the Housing Element**
Following this Introduction, the Housing Element includes the following major components:

**Section 2. Review of Prior Housing Element.** A review of the 2014-2022 Housing Element, including an analysis of the effectiveness and appropriateness of each program established for the previous housing element planning period.

**Section 3. Housing Goals, Policies, and Programs.** A series of goals, policies, and programs to address the County’s housing needs.
**Section 4.** Quantified Objectives. An estimate of the anticipated and potential housing development during the planning period, including units assisted through programs.

**Section 6.** Housing Needs Assessment. Analysis of housing conditions and needs in Napa County.

**Section 7.** Assessment of Fair Housing. Analysis of Fair Housing Issues in Napa County.

**Section 8.** Projected Housing Needs. A summary of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the 2023 to 2031 planning period.

**Section 9.** Housing Constraints. An evaluation of Governmental and Non-Governmental constraints on housing.

**Section 10.** Housing Sites Inventory. Analysis and identification of sites to accommodate the County’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

**Consistency with the General Plan**
State Law requires that General Plan elements be “integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies.” This implies that all elements have equal legal status and no one element is subordinate to any other element. The Housing Element must be consistent with land use goals and policies set forth in the Land Use Element, and closely coordinated with other elements of the General Plan. Concurrent with the Housing Element Update, the County is conducting an update of the Safety Element. As part of the adoption of the Housing Element Update, the County will modify policies in other elements if needed to achieve internal General Plan consistency.
2. REVIEW OF PRIOR HOUSING ELEMENT

Napa County adopted its 5th Cycle Housing Element for the 2015 to 2023 time period on December 16, 2014. The 2015 to 2023 Housing Element was built around eight goals, including:

5th Cycle Goals

GOAL H-1: Plan for the housing needs of all economic segments of the population residing in unincorporated Napa County.

GOAL H-2: Coordinate non-residential and residential goals, policies, and objectives with the cities and towns in Napa County to direct growth to urbanized areas, preserve agricultural land, and maintain a County-wide jobs/housing balance.

GOAL H-3: Support agricultural industries with a policy and regulatory environment that facilitates the provision of permanent and seasonal farmworker housing.

GOAL H-4: Maintain and upgrade the County’s housing stock and reduce the number of housing units lost through neglect, deterioration, or conversion from affordable to market-rate or to non-residential uses.

GOAL H-5: Maximize the provision of new affordable housing in both rental and ownership markets within unincorporated Napa County.

GOAL H-6: Maximize housing choice and economic integration, and eliminate housing discrimination in unincorporated Napa County based on race, age, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition, marital status, gender, self-identified gender or sexual orientation, or economic status.

GOAL H-7: Maintain an orderly pace of growth that helps the County preserve the public health, safety, and welfare and provide needed public services.

GOAL H-8: Increase energy efficiency and water conservation in new and existing residential structures in unincorporated Napa County.

5th Cycle Policies

The Napa County 5th Cycle Housing Element policies and corresponding implementation programs to support attainment of the County’s housing goals. The policies were organized around to topics of Rehabilitation, Affordability, Special Housing Needs, Housing Development, Removal of Governmental Constraints, and Energy and Water Conservation, as follows:
Rehabilitation Policies

**Policy H-1a:** Improve the quality of the County housing stock over time by ensuring that new units meet applicable codes and existing units found to be in violation are brought into compliance as opposed to removed, whenever possible.

**Policy H-1b:** Seek state and federal funding to assist qualified owners of rental properties with rehabilitation of identified substandard units, to the extent that these units are reserved for lower-income households.

Housing Affordability Policies

**Policy H-2a:** Work to reduce the cost of housing to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households through available local, state, federal, and private rental and homeownership assistance programs, including the County’s worker proximity housing program that encourages low- and moderate-income homebuyers, to purchase a home within 15 miles of their place of employment, by providing local down payment assistance.

**Policy H-2b:** Encourage the construction of new affordable housing units within designated urban areas at densities that are commensurate with the availability of public or private water and sewer systems. These units shall be affordable to persons of extremely low-, very low-, low- and/or moderate-income.

**Policy H-2c:** Use inclusionary housing to promote development of a full range of housing types in the County and ensure that multifamily projects and subdivisions include onsite affordable housing components.

**Policy H-2d:** Continue to ensure that the Growth Management System does not constrain affordable housing production by allowing unused Category 4 permits to accumulate indefinitely. (Also see Policy AG/LU-119.)

**Policy H-2e:** Continue to use the Affordable Housing (:AH) combination zoning district as an incentive for affordable housing production.

**Policy H-2f:** Continue to cooperate with the incorporated municipalities in Napa County by using the Affordable Housing Fund to assist with the construction or rehabilitation of affordable housing units in suitable locations and at suitable densities consistent with the Affordable Housing Ordinance and criteria when funds are available.

**Policy H-2g:** Encourage the provision of second units, as described in Government Code section 65852.2, in suitable locations.
Policy H-2h: Maximize the length of time that affordable housing units stay affordable, particularly when units are developed using Affordable Housing Fund monies, produced through the inclusionary housing program, built upon County-owned land, or receive other forms of County assistance. Typically such units shall be deed restricted as affordable for a minimum of 40 years.

Policy H-2i: Encourage the rehabilitation of mobile home parks to retain existing affordable units and/or provide new affordable units. To the extent allowed by law, prohibit the conversion of mobile home parks for replacement by housing for vacation use, second homes, or transient occupancy.

Policy H-2j: Support approaches to increasing funding for affordable housing that involve a range of industries that create demand for affordable housing units.

Special Housing Needs Policies

Policy H-3a: Work with the agricultural industry, its trade organizations, non-profit organizations, and public agencies to assess, plan for, and meet the needs of permanent and seasonal farmworkers, including farmworker families and unaccompanied farmworkers.

Policy H-3b: Work to ensure that migrant farmworker housing meets applicable health and safety standards.

Policy H-3c: Work in cooperation with other public and private agencies to prevent and remedy instances of housing discrimination within the unincorporated County.

Policy H-3d: Give priority to providing assistance for housing targeted to those groups with demonstrated special needs such as the elderly, disabled (including developmentally disabled), farmworkers (including increased emphasis on housing for farmworker families located near schools, retail, services, and transportation), and homeless, consistent with adopted funding criteria.

Policy H-3e: Support emergency and transitional housing programs through public and private service agencies.

Policy H-3f: Work with the cities to establish and operate adequate emergency shelters within the County and continue to provide adequate opportunity for the development of emergency shelters through County land use regulations.
**Policy H-3g**: Support design of residential structures to allow accessibility by all disabled and physically challenged residents and visitors to all future residential units (i.e., so called “Universal Design”).

*Housing Development Policies*

**Policy H-4a**: Permit multifamily housing within designated urban areas of the County where public services are adequate or can be made available. Individual single-family residences, legal accessory dwellings on commercially-zoned parcels, farm labor dwellings and farmworker housing, and second units may be located outside of designated urban areas.

**Policy H-4b**: Ensure that future housing growth continues to be consistent with the goals and policies of both the County’s Growth Management System (See Policy AG/LU-119 and the policies and programs in this Housing Element).

**Policy H-4c**: Explore housing transfer agreements and other collaborations with incorporated jurisdictions aimed at providing housing within urbanized areas of the County.

**Policy H-4d**: Consistent with Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element Policy AG/LU-15.5, continue to promote planning concepts and zoning standards, such as coverage and separation/buffering standards, to minimize the impact of new housing on County agricultural lands and conflicts between future residences and agricultural uses, including wineries.

**Policy H-4e**: Support housing production and maintain appropriate zoning in areas where the land and location can support increased densities and development of additional affordable housing units.

**Policy H-4f**: Consistent with Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Action Item 45.1 continue to facilitate the provision of accessory housing within commercial areas when compatible with adjacent commercial uses.

**Policy H-4g**: Establish preferences for local workers in new affordable housing projects, and provide similar “proximity” preferences for multifamily market rate housing to the extent permitted by law. As funds are available, provide assistance to households with local workers.

**Policy H-4h**: Manage housing growth to maximize protection of agricultural lands and recognize the County’s limited ability to provide services.

**Policy H-4i**: To the maximum extent feasible, manage housing growth to keep pace with the creation of jobs.
**Consider New Policy H4j**: To the maximum extent feasible, promote the development of housing concurrent with new non-residential development.

**Policies Regarding Removal of Governmental Constraints**

**Policy H-5a**: Reduce, defer, or waive planning, building, and/or development impact fees when non-profit developers propose new affordable housing development projects.

**Policy H-5b**: Expedite permit processing for projects that meet or exceed the County’s inclusionary requirements by providing affordable units on-site.

**Energy and Water Conservation Policies**

**Policy H-6a**: Encourage mixed-use development and appropriate housing densities in suitable locations within designated urban areas to facilitate access by foot, bicycle, and/or mass transit to and from commercial services and job locations, educational facilities and to minimize energy and water usage.

**Policy H-6b**: In site development standards for major projects, promote and encourage design and landscaping to reduce the use of fossil fuels and water and encourage utilization of solar energy and recycled water, through such means as mixed-use guidelines, drought-resistant vegetation, solar access design, shading standards, modified parking standards when appropriate, and reduced street widths.

**Policy H-6c**: Consistent with General Plan Policy CON-65 and CON-67, consider greenhouse gas emissions in the review of discretionary housing projects and promote “green building” design.

**Policy H-6d**: Use the County building code, including the County’s implementation of the CalGreen code, to encourage and provide incentives for retro-fitting existing buildings and designing new buildings that reduce the use of fossil fuels and water through energy conservation and the utilization of renewable resources.

The County’s 5th Cycle Housing Goals remain largely relevant today and the 6th Cycle Housing Element updates, rather than completely overhauls the housing goals and policy framework to reflect evolving challenges and priorities, including issues such as wildfire re-construction and embracing a new statewide emphasis on affirmatively furthering fair housing.

**5th Cycle RHNA**

In addition to reflecting local needs and priorities, the 2015-2023 Housing Element also incorporated the County’s 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), which identified the number of new housing units for which the County was required to provide
sufficient sites for construction. The following summarizes the County’s 5th Cycle RHNA as well as the housing production to date during the 5th Cycle:

**Table 4: 5th Cycle RHNA and Housing Production to Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th Cycle RHNA (units)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Cycle Production through 2021</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5th Cycle Quantified Objectives**

Considering its available resources and the constraints in the local housing market, Napa County established the following quantified objectives for the construction, rehabilitation, and conservation/preservation of housing units for the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element:

**Table 5: 5th Cycle Quantified Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Extremely Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>15 (b)</td>
<td>15 (b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) The objective was the conservation of the County’s three farmworker housing centers.
(b) The objective was direct involvement in the conservation of 15 low- and 15 moderate-income mobile home units through assistance with code compliance, rehabilitation assistance and/or other financial assistance.

The County’s 5th Cycle objectives for new housing unit construction mirrored the County’s RHNA for the period, splitting the RHNA for the very low-income category roughly equally between the extremely low-income and very low-income construction objectives.

**Progress Implementing 2015 to 2023 Housing Element Programs**

Napa County has made good progress in implementing its programs from the 5th Cycle Housing Element. Appendix B contains a summary of the implementation status of each of the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element’s implementation programs, as reported in the County’s 2021 Annual Progress Report to the State Department of Housing and Community Development.

**Evaluation of 5th Cycle Programs and Status for 6th Cycle Housing Element**

As summarized in Appendix B, many of the Housing Element programs from the 5th Cycle remain relevant with updated housing goals and policies; however, some programs called for
one-time actions that have been completed or are no longer relevant. The following is a discussion of 5th Cycle programs that are being eliminated or substantially modified for the 6th Cycle:

- Program H-2a focused on the affordable housing sites identified in the 5th Cycle Housing Element. Because the 6th Cycle Housing Element identifies different sites in the sites inventory, this program is updated to support the development of lower-income housing on those sites that are included in the sites inventory.

- Program H-2i will be expanded to provide financial assistance for deed-restricted JADUs as well as ADUs.

- Program H-2j had limited effectiveness in preventing the conversion of mobilehome parks to other uses. This program will be modified for the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

- Programs H-2l (inventory of surplus county land) and H-2m (water supply for Napa Pipe project) were completed but the program will be modified for the 6th Cycle to focus on facilitating development of the new County-owned Spanish Flat location that is include in the 6th Cycle housing sites inventory.

- Program H-3d which included a goal including at least 10 percent of households assisted with Affordable Housing Fund monies is expanded to also include a goal those assisted to include at least 10 percent senior households.

- Program H3-e to assist in the preservation of private farmworker housing is retained and expanded to include assistance for preservation of mobilehome parks.

- Program H-3i soliciting developer requests for Affordable Housing Fund monies for projects that will address unmet needs is retained and modified to include an emphasis on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing through funding criteria.

- Program H-3j which involved amendments to the County Code to align with state law was completed but is retained and modified to specify new County Code amendments necessary to align with new changes in state law.

- Zoning ordinance updates specified in Program H-3j were completed. A modified program to complete zoning ordinance updates needed to comply with recent State housing laws is included in the 6th Cycle Housing Element programs.
• Program H-4b which allocates Affordable Housing Fund monies to affordable housing development in the cities is retained but modified to include an emphasis on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing via funding criteria.

• Program H-4d (ADUs in commercial zones) is deleted from the programs list, but the County will continue this, consistent with the current Zoning Ordinance.

• Program H-4e (collaboration with Napa Pipe developers to support a 140-unit affordable housing project) was completed and will not be included in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

• Program H-4f (SROs in zones that allow multifamily housing) is being deleted from the 6th Cycle programs list, but the County will continue to allow SROs in zones that allow multifamily housing, consistent with the current Zoning Ordinance.

• Program H-6d was completed and will be modified for the 6th Cycle Housing Element to focus on promoting the PACE program and helping property owners to make energy improvements to housing.

(Note that program numbering for programs to be carried over as 6th Cycle programs may be different than the 5th Cycle program numbers referenced above.)

Effectiveness of the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element

On an overall level, the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element was effective in guiding achievement of Napa County’s housing goals and objectives. In particular, the County issued building permits for 175 housing units between 2015 and 2021, just short of the total unit count for its quantified objective for new construction and overall RHNA (180).

Like most jurisdictions, the County is falling short of its objectives in the production housing units affordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. However, the County has already exceeded its objectives for production of housing units for moderate- and above moderate-income housing units.

The overall production numbers reflect the strong demand for housing in Napa County and the County’s ability to work with the developer community to deliver new housing units in response to that demand. At the same time, the fact that the permit activity for above moderate- and moderate-income units (i.e., market rate units) exceeds the RHNA targets and the County’s own objectives and the permit activity for below market rate units reflects the limited resources available to develop subsidized housing that can meet the needs of moderate- and lower-income households.
With respect to its housing rehabilitation objectives for the 5th Cycle, Napa County worked with Habitat for Humanity to assist one mobilehome owner whose unit was in need of replacement and is currently in the process of assisting with a second mobilehome unit.

With respect to the County’s housing conservation objectives, the County was successful in conserving and maintaining its three farmworker housing centers; however, it was not as successful with its objective of conserving mobilehome units. The County has lost a number of mobilehome units due to fire (58 units, including 44 units in Spanish Flat Mobile Villa, 13 units in Mund Mobile Home Park, and one unit in Capell Valley Mobile Homes Park).

The County has considered the effectiveness of the 5th Cycle Housing Element goals, policies, and programs in completing updates to incorporate into the 6th Cycle Housing Element Update, which are presented in the chapter that follows.
3. HOUSING GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

This chapter is the core of the Napa County Housing Element, as it lays out the County’s housing goals; the policies that will guide County actions to achieving those goals; and the programs that the County will implement in the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Planning period to work toward its goals.

Housing Goals
This section articulates each of Napa County’s housing goals. A series of supporting policies accompanies each goal. Along with other goals and policies contained in other elements of the General Plan, County decision-makers and County staff will use these goals and policies to guide their work in administering their duties. In particular, housing developments and other projects affecting housing within Napa County must be consistent with these goals and policies.

GOAL H-1: Plan for the housing needs of all economic segments of the population residing in unincorporated Napa County.

GOAL H-2: Coordinate non-residential and residential goals, policies, and objectives with the cities and towns in Napa County to direct growth to urbanized areas, preserve agricultural land, and maintain a County-wide jobs/housing balance.

GOAL H-3: Support agricultural industries with a policy and regulatory environment that facilitates the provision of permanent and seasonal farmworker housing.

GOAL H-4: Maintain and upgrade the County’s housing stock and reduce the number of housing units lost through neglect, deterioration, or conversion from affordable to market-rate or to non-residential uses.

GOAL H-5: Facilitate rebuilding of housing lost in wildfires.

GOAL H-6: Maximize the provision of new affordable housing in both rental and ownership markets within unincorporated Napa County.

GOAL H-7: Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by maximizing housing choice and economic integration, and eliminating housing discrimination in unincorporated Napa County based on race, age, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition, marital status, gender, self-identified gender or sexual orientation, or economic status.
GOAL H-8: Maintain an orderly pace of growth that helps the County preserve the public health, safety, and welfare and provide needed public services.

GOAL H-9: Increase energy efficiency and water conservation in new and existing residential structures in unincorporated Napa County.

**Housing Policies**

**HOUSING REHABILITATION POLICIES**

**Policy H-1a:** Improve the quality of the County housing stock over time by ensuring that new units meet applicable codes and existing units found to be in violation are brought into compliance as opposed to removed, whenever possible.

**Policy H-1b:** Seek state and federal funding to assist qualified owners of rental properties with rehabilitation of identified substandard units, to the extent that these units are reserved for lower-income households.

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY POLICIES**

**Policy H-2a:** Work to reduce the cost of housing to extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households through available local, state, federal, and private rental and homeownership assistance programs, including the County’s worker proximity housing program that encourages low- and moderate-income homebuyers, to purchase a home within 15 miles of their place of employment, by providing local down payment assistance.

**Policy H-2b:** Encourage the construction of new affordable housing units within designated urban areas at densities that are commensurate with the availability of public or private water and sewer systems. These units shall be affordable to persons of extremely low-, very low-, low- and/or moderate-income.

**Policy H-2c:** Use inclusionary housing to promote development of a full range of housing types in the County and ensure that multifamily projects and subdivisions include onsite affordable housing components.

**Policy H-2d:** Continue to ensure that the Growth Management System does not constrain affordable housing production by allowing unused Category 4 permits to accumulate indefinitely. (Also see Policy AG/LU-119.)

**Policy H-2e:** Continue to use the Affordable Housing (:AH) combination zoning district as an incentive for affordable housing production.
Policy H-2f: Continue to cooperate with the incorporated municipalities in Napa County by using the Affordable Housing Fund to assist with the construction or rehabilitation of affordable housing units in suitable locations and at suitable densities consistent with the Affordable Housing Ordinance and criteria when funds are available.

Policy H-2g: Encourage the provision of second units, as described in Government Code section 65852.2, in suitable locations.

Policy H-2h: Maximize the length of time that affordable housing units stay affordable, particularly when units are developed using Affordable Housing Fund monies, produced through the inclusionary housing program, built upon County-owned land, or receive other forms of County assistance. Typically such units shall be deed restricted as affordable for a minimum of 40 years.

Policy H-2i: Encourage the rehabilitation of mobile home parks to retain existing affordable units and/or provide new affordable units. To the extent allowed by law, prohibit the conversion of mobile home parks for replacement by housing for vacation use, second homes, or transient occupancy.

Policy H-2j: Support approaches to increasing funding for affordable housing that involve a range of industries that create demand for affordable housing units.

SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING POLICIES

Policy H-3a: Work with the agricultural industry, its trade organizations, non-profit organizations, and public agencies to assess, plan for, and meet the needs of permanent and seasonal farmworkers, including farmworker families and unaccompanied farmworkers.

Policy H-3b: Work to ensure that migrant farmworker housing meets applicable health and safety standards.

Policy H-3c: Work in cooperation with other public and private agencies to prevent and remedy instances of housing discrimination within the unincorporated County.

Policy H-3d: Give priority to providing assistance for housing targeted to those groups with demonstrated special needs such as the elderly, disabled (including developmentally disabled), farmworkers (including increased emphasis on housing for farmworker families located near schools, retail, services, and transportation), and homeless, consistent with adopted funding criteria.

Policy H-3e: Support emergency and transitional housing programs through public and private service agencies.
**Policy H-3f:** Work with the cities to establish and operate adequate emergency shelters within the County and continue to provide adequate opportunity for the development of emergency shelters through County land use regulations.

**Policy H-3g:** Support design of residential structures to allow accessibility by all disabled and physically challenged residents and visitors to all future residential units (i.e., so called “Universal Design”).

**HOUSING DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

**Policy H-4a:** Permit multifamily housing within designated urban areas of the County where public services are adequate or can be made available. Individual single-family residences, legal accessory dwellings on commercially-zoned parcels, farm labor dwellings and farmworker housing, and second units may be located outside of designated urban areas.

**Policy H-4b:** Ensure that future housing growth continues to be consistent with the goals and policies of both the County’s Growth Management System (See Policy AG/LU-119 and the policies and programs in this Housing Element).

**Policy H-4c:** Explore housing transfer agreements and other collaborations with incorporated jurisdictions aimed at providing housing within urbanized areas of the County.

**Policy H-4d:** Consistent with Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element Policy AG/LU-15.5, continue to promote planning concepts and zoning standards, such as coverage and separation/buffering standards, to minimize the impact of new housing on County agricultural lands and conflicts between future residences and agricultural uses, including wineries.

**Policy H-4e:** Support housing production and maintain appropriate zoning in areas where the land and location can support increased densities and development of additional affordable housing units.

**Policy H-4f:** Consistent with Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Action Item 45.1 continue to facilitate the provision of accessory housing within commercial areas when compatible with adjacent commercial uses.

**Policy H-4g:** Establish preferences for local workers in new affordable housing projects, and provide similar “proximity” preferences for multifamily market rate housing to the extent permitted by law. As funds are available, provide assistance to households with local workers.

**Policy H-4h:** Manage housing growth to maximize protection of agricultural lands and recognize the County’s limited ability to provide services.
**Policy H-4i:** To the maximum extent feasible, manage housing growth to keep pace with the creation of jobs.

**Policy H-4j:** To the maximum extent feasible, promote the development of housing concurrent with new non-residential development.

**Policy H-4k:** Expedite the permitting process for re-construction of housing units lost in wildfires.

**POLICIES REGARDING THE REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT CONSTRAINTS**

**Policy H-5a:** Reduce, defer, or waive planning, building, and/or development impact fees when non-profit developers propose new affordable housing development projects.

**Policy H-5b:** Expedite permit processing for projects that meet or exceed the County’s inclusionary requirements by providing affordable units on-site.

**ENERGY AND WATER CONSERVATION POLICIES**

**Policy H-6a:** Encourage mixed-use development and appropriate housing densities in suitable locations within designated urban areas to facilitate access by foot, bicycle, and/or mass transit to and from commercial services and job locations, educational facilities and to minimize energy and water usage.

**Policy H-6b:** In site development standards for major projects, promote and encourage design and landscaping to reduce the use of fossil fuels and water and encourage utilization of solar energy and recycled water, through such means as mixed-use guidelines, drought-resistant vegetation, solar access design, shading standards, modified parking standards when appropriate, and reduced street widths.

**Policy H-6c:** Consistent with General Plan Policy CON-65 and CON-67, consider greenhouse gas emissions in the review of discretionary housing projects and promote “green building” design.

**Policy H-6d:** Use the County building code, including the County’s implementation of the CalGreen code, to encourage and provide incentives for retro-fitting existing buildings and designing new buildings that reduce the use of fossil fuels and water through energy conservation and the utilization of renewable resources.
POLICIES TO AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHER FAIR HOUSING

Policy H-7a: In discretionary decision-making on housing-related matters, prioritize decisions that promote equitable access to housing and opportunity for current and prospective residents.

Policy H-7b: In allocation of County resources for affordable housing, prioritize projects that promote integrating and diversifying the population within Napa County and provide lower-income households with access to housing in high resource areas.

In addition, see AFFH-related policies in other sections:
Policy H-3c: Work in cooperation with other public and private agencies to prevent and remedy instances of housing discrimination within the unincorporated County.

Policy H-3d: Give priority to providing assistance for housing targeted to those groups with demonstrated special needs such as the elderly, disabled (including developmentally disabled), farmworkers (including increased emphasis on housing for farmworker families located near schools, retail, services, and transportation), and homeless, consistent with adopted funding criteria.

Policy H-3g: Support design of residential structures to allow accessibility by all disabled and physically challenged residents and visitors to all future residential units (i.e., so called “Universal Design”).

Policy H-5a: Reduce, defer, or waive planning, building, and/or development impact fees when non-profit developers propose new affordable housing development projects.

Policy H-5b: Expedite permit processing for projects that meet or exceed the County’s inclusionary requirements by providing affordable units on-site.

Housing Programs
As mentioned previously, many 5th Cycle Housing Element programs remain relevant and have been carried forward for the 6th Cycle. As noted in Appendix B, modifications have been made to many of the retained programs to reflect current conditions and new emphasis for the 6th Cycle, including Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. Table 6, on the following pages, contains the 6th Cycle Housing Element programs. For each program, the table includes a description, a statement of the program objective, the timing for implementation during the 2023 to 2031 planning period, and identification of the County department(s) that will be responsible for implementation.
### Table 6: 6th Cycle Housing Element Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6th CYCLE HOUSING PROGRAMS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Rehabilitation Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-1a:</strong> Continue to inspect housing in response to complaints, and work with property owners to bring units up to current housing code standards. Make property owners aware that financial assistance is available for properties housing lower-income</td>
<td><strong>Objective H-1a:</strong> Through code enforcement efforts and funding assistance, the County will seek to facilitate the rehabilitation of 10 housing units in fair or dilapidated condition in the County or in the Cities that are occupied by low- (4 units), very low- (4 units), or extremely low-income (2 units) households during the planning period.</td>
<td>Ongoing as complaints are received.</td>
<td>PBES Code Enforcement Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-1b:</strong> To the extent permitted by law, implement a program to enable non-profit organizations to apply for the use of up to 10 percent of new funds annually to fund projects and programs designed to correct health and safety hazards in owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing that is reserved for low-, very low-, or extremely low-income households.</td>
<td><strong>Objective H-1b:</strong> The County will seek to make available up to 10 percent of new Affordable Housing Fund money annually to leverage federal, state, and other public and private housing rehabilitation funds.</td>
<td>Annually, through NOFA process.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-1c:</strong> In addition to the priorities identified in Policy AG/LU-118, assign high priority to abatement of illegal vacation rentals, ensuring that existing dwelling units are used as residences, rather than tourist accommodations.</td>
<td><strong>Objective H-1c:</strong> Increase availability of housing by eliminating all illegal vacation rentals.</td>
<td>Ongoing as illegal vacation rentals are reported to County or detected.</td>
<td>PBES, Code Enforcement Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Affordability Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-2a:</strong> Prioritize the use of funds for development of Affordable Housing Combination District (‘AH overlay) sites and other sites supporting affordable housing development and identified in the 6th Cycle Housing Site Inventory, and continue to work with interested parties to encourage their development of the sites under the ‘AH provisions.</td>
<td><strong>Objective H-2a:</strong> The County will seek to facilitate the development of lower income units by prioritizing its Affordable Housing Fund monies to assist affordable housing development on at least one housing site identified in the 6th Cycle Housing Sites Inventory, with the objective of permitting and assisting development of at least 25 affordable units during the planning period (10 moderate-, 8 low-, and 7 very low-income units, with a goal of half of the very low-income units serving the extremely low-income level).</td>
<td>Ongoing; the County will seek to partner with a property owner/developer on at least one site from the 6th Cycle housing sites inventory during the planning period.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division; PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2b: Continue to encourage greater provision of affordable housing units in conjunction with market rate projects by implementing the Affordable Housing Ordinance. Conduct new nexus analysis to update inclusionary requirements (including addition of rental inclusionary component) and in-lieu fee rates, to strike a balance between market rate development feasibility and affordable housing needs.</td>
<td>Objective H-2b: Affirmatively further fair housing by encouraging provision of affordable housing units integrated with market rate housing units via onsite inclusionary requirements.</td>
<td>Ongoing; complete ordinance updates by December, 2025.</td>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2c: Continue to generate affordable housing funds in conjunction with new job-generating development via the commercial housing impact fee. Update the nexus and economic feasibility studies to determine if the fees may be increased given current economic conditions.</td>
<td>Objective H-2c: Generate commercial impact fees to mitigate the impact of commercial development on the need for affordable housing to the extent consistent with economic feasibility. Generate commercial impact fee funds sufficient to assist in the development of 10 below market rate housing units.</td>
<td>Ongoing, complete nexus analysis and update fee schedule by December, 2025.</td>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2d: Through a Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA) process, notify the public of available special assistance programs in coordination with the cities and other public and private agencies, using brochures and news releases.</td>
<td>Objective H-2d: Provide the public with notice of available assistance programs at least every other year during the planning period.</td>
<td>Annually, through NOFA process</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2e: Continue program of exempting all secondary residential units from the Growth Management System (GMS).</td>
<td>Objective H-2e: The County will seek to facilitate the development at least 72 second units in zoning districts where they are allowed during the planning period.</td>
<td>Ongoing as applications are submitted.</td>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2f: Continue to require new affordable housing development projects receiving Affordable Housing Fund monies or any other type of County assistance, as well as those units built as part of the County’s inclusionary housing requirement, to apply deed restrictions that will require affordability of assisted low- and very low-income units for a minimum of 40 years.</td>
<td>Objective H-2f: Ensure long-term affordability of all new housing units receiving County assistance.</td>
<td>Ongoing as projects are funded.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division; PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2g: Continue to use the Affordable Housing (‘AH) Combination District as a tool to provide specific and reasonable development standards and stimulate affordable housing production in designated locations.</td>
<td>Objective H-2g: For ‘AH sites established for 5th Housing Element Cycle or earlier, evaluate and modify the AH requirements to reduce the amount of affordable housing that must be provided for development under the ‘AH provisions as a way to better incentivize the development of housing on these sites.</td>
<td>Ongoing; update ‘AH requirements by January, 2024.</td>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2h: Continue to implement the County’s worker proximity housing program that encourages low- and moderate-income homebuyers, to purchase a home within 20 miles of their place of employment, by providing local down payment assistance.</td>
<td>Objective H-2h: Provide downpayment assistance to 240 low- and/or moderate-income households during the planning period.</td>
<td>Ongoing as applications are received.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2i: Continue to offer financial assistance to property owners who are interested in building second units, including ADUs and JADUs, that would be deed restricted for use by very low- or low-income residents.</td>
<td>Objective H-2i: Assist 45 property owners who commit to deed restrict ADU/JADUs for use by very low- or low-income residents.</td>
<td>Ongoing as applications are received.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2j: Maintain the affordable housing provided in existing mobile home parks to the extent permitted by State law. Existing mobile home parks may be redeveloped, including adding up to 25 percent more units than the number of units allowed by their underlying zoning, provided that the adverse impact of such redevelopment on existing residents, including impact to housing affordability and displacement, is fully analyzed and mitigated. Rezone sites to allow MHP use only.</td>
<td>Objective H-2j: Discourage conversion of existing mobilehome parks to other uses.</td>
<td>Conversion density bonus – Ongoing; rezone for exclusive MHP use by December, 2025.</td>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2k: Continue to allow infrastructure improvements as an eligible cost under the Affordable Housing Ordinance, and work with affected agencies to pursue grant money to improve water and sewer infrastructure on the 6th cycle sites within the inventory and other sites that accommodate lower-income housing to address RHNA requirements.</td>
<td>Objective H-2k: Assist in application for at least one grant for water and/or sewer improvements on a site identified in the 6th Cycle Housing Sites Inventory.</td>
<td>Ongoing; work to pursue grant funding to assist at least one project during the planning period.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2l: Study vacancy tax on housing units not used for permanent residences, to be directed to Affordable Housing Fund to determine effectiveness and feasibility of such a tax and determine whether to place on ballot in 2026.</td>
<td>Objective H-2l: Increase the number of housing units that are available for occupancy by year round residents.</td>
<td>Conduct study of potential tax by January 2025.</td>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Special Needs Housing Programs

**Program H-3a:** Continue the County’s program of inspecting migrant farm labor housing to ensure compliance with state standards. Efforts will be made to seek compliance to avoid closure of such facilities.

**Objective H-3a:** Ensure 100 percent of migrant farmworker units are maintained in sound condition throughout the planning period.

Inspect annually and follow-up as necessary.

PBES, Code Enforcement Division

**Program H-3b:** Continue to contract with Fair Housing Napa Valley or another capable organization that will review housing discrimination complaints, attempt to facilitate equitable resolution of complaints and, where necessary, refer complainants to the appropriate County, State, or Federal authorities for further investigation and action. At a minimum, presentations, materials, and announcements will be provided in English and Spanish.

**Objective H-3b:**
- Public outreach and education events in north, south, and mid-county locations (2 times during planning cycle)
- Outreach and education events for rental housing property managers and Realtors (2 times during planning period)
- Continuous distribution of fair housing information in publicly visible locations, such as libraries, bulletin boards in businesses, etc., throughout the county.
- Public service announcements in newspapers, local television, radio targeting different demographic groups (at least twice a year during the planning cycle)

Incorporate objectives upon renewal of contract with FHNV or other appropriate provider.

CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division

**Program H-3c:** Continue to contribute towards the annual operating costs of local emergency shelters and transitional housing where such funds are available and their use legally permissible.

**Objective H-3c:** Provide Affordable Housing Fund resources for the development and operation of emergency shelter and transitional housing facilities for 8 additional homeless families in a partnership between the County Department of Health and Human Services and a non-profit.

Ongoing; allocate funds annually as part of budget process.

CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division

**Program H-3d:** To the extent permitted by law, continue to require a preference for local workers, including farmworker households, in affordable housing developments assisted with Affordable Housing Fund monies, with a goal of including farmworker households in at least 10 percent of the units assisted with Affordable Housing Fund money and seniors in at least 10 percent of units assisted with Affordable Housing Fund money. The County will monitor the percentage of farmworker households occupying housing units assisted with Affordable Housing Fund money in conjunction with income eligibility monitoring for affordable housing units.

**Objective H-3d:**
- Encourage and facilitate development of 12 new farm labor dwellings on agriculturally-zoned properties and encourage; facilitate development of one new multifamily housing complex targeted to families with members who work within the County; include seniors as at least 10 percent of households assisted with Affordable Housing Fund monies.
- Annually, as part of NOFA process.

CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-3e: Facilitate public/private partnerships and, when appropriate and available, use Affordable Housing Fund monies to help prevent the loss of privately owned farmworker housing facilities serving six or more individuals when private owners are no longer able or willing to do so. The County will approach farmworker housing owners at the time it becomes aware of a potential closure of a private farmworker housing facility. The County’s Division of Environmental Health monitors the status of private farmworker housing facilities serving six or more individuals on an annual basis and will evaluate the efficacy of the program in helping to preserve existing units, and propose modifications to the program if units are lost.</th>
<th>Objective H-3e: Provide financial assistance to incentivize owners to maintain existing supply of privately owned farmworker housing units.</th>
<th>Ongoing; conduct outreach to owners when County becomes aware of potential closures.</th>
<th>PBES, Environmental Health Division; CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program H-3f: Continue to monitor the need for farm worker housing throughout the harvest season.</td>
<td>Objective H-3f: Track the utilization of farmworker housing and determine if additional housing is needed.</td>
<td>Annually, during harvest season.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-3g: Work to identify a site and funding for a new farmworker family housing development and prioritize use of resources available to support new farmworker housing accordingly.</td>
<td>Objective H-3g: Identify at least one site and pursue funding to assist in new farmworker housing development during the planning period.</td>
<td>Identify at least one suitable site by June, 2024</td>
<td>PBES; CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-3h: Conduct an analysis to identify sites within the unincorporated area where up to 12 units of onsite farmworker housing could be developed, which are near cities and in locations where schools, transit, services, and shopping are relatively easily accessible. The County will provide owners of identified properties with information about opportunities to build farmworker housing on their sites, including potential County assistance.</td>
<td>Objective H-3h: Conduct outreach to at least 10 owners of suitable property during the planning period.</td>
<td>Conduct outreach to owners by December, 2023; follow up as necessary with interested owners.</td>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-3i: In soliciting developer requests for Affordable Housing Fund monies, encourage developers to propose projects that can address unmet needs for housing with supportive services for the disabled (including the developmentally disabled) and projects serving other populations on sites in high resource areas through funding criteria that Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.</td>
<td>Objective H-3i: Encourage development of at least one project that targets special needs populations within a high resource area during the planning period.</td>
<td>Annually, as part of NOFA process.</td>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Housing Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-4a: Consistent with Conservation Element Policy Con-66 continue the program of providing local worker or “proximity” preferences to new affordable housing projects and continue providing assistance to local workers who buy homes in market rate projects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective H-4a:</strong> Assist 240 Local employees to purchase homes as part of proximity preference program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing as applications are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-4b: Continue to allocate Affordable Housing Fund monies to affordable housing developments in the cities when funds are available and such allocation is consistent with the Affordable Housing Ordinance and criteria. The County will continue to work with the cities to establish and update a list of criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals for use of Affordable Housing Fund monies, with priority for projects that serve extremely low income households and projects that place affordable housing in high resource areas. The County will use a NOFA process to solicit applications on an annual basis and the funding criteria will emphasize Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective H-4b:</strong> Assist 200 lower-income housing units and 50 extremely low-income housing units in the cities during the planning period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually, as part of NOFA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-4c: Consistent with Agriculture and Land Use Policy AG/LU-15.5, staff of the County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services will review and recommend to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors appropriate changes to planning and zoning standards that minimize any conflicts between housing and agriculture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective H-4c:</strong> Review planning and zoning standards at least once during the planning period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors and recommend updates by January, 2027.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-4d: Housing Sites Rezoning. Rezone sites at a minimum density of 20 units per acre to accommodate the County’s lower income housing need of 61 lower income units, ensuring that the sites affirmatively further fair housing. If applicable, require replacement housing consistent with Section 65915(c) on all sites designed for housing in the Housing Element.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective H-4d:</strong> Provide adequate sites to fully accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA, and require replacement housing on all designated sites, if applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 to 3 years of January 31, 2023, as applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-4e: No Net Loss Monitoring. If sites are developed during the planning period at lower density or at a different income level than shown in this Housing Element, make findings required by Section 65863 to determine whether adequate sites exist at all income levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-4f: Facilitate rebuilding process for mobilehome parks lost in wildfires, such as Spanish Flat MHP, by offering technical assistance and working with property owners to increase residential density above prior levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-4g: Facilitate subdivision of any parcel over 10 acres in size within the Site Inventory for multiple family development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-4h: Provide Housing Element copy to water and sewer providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-4i: Pursue housing subsidy funding for farmworker housing from sources such as State Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Farmworker Set-Aside and/or USDA Rural Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-4j: Develop an ordinance which would require onsite employee housing as part of large non-residential developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to Remove Constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-5a</strong>: Continue to provide fee waivers for nonprofit affordable housing developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-5b</strong>: Expedite permit processing for housing projects that will serve very low-, low-, and moderate-income households when such projects provide adequate assurances of long-term affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-5c</strong>: Exempt affordable housing projects from the 30-acre minimum parcel size requirement for PD zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-5d</strong>: Continue to monitor the Growth Management System by (i) continuing the practice of accumulating unused Category 4 (affordable) permits indefinitely; (ii) continuing the practice of accumulating unused permits in other categories for three years; (iii) consolidating implementation of Category 1-3 permits except when a lottery is required; and (iv) simplifying periodic updates to the permit limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-5e</strong>: Staff will report to the Board of Supervisors on the status of housing entitlement processing on priority sites and, if necessary, recommend changes in policies and regulations as appropriate to promote their development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Program H-5f: Update County Code to Align with State Housing Laws

**Objective H-5f:**
- Implement Requirements of SB 9
- Add definition of Low-Barrier Navigation Centers to Zoning Code and identify zoning districts where they will be allowed by-right, consistent with GC Section 65660 et. seq.
- Review and revise the Density Bonus provisions to be consistent with current state law.
- Provide all information required by GC Section 64940.1 subd. (a)(1)(A) through (E) accessible via links on a single County web page.
- Review and revise design standards to provide objective standards.
- Establish a process for streamlining affordable housing projects consistent with SB 35.
- Eliminate requirement for CUP for multifamily residential projects in the RM zone.
- Modify parking requirements for emergency shelters to eliminate the component requiring 1 space for every four shelter beds.
- Modify requirements for permanent supportive housing developments to provide for permit streamlining consistent with GC Section 65650 et. seq.
- Modify Zoning Code to allow residential care facilities (small) in zones where mobilehomes and multifamily housing is allowed.
- Modify Zoning Code to remove CUP requirement for residential care facilities (medium) in residential zones and make further modifications to ensure that residential care facilities (medium) and residential care facilities (large) be treated the same as other residential structures of the same type in the same zone.
- Modify Zoning Code to make ADUs a permitted use in the AP zone.

### Programs to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-6a: Affirmative Marketing of Affordable Housing Opportunities</th>
<th>Objective H-6a: Affirmatively market affordable housing opportunities to farmworkers whenever wait lists open for affordable projects. Partner with schools, churches, and non-profit organizations to connect with farmworker populations.</th>
<th>Complete Code updates by December, 2023.</th>
<th>PBES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program H-6b: Partner with Bureau of Reclamation and private concessionaires to increase opportunity for residents within the Lake Berryessa area.</td>
<td>Objective H-6b: Via the RFP process for new concessionaires at Lake Berryessa, increase access to jobs, shopping, and services for current and future residents of Lake Berryessa area.</td>
<td>4 RFPs have already been issued; release 3 additional RFPs within the planning period.</td>
<td>CEO, PBES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also Programs H-1b (Rehabilitation funds for ELI, VLI, and LI housing); H-2b (Inclusionary Housing); H2-h (Worker Proximity downpayment assistance program); H2-j (Mobilehome Park conservation); H3-b (Fair housing services); H3-d (Farmworker preference in projects receiving Affordable Housing Fund assistance); H3-i (Prioritization of housing with supportive services for disabled and prioritization affordable housing in high resource areas); and H-4b: (Allocation of Affordable Housing Fund monies for projects in the cities with criteria emphasizing AFFH).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs for Energy and Water Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-7a:</strong> As part of the development review process for major projects, encourage mixed-use development, such as Napa Pipe, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program H-7b:</strong> Continue to enforce current state mandated standards governing the use of energy efficient construction, and continue to implement green building standards in building code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

State Housing Element Law requires that each jurisdiction establish quantified objectives for Housing Element planning period. Quantified objectives differ from the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) because they include not only targets for production of new housing units by household income level, but also include targets for rehabilitation of housing units and targets for conservation of housing units. In addition, local jurisdictions set their quantified objectives based on their realistic assessment of what can be achieved during the Housing Element planning period. Thus, the quantified objectives for housing production may differ from the local jurisdiction’s RHNA for new housing units for the same planning period. The distinction is that the RHNA requires that the County provide sufficient land, appropriately zoned, to accommodate construction of the targeted number of housing units, while the quantified objective for housing production represents the number of housing units that the local jurisdiction expects to be built, considering market conditions, financial resources, and other factors. The following provides Napa County’s quantified objectives for new unit construction, rehabilitation of existing housing units, and conservation of existing affordable housing units at-risk of conversion to market rates during the 2023 to 2031 planning period.

As shown in Table 7, for new construction, the County’s quantified objectives for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income housing units are tied to its objectives connected with Housing Element housing development programs, (see Section 3). Those quantified objectives may include housing units to be built within the cities that Napa County helps to fund. The County’s quantified objective for new moderate-income housing production is tied to its estimate of expected ADU construction for units affordable at the moderate-income level, as discussed in Section 9 (Housing Sites Inventory). The County’s quantified objective for above moderate-income housing new construction is based on expectations for new market rate housing development activity during the planning period.

For rehabilitation, the County’s quantified objectives for are tied to the County’s objectives for Program H-1a, which call for assisting with the rehabilitation of two units occupied by extremely low-income households, four units occupied by very low-income households, and four units occupied by low-income households.

Napa County’s housing conservation objectives include three very low-income units, ten low-income units, and ten moderate-income units.
Table 7: 6th Cycle Quantified Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Extremely Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

California Housing Element law requires local governments to adequately plan for the existing and projected future housing needs of their residents, including the jurisdictions’ fair share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). A complete and thorough analysis must include both a quantification and a descriptive analysis of the specific housing needs that currently exist and those that are reasonably anticipated within the community during the planning period, as well as the resources available to address those needs. The following section summarizes information regarding existing and projected housing needs in Napa County.

Introduction
The Bay Area continues to see growth in both population and jobs, which means more housing of various types and sizes is needed to ensure that residents across all income levels, ages, and abilities have a place to call home. While people have continued to be drawn to the region over the past 30 years, housing production has not kept up with the growth of jobs and population, a significant factor in the housing shortage that communities are experiencing today. In many communities in the region, this has resulted in existing residents being priced out, increased traffic congestion caused by longer commutes, and fewer people across incomes being able to purchase homes or meet surging rents.

The 2023-2031 Housing Element Update provides a roadmap for how to meet growth and housing challenges. Required by the state, the Housing Element identifies existing housing conditions and community needs, reiterates goals, and creates a plan for more housing. The Housing Element is an integral part of the General Plan, which guides the policies of Unincorporated Napa County.

Summary of Key Findings
This section provides a high level summary of key findings from the housing needs assessment. More detailed discussions are provided in the sections that follow.

- While the population of the Bay Area continues to grow because of natural growth and because the strong economy draws new residents to the region, the population of Unincorporated Napa County decreased by 9.3 percent from 2000 to 2020. This was largely due to annexations of unincorporated properties to cities and catastrophic wildfires that occurred between 2017 and 2020.

- In 2019, Unincorporated Napa County’s youth population under the age of 18 was 3,799 and senior population 65 and older was 6,114. These age groups represent 14.7 percent and 23.6 percent, respectively, of Unincorporated Napa County’s estimated population of 25,929.
In 2019, 68.8 percent of Unincorporated Napa County’s population was White non-Hispanic while 2.3 percent was Black non-Hispanic, 4.5 percent was Asian/Pacific Islander Non-Hispanic, and 21.4 percent was Latino. People of color in Unincorporated Napa County comprise a proportion below the overall proportion in the Bay Area as a whole.

Unincorporated Napa County residents most commonly work in the Health & Educational Services industry (23.1 percent). From April 2010 to April 2021, the unemployment rate in Unincorporated Napa County decreased by 6.3 percentage points to 3.9 percent. Between 2010 and 2018, the number of jobs located in the Unincorporated County increased by 7,992 (42.1 percent). Additionally, the jobs-household ratio in Unincorporated Napa County increased from 1.99 in 2002 to 2.84 jobs per household in 2018, indicating that there are not enough housing units in Unincorporated Napa County to house workers in the Unincorporated County (on average, there are 1.48 workers per household in the Bay Area).

The number of new homes built in the Bay Area has not kept pace with the demand, resulting in longer commutes, increasing prices, and exacerbating issues of displacement and homelessness. The number of homes in Unincorporated Napa County decreased 9.5 percent from 2010 to 2021, primarily due to catastrophic fires between 2017 and 2020, while the number of homes in Napa County as a whole grew by only 0.4 percent and the housing stock in the Bay Area as a whole grew by 5.8 percent.

A diversity of homes affordable at all income levels would create opportunities for all Unincorporated Napa County residents to live and thrive in the community. The largest proportion of homes had a value in the range of $2 million and above in 2019. Home prices increased by 48.1 percent from 2010 to 2020. The median contract rent for a rental housing unit in Unincorporated Napa County was $1,537 in 2019. Rental prices increased by 49.0 percent from 2009 to 2019. To rent a typical apartment without excessive cost burden, a household would need to have an annual income of over $61,000.

It is important to have a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a community today and in the future. In 2021, 83.1 percent of homes in Unincorporated Napa County were single-family detached, 3.3 percent were single-family attached, 5.5 percent were small multifamily (2 to 4 units in structure), and 3.3 percent were medium or large multifamily (5+ units in structure). Between 2010 and 2021, the number of multifamily units was essentially unchanged, while the number of single-family units declined due to wildfires. In Unincorporated Napa County, the share of the housing stock that is

---

1 In this Housing Needs Assessment, the terms “Hispanic” and “Latino” are used interchangeably.
detached single-family homes is far greater than that for the Bay Area, where only slightly more than half of units are single family detached homes.

- The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends no more than 30 percent of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30 percent of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.” In Unincorporated Napa County, 17.8 percent of households spend 30 to 50 percent of their income on housing, while 15.8 percent of households are severely cost burdened and use the majority of their income for housing.

- According to research from the University of California, Berkeley, 22.4 percent of households in Unincorporated Napa County live in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement, and 1.1 percent live in areas at risk of or undergoing gentrification. 13.2 percent of households in Unincorporated Napa County live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely excluded due to prohibitive housing costs.

- Just under twelve percent of residents in Unincorporated Napa County live in communities (as defined by Census tracts and block groups) identified as “Highest Resource” or “High Resource” areas by State-commissioned research, while 6.1 percent of residents live in areas identified by this research as “Low Resource” areas. These neighborhood designations are based on a range of indicators covering areas such as education, poverty, proximity to jobs and economic opportunities, low pollution levels, and other factors.

- Some population groups may have special housing needs that require specific program responses, and these groups may experience barriers to accessing stable housing due to their specific housing circumstances. In Unincorporated Napa County, 13 percent of residents have a disability of some kind and may require accessible housing. Additionally, 8.7 percent of Unincorporated Napa County households are larger households with five or more people, who likely need larger housing units with three bedrooms or more. Female-headed households make up 6.3 percent of all households in the unincorporated county; these households are often at greater risk of housing insecurity.

**Note on Data**
Many of the tables in this report are sourced from published data from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey or U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, both of which rely on samples and as such, are subject to sampling variability. This means that data represent estimates, and
that other estimates could be possible if another set of respondents had been reached. This analysis uses the five-year release to get a larger data pool to minimize this “margin of error” but particularly for smaller communities such as Unincorporated Napa County, the data will be based on fewer responses, and the information should be interpreted accordingly.

Looking to the Future: Regional Housing Needs

Regional Housing Needs Determination

The Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint forecasts that the nine-county Bay Area will add 1.4 million new households between 2015 and 2050. For the eight-year time frame covered by this Housing Element Update, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has identified the region’s housing need as 441,176 units. The total number of housing units assigned by HCD is separated into four income categories that cover housing types for all income levels, from very low-income households to market rate housing. This calculation, known as the Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND), is based on population projections produced by the California Department of Finance as well as adjustments that consider the region’s current housing need. The adjustments result from recent legislation requiring HCD to apply additional adjustment factors to the baseline growth projection from California Department of Finance, in order for the regions to get closer to healthy housing markets. To this end, adjustments focus on the region’s vacancy rate, level of overcrowding and the share of cost burdened households. These new laws governing the methodology for how HCD calculates the RHND resulted in a significantly higher number of housing units for which the Bay Area must plan compared to previous RHND cycles.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

A starting point for the Housing Element Update process for every California jurisdiction is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA. For the Bay Area, the share of the RHND is assigned to each jurisdiction by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). State Housing Element Law requires ABAG to develop a methodology that calculates the number of housing units assigned to each city and county and distributes each jurisdiction’s housing unit allocation among four affordability levels. The RHND increased by 135 percent, from 187,990 in the last cycle to 441,776 in this RHNA cycle. For more information on the RHNA process this cycle, see ABAG’s website: https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/housing/rhna-regional-housing-needs-allocation.

---

2 Plan Bay Area 2050 is a long-range plan charting the course for the future of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. It covers four key issues: the economy, the environment, housing, and transportation.
3 HCD divides the RHND into the following four income categories: Very Low-income - 0-50% of Area Median Income; Low-income - 50-80% of Area Median Income; Moderate-income - 80-120% of Area Median Income; and Above Moderate-income - 120% or more of Area Median Income.
4 For more information on HCD’s RHND calculation for the Bay Area, see this letter sent to ABAG from HCD on June 9, 2020: https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/abagrhna-final060920(r).pdf.
In December 2021, ABAG adopted its Final RHNA Allocations, which provide allocations for Bay Area jurisdictions. For Unincorporated Napa County, Napa County was initially assigned a total RHNA of 1,014 units, a substantial increase from the last cycle’s allocation of 180 total units.

Among local jurisdictions in Napa County, there is agreement on the goal of focusing most urban development in the cities, where housing and residents have access to infrastructure, transportation, schools, services, and other amenities, so that open space and agricultural lands can be conserved in the unincorporated areas. In furtherance of these goals, Napa County and several of the cities have cooperated for several Housing Element update cycles to transfer a portion of the County’s RHNA to cities. These RHNA transfer agreements were adopted when significant developable land in Unincorporated Napa County was annexed to the Cities of Napa and American Canyon, and when substantial assistance for affordable housing was provided to those cities and to the City of St. Helena. In accordance with Government Code Section 65584.07(a), the RHNA transfer agreements were approved by ABAG on March 17, 2022, and the County’s RHNA for the 6th Cycle is as follows:

**Table 8: Final Regional Housing Needs Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (&lt;30% of AMI)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30% to 50% of AMI)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50% to 80% of AMI)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income (80% to 120% of AMI)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate Income (&gt;120% of AMI)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

The Housing Sites Inventory chapter analyzes and demonstrates how Napa County will provide land, appropriately zoned, to accommodate this remaining RHNA allocation. Information describing Napa County’s RHNA transfer request to the ABAG Executive Board is included in Appendix C.
Population, Employment, and Household Characteristics

Population
The Bay Area is the fifth-largest metropolitan area in the nation and has seen a steady increase in population since 1990. Many cities in the region have experienced significant growth in jobs and population. While these trends have led to a corresponding increase in demand for housing across the region, the regional production of housing has largely not kept pace with job and population growth. However, in Unincorporated Napa County, the population has been declining. Between 2000 and 2020 Unincorporated Napa County’s population decreased by 9.3 percent; Napa County’s overall population increased by 11.8 percent, indicating that growth in the county has occurred entirely within its incorporated cities. Overall, however, the county has lagged the region, which has seen growth of 14.2 percent over the same decade.

Table 9: Population Trends, 2000-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa County</td>
<td>27,483</td>
<td>24,924</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>124,279</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG Region</td>
<td>6,784,348</td>
<td>7,748,930</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The nine-county ABAG Region includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties.

Sources: California Department of Finance, E-4 Series and E-5; BAE, 2021.

In 2020, the population of Unincorporated Napa County was estimated to be 24,924 (see Table 1). The population of Unincorporated Napa County makes up 17.9 percent of Napa County. From 1990 to 2000, the population of the unincorporated county decreased by 24 percent, largely due to the incorporation of American Canyon rather than an actual decline in population. This trend continued, with a decrease of 4.6 percent between 2000 and 2010, again due in part to annexations of unincorporated properties. A further decline of 4.9 percent occurred between 2010 and 2000. However, it should be noted that between 2010 and 2016, unincorporated population increased by 673, but catastrophic fires between 2017 and 2020 resulted in loss of 1,329 housing units which accounts for the overall decline. If the fires had not occurred, the growth rate of new housing units between 2017 and 2020 would have been similar to that of 2010 through 2016.

To compare the rate of growth across various geographic scales, Figure 1 shows population for the jurisdiction, county, and region indexed to the population in the year 1990. This means that the data points represent the population growth (i.e., percent change) in each of these geographies relative to their populations in 1990.
**Figure 1: Population Growth Trends**

![Population Growth Trends Graph](image)

**Notes:**
- Universe: Total population.
- The data shown on the graph represents population for the jurisdiction, county, and region indexed to the population in the year 1990. The data points represent the relative population growth in each of these geographies relative to their populations in 1990.
- For some jurisdictions, a break may appear between 2009 (estimated data) and 2010 (census count data). DOF uses the decennial census to benchmark subsequent population estimates.

**Source:**
California Department of Finance, E-4 and E-5 series.

**Household Trends**
As illustrated by Table 10, trends for the change in the number of households mirror those for population. The number of households declined in Unincorporated Napa County between 2000 and 2020; as with population, recent declines can be attributed to annexations and to the loss of housing due to wildfires. Napa County showed modest growth in the number of households, lagging the ABAG Region. Average household size also declined in the Unincorporated County over the two decades, while it increased in the county and the ABAG Region. Since the average household size in the Unincorporated County declined while the overall county average household size increased, this indicates that the increase in household size occurred in the incorporated cities in the County.
Table 10: Households Trends, 2000-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa County</td>
<td>9,736</td>
<td>8,874</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>45,402</td>
<td>48,856</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG Region</td>
<td>2,466,020</td>
<td>2,752,510</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa County</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG Region</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The nine-county ABAG Region includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties.

Sources: California Department of Finance, E-4 and E-5 Series; BAE, 2021.

**Age**
The distribution of age groups shapes what types of housing the community may be needed in the near future. An increase in the older population may mean there is a developing need for more senior housing options, while higher numbers of children and young families can point to the need for more family housing options and related services. There has also been a move by many to age-in-place or downsize to stay within their communities, which can mean more multifamily and accessible units are also needed.

In Unincorporated Napa County, the median age in 2000 was 42.4; by 2019, this had increased to 48.8 years. More specifically, the population of those under 14 has decreased since 2010, while the 65-and-over population has increased (see Figure 2).
Race and Ethnicity

Understanding the racial makeup of a locale and region is important for designing and implementing effective housing policies and programs. These patterns are shaped by both historic and current market factors and government actions, such as exclusionary zoning, discriminatory lending practices and displacement that has occurred over time and continues to impact communities of color today. Since 2000, the percentage of residents in Unincorporated Napa County identifying as White Non-Hispanic has decreased – and by the same token the percentage of residents of all other races and ethnicities has increased – by 8.7 percent, with the 2019 White Non-Hispanic population standing at 17,827 (see Table 11). In absolute terms, the Latino population increased the most while the White, Non-Hispanic population decreased the most.
Table 11: Population by Race, 2000-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Asian / API, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Black or African American, Non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5% 2.7% 1.6% 77.4% 2.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4% 3.4% 2.0% 71.9% 2.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4% 4.5% 2.3% 68.8% 2.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The Census Bureau defines Hispanic/Latino ethnicity separate from racial categories for The purposes of this graph, The “Hispanic or Latino” racial/ethnic group represents those who identify as having Hispanic/Latino ethnicity and may also be members of any racial group. All other racial categories on this graph represent those who identify with that racial category and do not identify with Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004, Census 2010, Table P5, and American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B03002.

While its population has become more diverse in recent years, the unincorporated County is still less diverse than the County overall or the Bay Area region. Nearly 70 percent of the unincorporated county is White Non-Hispanic, in comparison to only 52 percent for the county and 39 percent for the region (see Figure 3). This indicates that the incorporated areas of the County contain a much higher percentage of the County’s minority population than the unincorporated area. The largest minority group in each area is the Hispanic or Latino population, which has been growing in the unincorporated County even as the overall population declines.
Examining the senior and youth population by race adds an additional layer of understanding, as families and seniors of color are sometimes more likely to experience challenges finding affordable housing. In Napa, people of color make up eight percent of seniors and 14 percent of youth under 18 (see Table 12). Shown separately, persons of Hispanic origin make up only five percent of seniors but 34 percent of youth under 18. As persons of Hispanic origin make up 21 percent of the total population, this indicates this group is over-represented among youth and underrepresented among the elderly. This is an indicator that the historic growth in the size and proportion of the Latino population in the Unincorporated County is likely to continue into the future.
Table 12: Senior and Youth Population by Race and Hispanic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Category</th>
<th>Age 0-17</th>
<th></th>
<th>Age 65+</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / API (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Multiple Races (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>3,257</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>21,449</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,799</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25,929</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Any Race</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic, Any Race</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5,784</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20,377</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
In the sources for this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. The overlapping category of Hispanic/ non-Hispanic groups is shown separately to avoid double counting.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-I).

Employment Trends

Balance of Jobs and Workers
A county houses employed residents who either work in the community where they live or work elsewhere in the region. Conversely, a county may have job sites that employ residents from the same county, but usually also employ workers commuting from outside of it. To some extent the regional transportation system is set up for a flow of workers to the region’s core job centers. Nevertheless, even in areas such as Napa County outside those core job centers, local jobs and the local worker population can be out of sync at a sub-regional scale.

One measure of this is the relationship between workers and jobs. A county with a surplus of workers “exports” workers to other parts of the region, while a county with a surplus of jobs must conversely “import” them. Between 2002 and 2018, the number of jobs in Unincorporated Napa County increased by 39.2 percent (see Figure 4).
Figure 4: Jobs in Unincorporated Napa County, 2002-2018

Universe: Jobs from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment
Notes: The data is tabulated by place of work, regardless of where a worker lives. The source data is provided at the census block level. These are crosswalked to jurisdictions and summarized.

There are 12,468 employed residents, and 24,021 jobs\(^5\) in Unincorporated Napa County - the ratio of jobs to resident workers is 1.93; Unincorporated Napa County is a net importer of workers.

Figure 5 shows the balance when comparing jobs to workers, broken down by different wage groups, offering additional insight into local dynamics. A community may offer employment for relatively low-income workers but have relatively few housing options for those workers - or conversely, it may house residents who are low wage workers but offer few employment opportunities for them. Such relationships may cast extra light on potentially pent-up demand for housing in particular price categories. A relative surplus of jobs relative to residents in a given wage category suggests the need to import those workers, while conversely, surpluses of workers in a wage group relative to jobs means the community will export those workers to other jurisdictions. Such flows are not inherently bad, though over time, sub-regional imbalances may appear. Unincorporated Napa County has more low-wage jobs than low-wage residents (where low-wage refers to jobs paying less than $25,000 per year). In fact, the

\(^5\) Employed residents in a jurisdiction is counted by place of residence (they may work elsewhere) while jobs in a jurisdiction are counted by place of work (they may live elsewhere). The job totals may differ from those reported in Figure 4 as the source for the time series is from administrative data, while the cross-sectional data is from a survey.
Unincorporated County has more jobs than residents for all of the wage categories shown, including high-wage jobs paying more than $75,000. However, many of these workers live nearby in the incorporated cities within Napa County, which have better access to local services needed for residents, such as grocery stores, schools, and transit. Overall, Napa County is somewhat more balanced between workers employed in the county and employed residents, with approximately 79,000 workers employed in the county and 69,000 working residents, for a ratio of 1.14 workers employed in the county to worker residents.

**Figure 5: Workers by Earnings, by Place of Work and Place of Residence for Unincorporated Napa County, 2018**

![Bar chart showing worker population by earnings and place of work and residence.]

Universe: Workers 16 years and over with earnings
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data 2015-2019, B08119, B08519

Figure 6 shows the balance of resident workers to the workers employed there for the Unincorporated County, the entire county, and the Bay Area region expressed as a ratio. A value of 1 means that a city has the same number of jobs in a wage group as it has resident workers - in principle, a balance. Values above 1 indicate a jurisdiction will need to import workers for jobs in a given wage group. For the Bay Area region, this ratio for all income levels is 1.04 workers working in the region for each worker living in the region, implying a modest import of workers from outside the region. For Unincorporated Napa County, this ratio is 1.93 and for Napa County overall the ratio is 1.14, such that the county as a whole is importing a
slightly higher proportion of its workers than the region. This can be indicative of a somewhat constrained housing market, with limited inventory relative to demand and/or housing unaffordable to many worker households.

**Figure 6: Ratio of Workers Employed in an Area to Working Residents**

![Bar chart showing the ratio of workers working in an area to workers living in the area for Unincorporated Napa County, Napa County, and the Bay Area.]

Universe: Workers 16 years and older  
Notes:  
Data is for workers not for jobs. A worker may hold more than one job.  
U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Tables B08128 and B08604.

Figure 7 shows these ratios for the Unincorporated County broken out by different wage levels for years from 2002 through 2018. As shown, there are more jobs than workers living in an area for each of the wage levels shown. Interestingly, the gap is substantially lower for the lowest-wage group. However, providing affordable housing for this population is more challenging than for those with higher incomes.

---

6 The source data for this table varies from the previous table. The source table is top-coded at $75,000, precluding more fine grained analysis at the higher end of the wage spectrum.
Figure 7: Jobs-Worker Ratios, By Wage Group

Imbalances between jobs and workers may directly influence the housing demand in a community. New jobs may draw new residents, and when there is high demand for housing relative to supply, many workers may be unable to afford to live where they work, particularly where job growth has been in relatively lower wage jobs. This dynamic not only means many workers will need to prepare for long commutes and time spent on the road, but in the aggregate, it contributes to traffic congestion and time lost for all road users.

If there are more jobs than employed residents, it means a locale is relatively jobs-rich, typically also with a high jobs to households ratio. Bringing housing into the measure, the jobs-
The household ratio in Unincorporated Napa County has increased from 1.99 in 2002, to 2.84 jobs per household in 2018 (see Figure 8).

**Figure 8: Jobs-Household Ratio**

![Jobs-Household Ratio Graph](image)

Universe: Jobs in a jurisdiction from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment; households in a jurisdiction

Notes: The data is tabulated by place of work, regardless of where a worker lives. The source data is provided at the census block level. These are crosswalked to jurisdictions and summarized. The ratio compares place of work wage and salary jobs with households, or occupied housing units. A similar measure is the ratio of jobs to housing units. However, this jobs-household ratio serves to compare the number of jobs in a jurisdiction to the number of housing units that are actually occupied. The difference between a jurisdiction's jobs-housing ratio and jobs-household ratio will be most pronounced in jurisdictions with high vacancy rates, a high rate of units used for seasonal use, or a high rate of units used as short-term rentals.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files (Jobs), 2002-2018; California Department of Finance, E-8 and E-5 (Households)

**Sectoral Composition of Resident Employment**

In terms of sectoral composition, the largest major industry sector in which Unincorporated Napa County residents work is Health & Educational Services, and the largest sector in which Napa County residents work is also Health & Educational Services (see Table 13). For the Bay Area as a whole, Finance and Professional Services employs the largest number of workers, indicating fewer residents working in higher paid office-type jobs in Napa County. The Unincorporated County and the county overall have relatively high proportions of residents employed in the Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation & Food Services sector, reflecting the strength of the tourism economy, which tends to have lower wage levels than many other sectors.
Table 13: Resident Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Unincorporated</th>
<th>Napa County</th>
<th>Napa County</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4,332</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial &amp; Professional Services</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>10,401</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Educational Services</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>14,734</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, Wholesale &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>13,843</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6,945</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accom &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>10,261</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>5,926</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>71,141</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Civilian employed population age 16 years and over
Notes: The data displayed shows the industries in which jurisdiction residents work, regardless of the location where those residents are employed (whether within the jurisdiction or not).
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table S2403.

Unemployment

As shown in Figure 9, unemployment trends in Unincorporated Napa County mirror those for the county overall and the Bay Area region, declining gradually from the end of the Great Recession through the beginning of 2018. All three geographies showed an upward spike in unemployment due to impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, with a general improvement and recovery beginning in the later months of 2020.
Figure 9: Unemployment Rate

Universe: Civilian noninstitutional population ages 16 and older
Notes: Unemployment rates for the jurisdiction level is derived from larger-geography estimates. This method assumes that the rates of change in employment and unemployment are exactly the same in each sub-county area as at the county level. If this assumption is not true for a specific sub-county area, then the estimates for that area may not be representative of the current economic conditions. Since this assumption is untested, caution should be employed when using these data. Only not seasonally-adjusted labor force (unemployment rates) data are developed for cities and CDPs.
Source: California Employment Development Department, Local Area unemployment Statistics (LAUS), Sub-county areas monthly updates, 2010-2021.

Current Tenure Patterns
The number of residents who own their homes compared to those who rent their homes can help identify the level of housing insecurity – ability for individuals to stay in their homes – in a locale and region. Generally, renters may be displaced more quickly if prices increase. In Unincorporated Napa County there are slightly more than 9,000 housing units, and fewer than one-fourth of residents rent their homes (see Figure 10). By comparison, 36 percent of households in Napa County are renters, while 44 percent of Bay Area households rent their homes.
Tenure Trends
The high rate of homeownership in Unincorporated Napa County has increased over the last two decades, from 73 percent in 2000 to 77 percent for the 2015-2019 period. However, this increase was due in large part to an actual decrease in the total number of housing units; the total number of owner-occupied units has declined by two percent, but the number of rental units has declined by over 20 percent. The overall decrease in occupied units is linked to the substantial loss of units due to wildfires in recent years (see further discussion in the housing stock discussion below). The greater loss of rental units also indicates that displacement due to the fires has fallen largely on renters, likely due to their being “outbid” for the decreased available housing inventory stock by more affluent owners.
Tenure by Race and Ethnicity

Homeownership rates often vary considerably across race/ethnicity in the Bay Area and throughout the country. These disparities not only reflect differences in income and wealth but also stem from historic federal, state, and local policies that limited access to homeownership for communities of color while facilitating homebuying for white residents. While many of these policies, such as redlining, have been formally eliminated, the impacts of race-based policy are still evident across Bay Area communities. In Unincorporated Napa County, 80 percent of White households owned their homes. The rates were slightly lower for Asian/API households at 70 percent, and only 48 percent for other race/multiple race households. The Hispanic/Latino homeownership rate was only 44 percent. The differences in these rates may result from historic patterns of housing and economic discrimination and from income differentials.

---

Table 15: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial / Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>% Across</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
<th>% Across</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / API</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Multiple Races</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,980</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,042</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,022</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latinx</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. Hispanic/Latino ethnicity is counted separately from race, and thus should not be summed with race data presented. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. The number of American Indian or Alaska Native and Black or African American households was extremely small and not a statistically reliable sample, so they have been combined into the Other Race or Multiple Races category.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003(A-I).

Tenure by Age

The age of residents can also indicate the housing challenges a community is experiencing. Typically, younger households tend to rent and may struggle to buy a first home in the Bay Area due to high housing costs. At the same time, senior homeowners seeking to downsize may have limited options in an expensive housing market and may remain as “empty nesters” in a larger house suitable for a family with children, thus contributing to a shortage of housing suitable for families. Unincorporated Napa County follows this pattern with ownership correlating strongly with the age of the householder. As shown in Figure 11, in Unincorporated Napa County, 53 percent of householders between the ages of 25 and 44 are renters, while only nine percent of householders over 65 are.
In most locales, homeownership rates for households in single-family homes are substantially higher than the rates for households in multi-family housing. This is the case in Unincorporated Napa County, where 81 percent of households in detached single-family homes are homeowners, while only 13 percent of households in multi-family housing are homeowners (see Figure 12). It is important to remember that nearly 90 percent of the overall housing inventory in the Unincorporated County is detached single-family homes, thus limiting the affordable options available to renters.
Displacement

Because of increasing housing prices, displacement is a major concern in the Bay Area. Displacement has the most severe impacts on low- and moderate-income residents. When individuals or families are forced to leave their homes and communities, they also lose their support network. The University of California, Berkeley has mapped all neighborhoods in the Bay Area, identifying their risk for gentrification. Their analysis (shown in Figure 13) finds that displacement is a potential issue in Unincorporated Napa County, where 22.4 percent of households live in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement and 1.1 percent live in neighborhoods at risk of or undergoing gentrification. Equally important, some neighborhoods in the Bay Area do not have housing appropriate for a broad section of the workforce. UC Berkeley estimates that 13.2 percent of households in Unincorporated Napa
County live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely to be excluded due to prohibitive housing costs.¹⁸

**Figure 13: Households by Displacement Risk and Tenure**

Universe: Households  
Notes: Displacement data is available at the census tract level. ABAG Staff aggregated tracts up to jurisdiction level using census 2010 population weights, assigning a tract to jurisdiction in proportion to block level population weights. Total household count may differ slightly from counts in other tables sourced from jurisdiction level sources. Categories are combined as follows for simplicity: At risk of or Experiencing Exclusion: At Risk of Becoming Exclusive; Becoming Exclusive; Stable/Advanced Exclusive At risk of or Experiencing Gentrification: At Risk of Gentrification; Early/Ongoing Gentrification; Advanced Gentrification; Stable Moderate/Mixed Income; Stable Moderate/Mixed Income Susceptible to or Experiencing Displacement: Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement; Ongoing Displacement Other: High Student Population; Unavailable or Unreliable Data Source: Urban Displacement Project for classification, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003 for tenure.

¹⁸ More information about this gentrification and displacement data is available at the Urban Displacement Project’s webpage: https://www.urbandisplacement.org/. Specifically, one can learn more about the different gentrification/displacement typologies shown in Figure 13 at this link: https://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/typology_sheet_2018_0.png. Additionally, one can view maps that show which typologies correspond to which parts of a jurisdiction here: https://www.urbandisplacement.org/san-francisco/sf-bay-area-gentrification-and-displacement
Extremely Low-Income Housing Needs

Household Income
Despite the economic and job growth experienced throughout the region since 1990, the income gap has continued to widen. California is one of the most economically unequal states in the nation, and the Bay Area has the highest income inequality between high- and low-income households in the state.\footnote{Bohn, S. et al. 2020. Income Inequality and Economic Opportunity in California. Public Policy Institute of California.}

Extremely low-income is defined as households with income less than 30 percent of area median income. The current (2022) area median income in the County is $117,950 for a four-person household.\footnote{Based on HCD Income Limits for 2021.} For extremely low-income households, this results in an income of $34,100 or less for a four-person household or $23,900 or less for a one-person household. Households with extremely low incomes have a variety of housing situations and needs. For example, most families and individuals receiving public assistance, such as supplemental security insurance (SSI) or disability insurance are considered extremely low-income households. Many households with multiple wage earners – including food service workers, full-time students, hotel workers, and farm workers – can fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively stagnant wages in many industries. The following table shows examples of occupations with wages where the worker households could potentially qualify as extremely low-income households.

Table 16: Examples of Low Wage Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Title</th>
<th>Median Hourly Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Resort Clerk</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Workers</td>
<td>$13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeepers</td>
<td>$14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manicurists and Pedicurists</td>
<td>$13.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosts and Hostesses</td>
<td>$12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Graders and Sorters</td>
<td>$12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters and Waitresses</td>
<td>$13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation and Serving Related Workers</td>
<td>$13.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table is based on historic data; California 2022 minimum wage is $15 per hour.

In Unincorporated Napa County, seven percent of households fall in the extremely low-income category (see Figure 14). This is lower than the proportion for Napa County overall, and below the 15 percent for the entire Bay Area. Sixty percent of Unincorporated County households...
make more than 100 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), compared to only 52 percent regionally. Nevertheless, the Unincorporated County shows a number of extremely low-income households, many of whom are likely to have a need for more affordable housing. The following discussion provides additional information profiling those households.

Figure 14: Households by Household Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
<th>Unincorporated Napa</th>
<th>Napa County</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%-30% of AMI</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%-50% of AMI</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%-80% of AMI</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100% of AMI</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 100% of AMI</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Occupied housing units


Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located. Households making between 80 and 120 percent of the AMI are moderate-income, those making 50 to 80 percent are low-income, those making 30 to 50 percent are very low-income, and those making less than 30 percent are extremely low-income. This is then adjusted for household size.
Household Income Distribution by Race

Housing the extremely low-income population (below 30 percent of area median income) can be especially challenging. Table 17 below provides a breakdown of extremely low-income households by race and ethnicity. The race/ethnicity with the highest share of extremely low-income households in Unincorporated Napa County is the Other Race or Multiple Races, non-Hispanic category (31.9 percent compared to 7.4 percent of all households). Approximately one-fifth of Black non-Hispanic households also have extremely low incomes. It should be noted that the number of households in these two categories is relatively limited and subject to statistical error as the data source uses a weighted sample.

Table 17: Extremely Low-Income Households by Race and Ethnicity, Unincorporated Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Households below 30% HAMFI</th>
<th>Share below 30% HAMFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / API, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Multiple Races, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,243</strong></td>
<td><strong>683</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Occupied housing units

Note: Numbers may not match other tables due to independent rounding. HAMFI refers to HUD Area Median Family Income.


Household Income Distribution by Tenure

Throughout the region, there are disparities between the incomes of homeowners and renters. Typically, the number of low-income renters greatly outpaces the amount of housing available that is affordable for these households. As shown in Figure 15, renters are distributed somewhat more evenly across the income spectrum when compared to owners in Unincorporated Napa County; almost two-thirds of owner households are in the Greater than 100 percent AMI group, while only 41 percent of renters fall in this income category.

In Unincorporated Napa County, the largest proportion of both renters and owners falls in the Greater than 100 percent of AMI income group. While there are more owner households than renters in most of the lower income groups, this is due in large part to ownership housing accounting for three fourths of the area’s housing stock.
Figure 15: Household Income Level by Tenure

![Bar chart showing household income level by tenure]

Universe: Occupied housing units 
Notes: Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland/Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose/Sunnyvale/Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo/Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.

**Poverty Status by Race**

People of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to white residents.12 These economic disparities also leave communities of color at higher risk for housing insecurity, displacement, or homelessness. In Unincorporated Napa County, American Indian or Alaska Native (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents experience the highest rates of poverty, followed by Black or African American (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents (see Table 18). As noted above, these groups represent a very small portion of the Unincorporated Napa County population.

---

Table 18: Poverty Status by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial / Ethnic Group</th>
<th>% of Group Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / API (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race or Multiple Races (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Population for whom poverty status is determined
Notes: The Census Bureau uses a federally defined poverty threshold that remains constant throughout the country and does not correspond to Area Median Income. For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latino. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latino may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latino, data for multiple white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. Therefore, the data should not be summed as the sum exceeds the population for whom poverty status is determined for this jurisdiction. However, all groups labelled “Hispanic and Non-Hispanic” are mutually exclusive, and the sum of the data for these groups is equivalent to the population for whom poverty status is determined.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17001(A-I)

Projected Need for Housing for Extremely Low-Income Households
Local jurisdictions are required to provide an estimate for their projected extremely low-income households in their Housing Elements. HCD’s official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making zero to 50 percent AMI) to calculate their projected need to house extremely low-income households.

HCD provides three methodologies for estimating this need: 1) allocate the percent of very low-income need to extremely low-income households based on the ABAG region’s proportion; 2) allocate the percent of very low-income need to extremely low-income households based on the current proportion for the Unincorporated County; 3) assume that 50 percent of the Unincorporated County’s very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households.

The analysis here is based on the third option. Based on this method, 23 units would be needed for extremely low-income households.

As discussed below (see Figure 25 in the section on overpayment and overcrowding), extremely low-income households are likely to face housing affordability issues. Seventy percent of Unincorporated Napa County’s extremely low-income households spend the majority of their income on housing and an additional 24 percent spend between 30 percent and 50 percent.
Many extremely low-income households seek rental housing and likely face overpayment, overcrowding or substandard housing conditions. Some extremely low-income household residents may have mental or other disabilities and have special housing needs. ELI households in Unincorporated Napa County may require specific housing solutions including:

- Deeper income targeting for subsidies
- Housing with supportive services
- Single-room occupancy and/or shared housing
- Rent subsidies (housing vouchers)
- Housing for farm workers

Of the housing types just mentioned, the type that most available within the Unincorporated County is farmworker housing, including private employee housing provided by agricultural employers and the three farmworker housing centers operated by Napa County Housing Authority in Napa, St. Helena, and Calistoga. As discussed in the Governmental Constraints section of the Housing Element, Napa County zoning provides for the development and operation of supportive housing, single-room occupancy housing, shared housing, and farmworker housing within the unincorporated area.

**Housing Stock Characteristics**

**Housing Unit Trends**

Unincorporated Napa County has seen the loss of a substantial portion of its housing stock over the last decade, contributing to an ongoing shortage of affordable housing. Based on California Department of Finance estimates, as of January 2021, Unincorporated Napa County held 11,115 housing units, 20 percent of the Napa County total (see Table 5). This represents a net loss of almost 1,200 housing units since 2010, 9.5 percent of the area’s total. This loss was due to large wildfires in 2017 and 2020. Nevertheless, the County overall has seen a very small increase in housing units due to additional residential construction in the incorporated cities of the county, particularly in the City of Napa.
Table 19: Housing Unit Trends, 2010-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Unincorporated Napa County</th>
<th>Napa County</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/1/2010</td>
<td>12,281</td>
<td>54,759</td>
<td>2,783,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2011</td>
<td>12,314</td>
<td>54,882</td>
<td>2,790,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2012</td>
<td>12,332</td>
<td>54,997</td>
<td>2,798,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>55,084</td>
<td>2,807,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>12,356</td>
<td>55,163</td>
<td>2,822,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2015</td>
<td>12,363</td>
<td>55,267</td>
<td>2,839,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td>12,359</td>
<td>55,380</td>
<td>2,855,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>12,377</td>
<td>55,567</td>
<td>2,873,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2018</td>
<td>11,815</td>
<td>55,157</td>
<td>2,888,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2019</td>
<td>11,753</td>
<td>55,180</td>
<td>2,904,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2020</td>
<td>11,768</td>
<td>55,289</td>
<td>2,924,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2021</td>
<td>11,115</td>
<td>54,982</td>
<td>2,944,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change, 2010-2021: (1,166) 223 160,795

Percent Change, 2010-2021: -9.5% 0.4% 5.8%

Source: California Department of Finance 2021 E-5 Report; BAE.

Housing Types, Year Built, Vacancy, and Permits

In recent years, most housing produced in the region and across the state consisted of single-family homes and larger multi-unit buildings. However, some households are increasingly interested in “missing middle housing” – including duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, cottage clusters and accessory dwelling units (ADUs). These housing types may open up more options across incomes and tenure, from young households seeking homeownership options to seniors looking to downsize and age-in-place.

The housing stock of Unincorporated Napa County is largely single family detached structures; this unit type makes up of 83.1 percent of the total in 2021. Of the remainder, 3.3 percent are single family attached homes, 5.5 percent units in multifamily structures with two to four units, 3.3 percent units in multifamily structures with five or more units, and 4.8 percent mobile homes (see Figure 16). Comparison with 2010 data shows that the loss of housing units due to wildfires is largely focused on single family detached units, likely due to the prevalence

---

13 Single-family detached structures are single-unit buildings that do not share a wall with any other house. There may be more than one such structure on a single parcel. An ADU that is detached from the primary dwelling would be counted as a separate housing unit.
of this unit type in the areas most susceptible to fire. Other unit types show little or no change in numbers since 2010, indicating that the supply of unit types most affordable for middle and lower-income households, especially renters, has stagnated in recent years.

**Figure 16: Housing Type Trends, 2010-2021**

![Housing Type Trends Chart](chart.png)

Universe: Housing units  
Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series

Production has not kept up with housing demand for several decades in the Bay Area, as the total number of units built and available has not yet come close to meeting the demand from population and job growth experienced throughout the region. In Unincorporated Napa County, the largest proportion of the housing stock was built from 1960 through 1979, with 3,527 units (28.6 percent of the total) constructed during this period (see Figure 17). Since 2010, only 456 units (3.7 percent of the total) were built, not enough to counter the units lost to wildfire since that time.
As shown in Table 20, vacant units make up 27.0 percent of the overall housing stock in Unincorporated Napa County, a far higher percentage than for countywide or for the Bay Area region.

Table 20: Occupancy Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>Vacant Housing Units</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent Across</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa County</td>
<td>9,022</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>48,705</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>2,731,434</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>172,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Housing units
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25002.
However, the vacancy rate for units actually available for rent stands at 5.9 percent (as of the 2015-2019 period), while the vacancy rate of homes for sale is 2.3 percent. These rates of units actually available for the conventional residential housing market are not unusually high or low. The high overall vacancy rate is due to the county’s status as a vacation and tourist destination. Of the vacant units in the Unincorporated County, the most common type of vacancy is units held for seasonal, recreational, or occasional Use (see Figure 18). Although the County does not permit short-term rentals, the large number of units held as second homes or for only occasional use has substantially reduced the availability of homes in the County for full-time residents.

Throughout the Bay Area, vacancies make up 5.9 percent of the total housing units, including homes listed for rent; units used for recreational or occasional use, and units not otherwise classified (other vacant) making up the majority of vacancies. The Census Bureau classifies a unit as vacant if no one is occupying it when census interviewers are conducting the American Community Survey or Decennial Census, or if it is currently occupied by a household whose usual place of residence was elsewhere. Vacant units classified as “for recreational or occasional use” are those that are held for short periods of use throughout the year. Accordingly, vacation rentals and short-term rentals like AirBnB are likely to fall in this category, although the County does not permit short-term rentals. The Census Bureau classifies units as “other vacant” if they are vacant due to foreclosure, personal/family reasons, legal proceedings, repairs/renovations, abandonment, preparation for being rented or sold, or vacant for an extended absence for reasons such as a work assignment, military duty, or incarceration. In a region with a thriving economy and housing market like the Bay Area, units being renovated/repairoed and prepared for rental or sale may represent a large portion of the “other vacant” category. Additionally, the need for seismic retrofitting in older housing stock could also influence the proportion of “other vacant” units in some jurisdictions.

---

14 There are slight differences in how the Census and the American Community Survey (ACS) enumerate units that may be temporarily occupied. The decennial Census counts the unit as occupied based on a usual place of residence definition, while the ACS counts the unit as occupied if it has been used as a place of residence continuously for two or more months.

15 For more information, see pages 3 through 6 of this list of definitions prepared by the Census Bureau: https://www.census.gov/housing/hvs/definitions.pdf.

Figure 18: Vacant Units by Type

Between 2015 and 2021, 175 housing units were issued permits in Unincorporated Napa County; 57.7 percent were for above moderate-income housing, 30.9 percent were for moderate-income housing, and 5.7 percent were for low-income housing and 5.7 percent were for very low-income housing, as summarized below in Table 21. This limited production is lower than the number of units lost to wildfires in recent years.
Table 21: Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Housing permits issued between 2015 and 2021
Notes: HCD uses the following definitions for the four income categories: Very Low Income: units affordable to households making less than 50% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Low Income: units affordable to households making between 50% and 80% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Moderate Income: units affordable to households making between 80% and 120% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Above Moderate Income: units affordable to households making above 120% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located.

Source: County of Napa, 2021 Annual Housing Element Progress Report

**Assisted Housing Developments At-Risk of Conversion**
While there is an immense need to produce new affordable housing units, ensuring that the existing affordable housing stock remains affordable is equally important. Additionally, it is typically faster and less expensive to preserve currently affordable units that are at risk of converting to market-rate than it is to build new affordable housing.

The data in the table below comes from the California Housing Partnership’s Preservation Database, the state’s most comprehensive source of information on subsidized affordable housing at risk of losing its affordable status and converting to market-rate housing. There are 18 assisted units in Unincorporated Napa County in the Preservation Database. This is a single apartment project at 2009 Imola Avenue, operated by a non-profit mental health services organization called Progress Foundation, Inc. The project was placed in service in 2005, and was funded with HUD Section 811. In addition, Napa County contributed $968,310 towards the construction of this project. Of these units, none are at Moderate, High Risk, or Very High Risk of conversion.17

---

17 California Housing Partnership uses the following categories for assisted housing developments in its database:
- Very-High Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate within the next year that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.
- Moderate Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in the next 5-10 years that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.
- Low Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in 10+ years and/or are owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.
Table 22: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Total Assisted Units in Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>110,177</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>116,459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: HUD, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), USDA, and CalHFA projects. Subsidized or assisted developments that do not have one of the aforementioned financing sources may not be included.

Notes: While California Housing Partnership’s Preservation Database is the state’s most comprehensive source of information on subsidized affordable housing at risk of losing its affordable status and converting to market-rate housing, this database does not include all deed-restricted affordable units in the state. Consequently, there may be at-risk assisted units in a jurisdiction that are not captured in this data table.

Source: California Housing Partnership, Preservation Database (2020).

Substandard Housing

Housing costs in the Bay Area region are among the highest in the country, which could result in households, particularly renters, needing to live in substandard conditions in order to afford housing. Generally, there is limited published data on the extent of substandard housing issues in a community. However, the Census Bureau data included in the table below shows that very few units are substandard by the criteria available from the American Community Survey. In Unincorporated Napa County, 1.3 percent of renters reported lacking a kitchen or lacking complete plumbing,18 compared to 0.6 of owners who lack a kitchen and 0.1 percent of owners who lack complete plumbing. Note that these two data points do not cover many traits of substandard housing, including the need for rehabilitation or replacement.

Table 23: Substandard Housing Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Amenity</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Renter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Occupied housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25053, Table B25043, Table B25049

18 Complete plumbing facilities are defined as hot and cold piped water, a bath-tub or shower, and a flush toilet.
Many of Napa County’s housing code cases involve unpermitted existing housing units, such as a single-family residence turned into a triplex, or a garage turned into an ADU without proper permitting, where the correction to the violation involves bringing the existing housing unit under permit, if possible. For example, County Code enforcement staff indicate that between 2015 and June of 2022, the County had 17 housing units with verified code violations. Of those, ten have been brought into compliance and the remaining seven violations are pending, with the goal of getting those units into compliance as well.

**Home Prices and Rent Levels**

Home prices reflect a complex mix of supply and demand factors, including an area’s demographic profile, labor market, prevailing wages, and job outlook, coupled with land and construction costs. In the Bay Area, the costs of housing have long been among the highest in the nation. Home values in Napa County overall are below the Bay Area average, but for many years, the Unincorporated Napa County showed values above the Bay Area; however, in recent years those values have continued to increase but have fallen behind the Bay Area average (see Figure 19). The region’s home values have generally increased steadily since 2001, aside from a decrease during the Great Recession. The rise in home prices has been especially steep since 2012, with the median home value in the Bay Area nearly doubling during this time. Since 2001, the typical home value has increased 48 percent in Unincorporated Napa County. As of December 2020, the typical home value in Unincorporated Napa County was estimated at $957,050 per data from Zillow. By comparison, the typical home value is $768,410 in Napa County and $1,077,230 the Bay Area. There were slight decreases in the Unincorporated County between 2016 and 2017 and between 2019 and 2020. These declines may be related to the recent wildfires which could indicate a perception of increased risk for homes in rural areas of the County.
### Figure 19: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)

Based on somewhat older American Community Survey data from 2015-2019 (inflation-adjusted to 2019 values), the largest share (approximately one-fifth of the Unincorporated County’s homes) was valued at $2 million or more.¹⁹ (see Figure 20). For the County overall, the largest share of units was valued between $500,000 and $750,000. The limited number of lower-value homes indicates a likely lack of units affordable to middle and lower-income households interested in home ownership.

¹⁹ Note that the values from the American Community Survey are based on residents estimating the current value of their home rather than actual sales data.
Similar to home values, rents have also increased dramatically across the Bay Area in recent years. Many renters have been priced out, evicted or displaced, particularly communities of color. Residents forced to move may have had to choose between commuting long distances to their jobs and schools or moving out of the region, and sometimes, out of the state.

In Unincorporated Napa County, the largest proportion of rental units rented in the $1,500-$2,000 monthly category, totaling 24 percent, followed by 23 percent of units renting in the $1,000-$1,500 category (see Figure 21). Looking beyond the Unincorporated County, the largest share of units in the County overall and the Bay Area also rent for $1,500-$2,000 category. One noteworthy difference for the Unincorporated County is the higher proportion of units renting for $500 to $1,000 per month. However, as noted previously in Figure 10 above, the Unincorporated County only has slightly more than 2,000 rental units total, so it is likely that demand still outstrips supply.
Between 2009 and 2019, the median monthly contract rent in each of the three geographies as shown increased by approximately 50 percent (see Figure 22). The median increased from $1,032 to $1,537 per month in Unincorporated Napa County, from $1,085 to $1,587 per month in Napa County, and from $1,187 to $1,824 per month in the Bay Area. The more current data on home values shown above in Figure 19 comes from Zillow, which does not have data on rent prices available for most Bay Area jurisdictions. The rent data in this document comes from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, which does not fully reflect current rents. Following Figure 22 is a discussion of more recent trends in rents in Napa County.
Table 24 presents more current rent data for Napa County compiled by CoStar, a private data vendor tracking residential markets nationwide. As shown, the average market-rate monthly asking rent for the third quarter in Napa County was reported at $2,331. This was an increase of 7.7 percent year-over-year; showing that rents have continued to climb even during the pandemic. Additionally, the 2.3 percent vacancy rate indicates a tight rental market. These rent levels and the vacancy rate exacerbate the ongoing affordability issues for lower-income households seeking housing in Napa County.

20 This vacancy rate reflects market conditions as of the third quarter of 2021 as estimated by CoStar for the multifamily rental market; the prior rental vacancy rate data came from the 2015 through 2019 period as estimated by the U.S. Census American Community Survey, and included units (e.g., single family homes) not included in the CoStar database.
Table 24: Multifamily Summary for Market-Rate Rentals in Napa County, Q3 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multifamily Summary</th>
<th>Market/Market Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inventory, Q3 2021 (bldgs)</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory, Q3 2021 (units)</td>
<td>6,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Units</td>
<td>6,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Inventory Size, Q3 2021 (sf)</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Asking Rents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Asking Rent, Q3 2020</td>
<td>$2,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Asking Rent, Q3 2021</td>
<td>$2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change Q3 2020 - Q3 2021</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Asking Rents psf</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Asking Rent psf, Q3 2020</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Asking Rent psf, Q3 2021</td>
<td>$2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change Q3 2020 - Q3 2021</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Overpayment and Overcrowding

*Overpayment*

Housing cost burden is most commonly measured as the percentage of gross income spent on housing. A household is considered to have a moderate housing cost burden if housing expenses are between 30 percent and 50 percent of income, and to have a severe cost burden when housing expenses exceed 50 percent of income. Low-income residents are the most impacted by high housing costs and experience the highest rates of cost burden. Spending such large portions of their income on housing puts low-income households at higher risk of displacement, eviction, or homelessness.

Unincorporated Napa County, Napa County, and the Bay Area all have a similar percentage of households (slightly above 60 percent) facing acceptable housing costs of less than 30 percent of their income (see Figure 23). Similar proportions also have moderate housing cost burdens, at 18 percent for the Unincorporated County and 20 percent for the County and the region, and the pattern holds for severe cost burdens, with all three geographies showing 16 percent of households at this level. These figures indicate that Napa County is not immune from the regional housing affordability issues found in the more urban core of the Bay Area. Over one-third of all households in all three areas appear to face excessive housing costs.
Renters are often more cost-burdened than owners. While the housing market has resulted in home prices increasing dramatically, homeowners often have mortgages with fixed rates, whereas renters are more likely to be impacted by market increases. However, as shown in Figure 24, in Unincorporated Napa County the proportion of renters and owners with moderate housing cost burdens of between 30 percent to 50 percent of their income is the nearly the same, at approximately 18 percent. A higher proportion of renters than owners, though, have severe cost burden (spending more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs), at 22 percent for renters and only 14 percent for owners. Additionally, housing cost burden is not computed for
households that report negative income\textsuperscript{21}, and these households make up 21 percent of renters and less than one percent of owners. Given the lack of income, these households represent an additional group facing unaffordable housing costs.

**Figure 24: Cost Burden by Tenure**

In Unincorporated Napa County, 16 percent of households spend 50 percent or more of their income on housing, while 18 percent spend 30 percent to 50 percent. However, these rates vary greatly across income categories; not surprisingly, lower income households are more likely to have issues with housing affordability (see Figure 25). For example, 70 percent of Unincorporated Napa County households making less than 30 percent of AMI spend the

\textsuperscript{21} Negative income may occur for households which reports a net loss of income, for instance, a self-employed worked may have expenses greater than revenues, or a household that received rental income may suffer a loss if the expenses involved are greater than the rent received.
majority of their income on housing but only four percent of Unincorporated Napa County households with income greater than 100 percent of AMI are severely cost-burdened, and 84 percent of those making more than 100 percent of AMI are not unduly cost-burdened, spending less than 30 percent of their income on housing.

**Figure 25: Housing Cost Burden by Income Level**

People of color often pay a greater percentage of their income on housing, and in turn, are at a greater risk of housing insecurity and more likely to experience poverty and financial instability in part as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to white residents.

---

**Notes:**
- Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities), for owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs”, which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income.
- Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI).
- Universe: Occupied housing units
However, in Unincorporated Napa County the proportion of households with housing cost burdens of 30 percent or below of income is similar across the major race/ethnic groups at between 61 and 66 percent, as shown in Figure 26. All groups show between 33 percent and 39 percent of households with a moderate or severe housing cost burden. White non-Hispanic households have slightly lower proportions with moderate or severe cost burdens, but these differences may not be statistically significant given the smaller minority populations in the Unincorporated County. In any case, substantial portions of households in each of the categories pay 30 percent or more of income for shelter expenses.

Figure 26: Cost Burden by Race

[Diagram showing cost burden by race]

Universe: Occupied housing units.
Notes: Other race includes but is not limited to American Indian/Alaska Native and Black/African American; there are too few households in these two racial groups for statistical reliability. Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs”, which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income. For the purposes of this graph, the “Hispanic or Latino” racial/ethnic group represents those who identify as having Hispanic/Latino ethnicity and may also be members of any racial group. All other racial categories on this graph represent those who identify with that racial category and do not identify with Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.

Large family households often have special housing needs due to a lack of adequately sized affordable housing available and may bear higher cost burdens than other household types. However, in Unincorporated Napa County, fewer of the large-family households experience moderate or severe cost burdens in comparison to other household types; 16 percent of large family households experience a cost burden of 30 percent to 50 percent and 11 percent of these large-family households spend more than half of their income on housing. For all other household types combined, 19 percent have a cost burden of 30 percent to 50 percent and 16 percent spend more than half of their income on housing (see Figure 27). It appears that in Unincorporated Napa County, the large family households may tend to be more affluent than other household types, but it should be noted that a substantial portion of these households still face unacceptably high housing costs.

**Figure 27: Cost Burden by Household Size**
When cost-burdened seniors are no longer able to make house payments or pay rents, displacement from their homes can occur, putting further stress on the local rental market or forcing residents out of the community they call home. Understanding how seniors might be cost-burdened is of particular importance due to their special housing needs, particularly for low-income seniors, who tend to face modest or severe cost burdens. This is the case in Unincorporated Napa County, where approximately two-thirds of extremely low income seniors are spending the majority of their income on housing. In contrast, for senior households making more than 100 percent of AMI, 88 percent are not cost-burdened and spend less than 30 percent of their income on housing, and only nine percent of this group have modest cost burdens and only three percent have severe cost burdens (see Figure 28). The proportions of senior households with modest or severe cost burdens are similar for each income range to households overall as shown in Figure 25.
Figure 28: Cost-Burdened Senior Households by Income Level

Universe: Senior households
Notes: For the purposes of this graph, senior households are those with a householder who is aged 62 or older. Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs,” which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.


Overcrowding
Overcrowding is often related to the cost of housing and can occur when demand in a city or region is high. Overcrowding occurs when the number of people living in a household is greater than the home was designed to hold. This report uses the Census Bureau definition of overcrowding, which is more than one occupant per room (not including bathrooms or kitchens). Additionally, the Census Bureau considers units with more than 1.5 occupants per room to be severely overcrowded.
Overcrowding is not as prevalent in the Unincorporated County as in Napa County overall or the Bay Area. Only 1.5 percent of the households in Unincorporated Napa County have from 1.01 to 1.5 occupants per room and only 1.0 percent are severely overcrowded. Both Napa County and the Bay Area have over four percent of households overcrowded with 1.10 to 1.5 persons per room; for the County, 1.7 percent of its households are severely overcrowded, and for the Bay Area, 2.7 percent of households are severely overcrowded.

Table 25: Overcrowding Severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>1.00 occupants per room or less</th>
<th>1.01 to 1.50 occupants per room</th>
<th>More than 1.50 occupants per room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent Across</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa</td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>45,693</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>2,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>2,543,056</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>115,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Occupied housing units
Notes: The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25014.

In many places, overcrowding is more prevalent among those that are renting, with multiple households sharing a unit to make it possible to stay in their communities. This is the case in Unincorporated Napa County, where 3.4 percent of renters experience moderate overcrowding (1.01 to 1.5 occupants per room), compared to 0.9 percent for those that own, and 2.7 percent of households that rent are severely overcrowded (more than 1.5 occupants per room), compared to only 0.5 percent of households that own (see Figure 29).
Figure 29: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity

![Bar chart showing overcrowding by tenure and severity.]

- **Owner Occupied**
  - 1 to 1.5 Occupants per Room: 0.9%
  - More than 1.5 Occupants per Room: 0.5%

- **Renter Occupied**
  - 1 to 1.5 Occupants per Room: 3.4%
  - More than 1.5 Occupants per Room: 2.7%

**Notes:**
- The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded.

**Source:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25014.

Not surprisingly, overcrowding often disproportionately impacts low-income households. This holds true for Unincorporated Napa County, where 5.2 percent of extremely low-income households are overcrowded, more than for any of the other AMI-based income group (see Figure 30). The lowest proportion of overcrowded households, 1.5 percent, was found in the greater than 100 percent AMI category.
Communities of color often experience overcrowding similar to how they are more likely to experience poverty, financial instability, and housing insecurity. People of color tend to experience overcrowding at higher rates than White residents. In Unincorporated Napa County, the racial/ethnic group with the largest overcrowding rate is Latino (see Figure 31); however, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Black or African American showed no overcrowded households in Unincorporated Napa County. The Hispanic/Latino cohort is by far the larger group in the area.
Figure 31: Overcrowding by Race

[Chart showing overcrowding by race, with data points labeled as follows:
- 14% Hispanic / Latino
- 10% Other Race or Multiple Races (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)
- 2% White (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)
- 1% White, Non-Hispanic]

Universe: Occupied housing units
Notes: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Black or African American showed no overcrowded households in Unincorporated Napa County and are not shown in chart. The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded. For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latino. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latino may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latino, data for both white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. However, all groups labelled “Hispanic and Non-Hispanic” are mutually exclusive.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25014.

Special Housing Needs

Large Households
Large households often have different housing needs than smaller households. If an area’s rental housing stock does not include larger apartments, large households who rent could end up living in overcrowded conditions. In Unincorporated Napa, for large households with five or more persons, approximately one-third of units are renter-occupied (see Figure 32). However, this is higher than the overall proportion of renter households (23 percent), which may indicate a stronger need for large rental units. Furthermore, in 2017, 12.4 percent of large
family households in the Unincorporated County were very low-income, earning less than 50 percent of the area median income (AMI); these households would likely have trouble finding affordable housing in the area.

**Figure 32: Household Size by Tenure**

The unit sizes available in a community affect the household sizes that can access that community. Large families are generally served by housing units with three or more bedrooms, of which there are 6,427 units in Unincorporated Napa County. Among these large units with three or more bedrooms, 15.0 percent are renter-occupied, and 85.0 percent are owner occupied (see Figure 33). This indicates that there may be a lack of housing units suitable for large-family lower-income renter households and a need for increased numbers of rental housing units with three or more bedrooms.
**Female-Headed Households**

Households headed by one person are often at greater risk of housing insecurity, particularly female-headed households, who may be supporting children or a family with only one income. In Unincorporated Napa County, the largest proportion of households is Married-couple Family Households at 62 percent of total, as shown in Figure 34. This is a higher proportion than for Napa County overall or the Bay Area region. Female-Headed Households make up only six percent of all households in the Unincorporated County, a somewhat lower percentage than the two larger geographies.
Female-headed households with children may face particular housing challenges, with pervasive gender inequality resulting in lower wages for women. Moreover, the added need for childcare can make finding a home that is affordable more challenging. In Unincorporated Napa County, the most recent ACS reports that include these data, which cover the 2015 to 2019 time period, show slightly more than 300 female-headed family households with children, with only 15 of these households in poverty (see Figure 35). Given that the ACS results are based on a sample, these estimates are subject to statistical error, but do indicate a limited number of female-headed households in poverty in Unincorporated Napa County. These households are likely to face difficulty finding affordable housing suitable for their families in the area. Lower-income female-headed households will benefit from increased availability of affordable housing.
Figure 35: Female-Headed Households by Poverty Status

![Bar Chart]

Universe: Female Households
Notes: The Census Bureau uses a federally defined poverty threshold that remains constant throughout the country and does not correspond to Area Median Income.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17012

**Seniors**

Senior households often experience a combination of factors that can make accessing or keeping affordable housing a challenge. They often live on fixed incomes and are more likely to have disabilities, chronic health conditions and/or reduced mobility. Seniors who rent may be at even greater risk for housing challenges than those who own because their housing costs can increase as market rents increase, whereas most owners’ housing costs are fixed by their mortgage payment and some senior owners have reduced housing costs for seniors who no longer have a mortgage on their place of residence. While the largest group of senior renters and homeowners have incomes greater than 100 percent of AMI, over one-third of senior owners and slightly less than half of senior renters have low, very low, or extremely low incomes (see Figure 36). The group most likely at risk for finding affordable housing is extremely low income senior renters, who make up over 20 percent of all senior renter households. Based on these findings, lower-income senior households could benefit from an increased supply of affordable rental housing, including housing with supportive services, such as assisted living facilities. For seniors who are still able to live independently, smaller housing units are often appropriate due to their typically smaller household sizes.
People with Disabilities

Population by Disability Status

People with disabilities face additional housing challenges. Encompassing a broad group of individuals living with a variety of physical, cognitive, and sensory impairments, many people with disabilities live on fixed incomes and are in need of specialized care, yet often rely on family members for assistance due to the high cost of care. Persons with disabilities are not only in need of affordable housing but may require accessibly designed housing, which offers greater mobility and opportunity for independence. Unfortunately, the need may outweigh what is available, particularly in a housing market with high demand. People with disabilities are at a high risk for housing insecurity, homelessness, and institutionalization, particularly if they lose aging caregivers.
For Unincorporated Napa County, approximately 3,300 of the civilian noninstitutionalized population (13 percent) are estimated to have one or more of the six disability types specified below in Figure 38. As shown in Figure 37, this proportion is slightly higher than the proportions for Napa County and the Bay Area.

**Figure 37: Population by Disability Status**

![Bar chart showing percentage of population by disability status in Unincorporated Napa, Napa County, and Bay Area.]

**Notes:**
Universe: Civilian noninstitutionalized population

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B18101.

**Disability by Type**

Figure 38 shows the rates at which different disabilities are present among residents of Unincorporated Napa County. There are a broad range of disabilities present, for which varying housing solutions may be required. In addition to housing designed to be accessible to people with various kinds of physical disabilities, people with disabilities that affect their ability to live independently would benefit from housing that includes supportive services.

---

22 These disabilities are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one disability. These counts should not be summed.
Figure 38: Disability by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>Proportion of Adult Population Reporting (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With an ambulatory difficulty</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a cognitive difficulty</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an independent living...</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a hearing difficulty</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a vision difficulty</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a self-care difficulty</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Civillian noninstitutionalized population 18 years and over

Notes: These disabilities are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one disability. These counts should not be summed. The Census Bureau provides the following definitions for these disability types:
- Hearing difficulty: deaf or has serious difficulty hearing.
- Vision difficulty: blind or has serious difficulty seeing even with glasses.
- Cognitive difficulty: has serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions. Ambulatory difficulty: has serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs.
- Self-care difficulty: has difficulty dressing or bathing.
- Independent living difficulty: has difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor's office or shopping.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B18102, Table B18103, Table B18104, Table B18105, Table B18106, Table B18107.

Developmental Disabilities by Age
State law also requires Housing Elements to examine the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities as defined in Section 4512 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. Developmental disabilities are defined as severe, chronic, and attributed to a mental or physical impairment that begins before a person turns 18 years old. This can include Down’s Syndrome, autism, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and mild to severe intellectual disability. Some people with developmental disabilities are unable to work, rely on Supplemental Security Income, and live with family members. In addition to their specific housing needs, they are at increased risk of housing insecurity after an aging parent or family member is no longer able to care for them.

Napa County’s developmentally disabled community is served by the North Bay Regional Center, which provides advocacy, services, support, and care coordination to children and
adults diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families. The regional center supports over 10,000 individuals in Napa, Sonoma, and Solano Counties.

In Unincorporated Napa County, children under the age of 18 make up 43 percent and adults make up 57 percent of the approximately 200 persons reported as having a developmental disability, as shown in Table 26.

Table 26: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 17 Years</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+ Years</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Universe: Population with developmental disabilities.
The California Department of Developmental Services is responsible for overseeing the coordination and delivery of services to more than 330,000 Californians with developmental disabilities including cerebral palsy, intellectual disability, Down syndrome, autism, epilepsy, and related conditions.

The California Department of Developmental Services provides ZIP code level counts. To get jurisdiction-level estimates, ZIP code counts were crosswalked to jurisdictions using census block population counts from Census 2010 SF1 to determine the share of a ZIP code to assign to a given jurisdiction.

Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Age Group (2020)

Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence
As shown in Table 27, the most common living arrangement for individuals with developmental disabilities in Unincorporated Napa County is the home of parent /family /guardian, at almost three fourths of all such individuals. As reflected in the table, if not living with family members, individuals with developmental disabilities may need housing that includes supportive services, or housing in some other type of congregate housing.
Table 27: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home of Parent /Family /Guardian</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent /Supported Living</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster /Family Home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Facility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Care Facility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by Residence Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Population with developmental disabilities
Notes: The California Department of Developmental Services is responsible for overseeing the coordination and delivery of services to more than 330,000 Californians with developmental disabilities including cerebral palsy, intellectual disability, Down syndrome, autism, epilepsy, and related conditions. The California Department of Developmental Services provides ZIP code level counts. To get jurisdiction-level estimates, ZIP code counts were crosswalked to jurisdictions using census block population counts from Census 2010 SF1 to determine the share of a ZIP code to assign to a given jurisdiction.

Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Residence Type (2020)

**Homelessness**

Homelessness remains an urgent challenge in many communities across the region and the state, reflecting a range of social, economic, and psychological factors. Rising housing costs result in increased risks of community members experiencing homelessness. Residents who have found themselves housing insecure have ended up unhoused in recent years, either temporarily or longer term.

Addressing the specific housing needs for the unhoused population remains a priority throughout the region; homelessness is disproportionately experienced by people of color, people with disabilities, those struggling with addiction and those dealing with traumatic life circumstances. As shown in Table 28, a total of 322 persons were identified in Napa County as homeless by the 2019 point in time count, as provided in the ABAG-compiled data approved by HCD for use for the current housing element update cycle. The City of Napa reports that most of the homeless in the County are found in the city; specific counts of the homeless for just the unincorporated portions of the county were unavailable.

In Napa County, the most common type of household experiencing homelessness is those without children in their care. Among households experiencing homelessness that do not have children, slightly more than half are unsheltered; of homeless households with children, most are sheltered in transitional housing (see Table 28).

---

23 https://www.cityofnapa.org/1048/Homeless-Services-Coordination.
Table 28: Homelessness by Household Type and Shelter Status, Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>People in Households Composed Solely of Children &lt; 18</th>
<th>People in Households with Adults &amp; Children</th>
<th>People in Households without Children &lt; 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered - Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered - Transitional Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness in Napa County.

Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. Per HCD's requirements, jurisdictions will need to supplement this county-level data with local estimates of people experiencing homelessness.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019).

In Napa County, homeless shelter and transitional housing facilities are located within the incorporated cities, where there is access to various supportive services nearby. Napa County contributes funding towards shelter capacity in the cities. Shelters include the South Napa Shelter, Rainbow House Family Shelter, and the Winter Shelter. All are located in the City of Napa. The South Napa Shelter has a capacity of 102 beds; recently expanded from 69 beds. The Rainbow House Family Shelter accommodates seven families at a time and can sleep as many as 30 people, depending on family make-up. The Winter Shelter operates seasonally from mid-November to mid-April each year and has a capacity of 55 beds. According to County staff, South Napa Shelter and the Rainbow House Family Shelter both operate at or near capacity throughout the year. The Winter shelter’s usage fluctuates depending on the weather. County staff indicate that while additional capacity would be beneficial for all facilities, the current focus is on building additional permanent supportive housing.

The existing shelter facilities and transitional housing do not operate in the Unincorporated Area, thus any homeless persons located in Unincorporated Napa County are unsheltered. However; Napa County zoning provides for the development and operation of these uses, as discussed in the Governmental Constraints section of the Housing Element. As shown in Table 28, there were 145 unsheltered individuals, indicating that, ideally, additional shelter facilities would be developed within Napa County.

While people of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability resulting in homelessness, the majority of persons in Napa County experiencing homeless are White.
The prevalence of homelessness by race generally reflects the racial makeup of the county; White (Hispanic and non-Hispanic) residents account for 77.0 percent of the homeless population while making up 73.4 percent of the overall population (see Figure 39). The minority group that is most overrepresented in the homeless population is the American Indian or Alaska Native (Hispanic and non-Hispanic) population, who make up nearly ten percent of the estimated homeless population but less than one percent of the county’s overall population. The Black or African American (Hispanic and non-Hispanic) populations are also slightly more likely than the overall population to be homeless.

Figure 39: Racial Group Share of General and Homeless Populations, Napa County

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness

Notes: Data based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. HUD does not disaggregate racial demographic data by Hispanic/Latino ethnicity for people experiencing homelessness. Instead, HUD reports data on Hispanic/Latino ethnicity for people experiencing homelessness in a separate table. Accordingly, the racial group data listed here includes both Hispanic/Latino and non-Hispanic/Latino individuals.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-I)

Available data do not separate the non-Hispanic from the Hispanic population by race.
In Napa County, Latino residents represent 38.5 percent of the population experiencing homelessness, while Latino residents comprise 33.9 percent of the general population, as shown in Figure 40.

**Figure 40: Latino Share of General and Homeless Populations, Napa County**

![Graph showing the comparison between Hispanic/Latino and Non-Hispanic/Latino populations in terms of percentage of homelessness and overall population.](image)

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness  
Notes: See notes for Figure 39 above.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-I)

Many of those experiencing homelessness are dealing with severe personal issues – including mental illness, substance abuse and domestic violence – that are potentially life threatening and require additional assistance. In Napa County, homeless individuals are commonly challenged by severe mental illness, with 177 reporting this condition (see Table 29). Of those, some 44 percent are unsheltered, further adding to the challenge of handling the issue. A substantial number (161) also report having problems with chronic substance abuse.
Table 29: Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness, Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Chronic Substance Abuse</th>
<th>HIV/AIDS</th>
<th>Severely Mentally Ill</th>
<th>Veterans</th>
<th>Victims of Domestic Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered - Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered - Transitional Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness
Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. Per HCD’s requirements, jurisdictions will need to supplement this county-level data with local estimates of people experiencing homelessness. These challenges/characteristics are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one challenge/characteristic. These counts should not be summed.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019).

In Unincorporated Napa County in recent school years, the student population experiencing homelessness has ranged from 63 to 99 students over an entire academic year, with the lower number from the 2019-20 school year.\(^{25}\) Countywide, 270 students and regionwide approximately 13,700 reportedly experienced homelessness at some time during that school year (see Table 30). Students facing homelessness face adding undue burdens on learning and thriving, with the potential for longer term negative effects.

Table 30: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>15,142</td>
<td>15,427</td>
<td>13,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools.
Notes: The California Department of Education considers students to be homeless if they are unsheltered, living in temporary shelters for people experiencing homelessness, living in hotels/motels, or temporarily doubled up and sharing the housing of other persons due to the loss of housing or economic hardship. The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography.

\(^{25}\) This table covers students who are homeless at any time during the school year, unlike the homeless count provided above in Table 28 above which is based on a single point in time. All counts of homeless persons are subject to potential undercounting as some persons experiencing homelessness may be overlooked by enumerators.
Farmworkers

Across the state, housing for farmworkers has been recognized as an important and unique concern. Farmworkers generally receive wages that are considerably lower than other jobs and may have temporary housing needs. Finding decent and affordable housing can be challenging, particularly in the current housing market. Because Napa County has a substantial agricultural economy, with most of the activity in unincorporated areas, farmworker housing is a key issue locally.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Census of Farmworkers, the number of permanent farm workers in Napa County has increased since 2002, totaling 4,290 in 2017, while the number of seasonal farm workers has decreased, totaling 5,734 in 2017 (see Figure 41). The overall number of farm workers was about the same in 2017 as in 2002.

Figure 41: Farm Labor in Napa County

![Farm Labor in Napa County Chart]

Universe: Hired farm workers (including direct hires and agricultural service workers who are often hired through labor contractors)
Notes: Farm workers are considered seasonal if they work on a farm less than 150 days in a year, while farm workers who work on a farm more than 150 days are considered to be permanent workers for that farm.

Farm workers have a variety of special housing needs in terms of affordability, location, and duration of residence. The increase in farmworkers living in Napa County on a permanent basis increases the need for local, affordable farmworker housing for household types other than single adult men and women, including family housing and all the services and neighborhood amenities associated with raising families and being permanent members of the community.

Farm workers may face added affordable housing challenges due to immigration status. Federally funded affordable housing projects require the head of household to have documentation of legal resident status, precluding some farm workers from subsidized farm worker housing.

Even seasonal farm workers may travel with families, with children who at least temporarily enroll in local schools. In Unincorporated Napa County, the migrant worker student population totaled 88 during the 2019-20 school year and has increased by 47 percent since the 2016-17 school year when there were 60. The change in the migrant worker student population at the county level is a more modest 19.4 percent increase for the same period. In contrast, the regional trend for the past few years has been a gradual decline in the migrant worker student population.

Table 31: Migrant Worker Student Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>3,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools.

Notes: The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography.


In 2021, Napa County was awarded a Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) grant to fund work to explore opportunities to increase farmworker housing. The County will be undertaking this study and will use the planning grant resource to better target its efforts to facilitate and encourage the development of farmworker housing. This may result in Housing Element program updates/modifications prior to adoption of the final 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update.

26 It is likely that many farm workers employed in unincorporated Napa County live in the incorporated cities of the county where most of the housing is located, particularly in City of Napa.
Non-English Speakers

California has long been an immigration gateway to the United States, which means that many languages are spoken throughout the Bay Area. Since learning a new language is universally challenging, it is not uncommon for residents who have immigrated to the United States to have limited English proficiency. This limit can lead to additional disparities if there is a disruption in housing, such as an eviction, because residents might not be aware of their rights or they might be wary to engage due to immigration status concerns. Regionwide and for Napa County overall, the proportion of residents five years and older with limited English proficiency is eight percent. However, the proportion is lower in Unincorporated Napa County, at only four percent. Because this is a vulnerable population, it is important that tenants rights outreach and education efforts be conducted in a multi-lingual fashion. As Spanish is the primary language of the majority of unincorporated Napa County’s non-English speakers, Housing Element Program H-3b calls for fair housing efforts to be conducted in Spanish as well as English, at a minimum.

Figure 42: Population with Limited English Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population 5 Years and Over Who Speak English &quot;Well&quot; or &quot;Very well&quot;</th>
<th>Population 5 Years and Over Who Speak English &quot;Not well&quot; or &quot;Not at all&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Napa</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universe: Population 5 years and over
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B16005.
6. ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

The Housing Element must include a program that promotes and affirmatively furthers fair housing throughout the community for all persons, regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, disability, or any other characteristics that are protected by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), Government code Section 65008, and all other applicable State and federal fair housing and planning laws. Under State law, affirmatively furthering fair housing means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.”

The Housing Element must also include an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) that is consistent with the core elements of the federal Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Final Rule from July 2015. The following section summarizes key findings from the Assessment of Fair Housing, which was completed in accordance with current HCD guidance, as well as a detailed reading of the California Government Code.

The main sources of information for the following analysis are the U.S. Census Decennial Census and American Community Survey, the HCD AFFH Data and Mapping Resources Tool, the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH), HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO), the State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), and the County of Napa.

HEAC meetings, public workshops, and stakeholder interviews conducted as part of the Housing Element Update raised the issues of fair housing and affirmatively furthering fair housing. This included a meeting convened specifically to gather input from Spanish-speaking community members, including farmworker representation. Participants did not raise major concerns with fair housing in the unincorporated area, focusing more on general challenges of housing availability and affordability. Participants did mention immigration status and language barriers as two challenges facing minorities, primarily Spanish-speaking community members. These community members may experience difficulty finding information about housing resources and housing rights and may also be fearful about asserting their rights, such for habitable rental housing, out of concerns that landlords would increase their rents if they were required to fix housing problems.

---

27 California Government Code § 8899.5 (a)(1)
Program H-3b (contract for fair housing services) calls for specific outreach activities to be conducted in both English and Spanish throughout the county.

**Fair Housing Enforcement and Capacity**

Fair housing complaints can be used as an indicator of the overall magnitude of housing complaints, and to identify characteristics of households experiencing discrimination in housing. Pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act [Government Code Section 12921 (a)], the opportunity to seek, obtain, and hold housing cannot be determined by an individual’s “race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, genetic information, or any other basis prohibited by Section 51 of the Civil Code.” Federal Law also prohibits many kinds of housing discrimination.

Housing discrimination complaints can be directed to either HUD’s Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) or the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH).

Fair housing issues that may arise in any jurisdiction include but are not limited to:

- housing design that makes a dwelling unit inaccessible to an individual with a disability;
- discrimination against an individual based on race, national origin, familial status, disability, religion, sex, or other protected characteristic when renting or buying a housing unit;
- and, disproportionate housing needs including cost burden, overcrowding, substandard housing, and risk of displacement.

Complaints have been filed with FHEO over housing discrimination in Napa County in recent years.\(^\text{29}\) From 2013 through 2020, 43 complaints were recorded, as shown below; slightly more than one-third of complaints were conciliated or settled, a no cause determination was made for slightly less than one third of complaints, and approximately one-fourth of complaints were withdrawn after resolution,

\(^{29}\) Data not available separately for unincorporated county only
Table 32: FHEO Fair Housing Complaints by Resolution Type, 2013 to 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Total, 2013-2020</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conciliated/settled</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed for lack of jurisdiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cause determination</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn after resolution</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn without resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, All Complaints</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: HUD, Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, 2021; BAE, 2021.

In addition to data from the FHEO, this analysis also reviewed data from the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). As reported in Table 33, there were a total of 18 complaints for Napa County between 2018 and 2021 year-to-date, covering 30 basis types and 32 discriminatory practices (a single complaint can include more than one of each of these two categories). Twelve of the complaints were found to have no cause, three were the subject of voluntary mediation, and three were withdrawn after resolution.
Table 33: DFEH Fair Housing Complaints in Napa County by Class, Practice, and Resolution Type, 2018-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis Type</th>
<th>Total, 2018-2021 (YTD)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancestry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National origin/color/race</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment-Quid Pro Quo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, All Basis Types</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discriminatory Practice (a)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied equal terms and conditions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied reasonable accommodation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied reasonable accommodation for a disability or medical condition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied rental/lease/sale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evicted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjected to restrictive/covenant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjected to discriminatory statements/advertisements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, All Practices</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cause determination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary mediation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn after resolution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, All Resolutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
(a) Each complaint may involve more than one basis type or discriminatory practice, but there is only one resolution per complaint.

Sources: California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, 2021; BAE, 2021.

Unincorporated Napa County Fair Housing Services

Napa County contracts with Fair Housing Napa Valley30 (FHNV) for fair housing services. FHNV provides assistance with monitoring and enforcing fair housing rights for residents throughout Napa County and also for Vallejo in Solano County. Services provided include landlord tenant counseling, outreach and education, and discrimination investigation.

The County directs parties to FHNV for further consideration and analysis of housing-related complaints. The Napa County Housing Authority provides a link to FHNV’s website at https://www.countyofnapa.org/467/Housing-Authority.

30 https://napafairhousing.org/
Integration and Segregation Patterns and Trends

Race and Ethnicity
As noted in the housing needs analysis, since 2000, the number and percentage of residents in Unincorporated Napa County identifying as White has decreased and the percentage of residents of all other races and ethnicities has increased by 10.3 percent, with the 2019 White Non-Hispanic population estimated at 17,827. The unincorporated county is still less diverse than the county overall. Based on 2019 ACS data, nearly 70 percent of the unincorporated county is White Non-Hispanic, in comparison to only 52 percent for the county and 39 percent for the region. This indicates that the incorporated areas of the county contain a much higher percentage of the county’s minority population than the unincorporated area. The largest minority group in both the unincorporated area and the incorporated area is the Hispanic/Latino population.

Historic Patterns of Racial Discrimination
The following section discusses longer-term trends regarding race and ethnicity in Napa County overall.

Black residents were present in what is now Napa County as early as 1845. Others who followed after the Civil War as freed slaves sought out new opportunities in California. The late 1800s showed ongoing patterns of segregation in Napa County along with progress on some fronts. Schools in the City of Napa were integrated in 1878, in large part due the expense of running a separate school for the small number of Black children in the city. However, discrimination in employment and housing opportunities and other factors led to a decline in the Black population in Napa County over the following decades. In 1900 the Census reported only 28 African Americans in Napa County, a decline from 106 in 1870.

There is no specific evidence in Napa County of the Home Owners’ Loan Corporation official “redline” maps first developed during the New Deal which reinforced housing segregation. However, some of the housing subdivisions developed during and after World War II reportedly had restrictive covenants that prohibited Black residence in those

33 Ibid. See discussion of housing discrimination beginning on page 75.
areas, but physical evidence of those covenants is difficult to find. In at least one case, the South Gordon Terrace housing development in the City of Napa, such a covenant existed for housing developed after such restrictions were declared unconstitutional and unenforceable. More likely, informal understandings between brokers and rental agents resulted in housing discrimination in Napa County.

In the late 19th Century, anti-Chinese sentiment led to the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, which along with other measures limited further Chinese immigration, especially for women and children, as well as closing the path to citizenship and employment for those of Chinese ancestry. Along with legal barriers, there were numerous other extralegal actions including attacks on Chinese individuals and businesses. The Exclusion Act was not repealed until the 1940s. Napa County was no stranger to the anti-Chinese trends, with boycotts of businesses employing or associated with those of Chinese ancestry, and arson fires in the county’s Chinese settlements: newspaper coverage often echoed the associated public sentiments. The Chinese population reported by the decennial Census showed a decline from 884 in 1880 to only 70 in 1930. Napa County’s history with respect to anti-Chinese racism is documented at https://napahistory.org/napa-county-and-the-anti-chinese-league/ and also at https://yesterdaysamerica.com/the-forgotten-history-of-napa-valley-chinatowns/, which describe patterns of housing segregation for the Chinese population in Napa County.

More recent trends are mixed in Napa County for various racial and ethnic groups. In 1980, Napa County was nearly 90 percent White non-Hispanic (see Table 34), with the Hispanic population making up the largest minority group with 8.7 percent of the County’s population. Since 1980, the White non-Hispanic population has steadily declined; recently released 2020 Census data indicates that this group is no longer a majority of the County’s total population, while the Hispanic population has grown to over one-third of the county’s total. Asian/Pacific Islanders were only 2.2 percent of the 1980 population, but now make up 7.9 percent of the total. No other group shown in the table makes up more than five percent of the 2020 population. The Black population, while a small percentage of the County total, increased gradually from 981 in 1980 to 2,440 in 2010, but declined to 2,300 in 2020, never constituting even two percent of the County’s population.

34 Ibid. See discussion on page 77.
Table 34: Napa County Race by Ethnicity, 1980 to 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86,466</td>
<td>89,453</td>
<td>85,932</td>
<td>76,967</td>
<td>68,909</td>
<td>-17,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>-322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>9,299</td>
<td>10,836</td>
<td>8,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (a)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>6,638</td>
<td>6,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Not Hispanic nor Latino</strong></td>
<td>90,600</td>
<td>94,824</td>
<td>94,863</td>
<td>92,474</td>
<td>89,190</td>
<td>-1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>8,599</td>
<td>15,941</td>
<td>29,416</td>
<td>44,010</td>
<td>48,829</td>
<td>40,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, All Races</strong></td>
<td>99,199</td>
<td>110,765</td>
<td>124,279</td>
<td>136,484</td>
<td>138,019</td>
<td>38,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>-20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>134.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>403.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (a)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3781.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Not Hispanic nor Latino</strong></td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>467.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, All Races</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Census Bureau has changed how it gathers race and Hispanic origin data over time, so findings about trends should be noted with caution. Especially significant was the addition in 2000 of the respondents’ ability to specify more than one race; this change is evidenced by the sharp increase in the “other” category, between 1990 and 2000, as it includes persons of two or more races starting in 2000.

(a) For 1980 and 1990, this category consists of persons of some other race alone. Beginning in 2000, it also includes persons of two or more races.


Dissimilarity Index

One of two key metrics recommended for use in fair housing analysis as part of the federal AFFH rule, the dissimilarity index measures the evenness with which two groups are distributed across the geographic units that make up a larger area, such as Census block groups within a jurisdiction. The index can range from zero to 100, with zero meaning no segregation, or spatial disparity, and 100 indicating complete segregation between the two groups. The index score can be interpreted as the percentage of one of the two groups that would have to move to produce an even distribution. An index score...
above 55 is considered evidence of high segregation, while 40 to 55 is considered moderate, and below 40 is considered to show low segregation.\textsuperscript{35}

The calculation of both the dissimilarity and isolation indexes relies on the use of block group and Census tract level data from the U.S. Census Bureau. However, the block groups and tracts in Napa County do not necessarily follow city boundaries, especially for the cities of Napa and American Canyon. For this analysis of fair housing, the block groups and tracts that included both incorporated places and Unincorporated Napa County were removed from the unincorporated county analysis if a review of maps and aerial images indicated that most of the population of the block group or tract lived within an incorporated place. Some lightly populated incorporated areas were unavoidably included in this analysis and some unincorporated areas of the County were not covered in the following analysis, but these areas were not substantially populated. Since data were not available for just the unincorporated portions, the calculations summarized below reflect the characteristics of entire block groups and tracts, including the portions of some block groups and tracts that extend into incorporated areas.

In 2010, Unincorporated Napa County showed moderate to high dissimilarity indexes for most minority populations, as shown in Table 35. The indexes for every group increased between 2010 and 2019, indicating a trend toward increased housing segregation in the Asian and Hispanic or Latino communities. For other racial and ethnic categories, as noted above in Table 34, the population of several of the minority groups in Napa County are extremely small; as a result, the 2015 to 2019 numbers are subject to potential statistical error.

Table 35: Dissimilarity Index, Unincorporated Napa County, 2010 and 2015-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial and/or Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Dissimilarity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P9, ACS 2015-2019 five-year sample data, Table B03002; BAE, 2021.

Isolation Index

The other key metric recommended under the federal AFFH rule is the Isolation Index, which compares a group’s share of the overall population to the average share within a given block group. Ranging from 0 to 100, the isolation index represents the percentage of residents of a given race or ethnicity in a block group where the average resident of that group lives, correcting for the fact that this number increases mechanically with that group’s share of the overall study area’s population. Using Hispanic or Latino residents as an example, an aggregate isolation index of 45 indicates that the average Hispanic or Latino resident lives in a block group where the Hispanic or Latino share of the population exceeds the overall communitywide average by roughly 45 percent. Isolation index values close to zero indicate that members of that minority group live in relatively integrated neighborhoods.36 37

Table 36 summarizes isolation index scores by racial and ethnic minority affiliation. The data indicate that most racial and ethnic subpopulations in Unincorporated Napa County live in areas with relatively high degrees of racial and ethnic integration. Hispanics make up the second largest race/ethnic group in the Unincorporated County and have the highest isolation index score. Non-Hispanic Whites, the largest single race/ethnic group in Unincorporated Napa County, have the second-highest score. The isolation indexes showed modest increases over the 2010 to 2019 period for all groups, but for all the groups, the isolation levels are still relatively low. Once again, it should be noted that the

population of several of the minority groups in Napa County are extremely small; as a result, the 2015 to 2019 numbers are subject to potential statistical error.

Table 36: Isolation Index, Unincorporated Napa County, 2010 and 2015-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial and/or Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Isolation Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>14.1 20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>2.0 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>0.2 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>4.3 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>0.3 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>0.2 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0.8 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>16.8 22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table P9, ACS 2015-2019 five-year sample data, Table B03002; BAE, 2021.

Geographic Distribution of Residents by Race and Ethnicity

Figure 43 through Figure 60 below illustrate the geographic concentrations of the overall non-White population and the non-Hispanic populations of White, Black, Native American/Alaska Native, Asian, Pacific Islanders, Some Other Race, and Two or More Races, and Hispanic or Latino residents by Census block group, for both Unincorporated Napa County and a comparison region, defined as Napa and Sonoma Counties combined. (the “North Bay Region”).

As noted above, Census block group and tract boundaries in Napa County do not always follow city boundaries, especially for the cities of Napa and American Canyon. As a result, some unincorporated areas are grouped with the incorporated cities in the maps and analysis below, and some unincorporated areas are excluded. The areas described on the maps as “Incorporated Jurisdiction Block Groups” or Incorporated Jurisdiction Tracts” are the areas that have been excluded from the analysis, but these may include some unincorporated areas.

While slightly more than two-thirds of the Unincorporated County’s population overall is White Non-Hispanic, the proportion of the total population of other race/ethnic groups varies considerably by Census block group, as shown in Figure 43, ranging from 14 percent to 69 percent. Correspondingly, the percentage of White non-Hispanic persons ranges from 31 percent to 86 percent (see Figure 45). The highest non-White and Hispanic concentrations are in a block group covering an unincorporated island within Napa city, and in a block group between Yountville and St. Helena. For the North Bay Region overall, the block groups with the highest non-White and Hispanic population tend to be in the urban areas, with concentrations by block group ranging from only four percent up to greater than 90 percent (see Figure 44). Conversely, the highest concentrations of White
non-Hispanic persons tend to be found in more rural areas of the region, ranging from eight percent to 96 percent, as shown in Figure 46.

None of the other major race/ethnic populations make up even four percent of the Unincorporated County population. However, there are concentrations of two of the groups in one particular area of the county, the community of Angwin, which has high proportions of non-Hispanic Blacks (Figure 49) and non-Hispanic Asians (Figure 51). This is an indicator of the diverse student body of Pacific Union College.
Figure 43: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, Unincorporated Napa County

Note: Includes all categories except White non-Hispanic persons.
Source: Esri 2018.
Figure 44: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-White, North Bay Region

Note: Includes all categories except White non-Hispanic persons.
Source: Esri 2018.
Figure 45: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic White, Unincorporated Napa County

Source: Esri 2018.
The largest non-White or Hispanic population in the Unincorporated County is the Hispanic/Latino population, at 21.4 percent of the area’s total, as shown above in the housing needs assessment. By block group, the percentage varies widely, from six percent to 64 percent (see Figure 47). This group is most concentrated to the southeast of St. Helena and in block groups adjacent to the City of Napa. Regionwide, there are areas with somewhat lower and somewhat higher concentrations of the Hispanic/Latino population, with the proportions ranging from six percent to 88 percent by block group. The highest concentrations are generally in the more urban areas of the North Bay Region (see Figure 48).
Figure 47: Census Block Groups by Percent Hispanic or Latino, Unincorporated Napa County
The Black non-Hispanic population of Unincorporated Napa County is extremely small, accounting for less than three percent of the area's population according to 2015-2019 American Community Survey data as discussed in the housing needs assessment. Three block groups in the area have no Black non-Hispanic residents, and the highest proportion is 6.5 percent in Angwin, likely related to the presence of Pacific Union College (see Figure 49). For the North Bay Region, the range by block group is from zero to 26 percent, as shown in Figure 50. The single block group at 26 percent is the block group for the Napa State Hospital, a psychiatric hospital in Napa city operated by the State of California. The only other block group with a non-Hispanic Black population making up more than 10 percent of the total is in American Canyon. Other block groups with high concentrations tend to be clustered in and around Santa Rosa.
Figure 49: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Black, Unincorporated Napa County
As noted in the housing needs assessment, non-Hispanic Asians and Pacific Islanders make up 4.5 percent of Unincorporated Napa County’s population. As seen in Figure 51, the proportion of non-Hispanic Asians by block group varies from less than 0.5 percent to 18.9 percent, with the highest proportion found in Angwin, again likely due to the presence of Pacific Union College – no other block group in the Unincorporated County is more than 10 percent Asian non-Hispanic.

For the North Bay Region, the proportion of population that is Asian non-Hispanic ranges from zero to 58 percent. The three block groups with the highest concentrations (greater than 40 percent) are associated with American Canyon (see Figure 52). These areas have shown more growth in recent years than the county overall and the high proportions of Asians and other non-White and Hispanic populations may indicate a declining level of discrimination in the region.
Figure 51: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Asian, Unincorporated Napa County
The Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander population in Unincorporated Napa County is extremely small. By Census block group, the proportions range from none to less than 0.8 percent (see Figure 53). Regionally, this population is also fairly small; the highest concentration by block group is only four percent, as illustrated in Figure 54.
Figure 53: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, Unincorporated Napa County

Source: Esri 2018.
As displayed in Figure 55, the non-Hispanic Alaska Native/Native American population in the Unincorporated County is also extremely small, ranging from zero to only 1.4 percent by block group. Regionally, the proportion in all but one block group was less than three percent. One rural block group in northwest Sonoma County showed non-Hispanic Native Americans making up approximately ten percent of the population (see Figure 56).
Figure 55: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Native American, Unincorporated Napa County

Source: Esri 2018.
Yet another very small race/ethnic cohort in the Unincorporated County and the North Bay Region is the non-Hispanic Some Other Race Alone population as shown in Figure 57 and Figure 58. In Unincorporated Napa County, the percentage by block group ranges from zero to only 0.7 percent, and in the entire North Bay Region, the largest concentration by block group is only 1.2 percent.
Figure 57: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, Unincorporated Napa County
Based on 2020 Census data, persons of two or more races and non-Hispanic make up the second-largest minority race/ethnic group in Napa County; however, this group makes up only four percent of the Unincorporated County total. Concentration by block group ranges from less than 0.5 percent to six percent of total population.\(^{38}\)

\(^{38}\) Range is based on 2015-2019 ACS data.
Figure 59: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, Unincorporated Napa County

Source: Esri 2018.
Figure 60: Census Block Groups by Percent Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, North Bay Region

Source: Esri 2018.
Persons with a Disability
As discussed in the housing needs assessment, approximately 13 percent (3,300 persons) of the civilian noninstitutionalized population in Unincorporated Napa County is estimated to have one or more of the six disability types specified by the American Community Survey. This proportion is similar to the County overall but higher than for the Bay Area.

Figure 61 shows the percent of persons with a disability by Census tract for the Unincorporated County using ACS data from 2015-2019. The tracts range from 8.2 percent to 15.8 percent of the civilian noninstitutionalized population having one or more type of disability. The highest proportion is found in a large tract that is northernmost in the county and is thinly populated.

As shown in Figure 62, the North Bay Region shows some Census tracts with very high proportions of disabled persons. There are five tracts reporting that over 20 percent of the non-institutionalized civilian population is disabled, with one of those tracts showing almost three-fourths of this population as disabled. This tract is home to the Napa State Hospital, a State-run facility for involuntarily held mentally disabled persons (e.g., persons found not guilty of a crime due to insanity); there is little other population in the tract. A closer look at the data indicates that the disabled proportion anomaly may be due to a misclassification of hospital residents as being non-institutionalized. Additionally, this lightly populated tract contains an affordable housing project, the Skyline Apartments that has 19 units targeted towards very low-income households with at least one disabled member. The second highest concentration of disabled persons was found in the tract containing the recently closed Sonoma Developmental Center. This facility closed in 2018, but the data from ACS covers a period beginning in 2015.

These high concentrations of reported disabled persons thus appear to be associated with institutionally dominated Census tracts, which may indicate a data collection problem rather than clusters of disabled persons in the non-institutionalized population. Otherwise, while disabled persons may face difficulty finding suitable housing in Unincorporated Napa County due to housing costs and other factors, these findings do not indicate any geographic pattern of housing discrimination or segregation of disabled persons in the area, except for those assigned by the courts to Napa State Hospital.
Figure 61: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, Unincorporated Napa County

Familial Status

Familial status discrimination means discrimination based on households with children under 18 or pregnancy. Households with more than one adult, especially married couple households, tend to have higher incomes, can better afford housing and are less likely to face discrimination due to familial status. As a result, the presence of higher proportions of married-couple families with children under 18 may indicate a lower likelihood of discrimination based on familial status. Unincorporated Napa County has a higher proportion of married-couple households compared to the County overall and the Bay Area, with 62 percent of households reporting as married-couple families compared to 53 percent for the county and 51 percent of the region. Most children under 18 in Unincorporated Napa County live in married-couple households. By Census tract, between 53 percent and 100 percent of children under 18 reside in married-couple households (as shown in Figure 63), indicating no areas within the Unincorporated County with a majority of children in single-parent or other non-married couple households. With the exception of the large northernmost tract, the higher concentrations...
of children under 18 in married couple households are to the north of Napa city. For the North Bay Region, the proportion of children in married-couple households ranges from 27 to 100 percent. There does not appear to be a clear pattern as to the location of the tracts with low percentages, but the highest percentages appear to be in more rural areas (see Figure 64).
Figure 63: Percent of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, Unincorporated Napa County

Households with only one parent or guardian present, especially female-headed households, are more likely to face problems in finding affordable housing. Figure 65 shows the distribution in the Unincorporated County of the percent of children in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present, with the proportion of children in this type of households ranging from none to 35 percent. That highest concentration is found in the thinly populated northernmost tract. Three other tracts show concentrations greater than 15 percent. For the North Bay Region, the proportion of children in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present ranges from none to 64 percent (see Figure 66). The only tract over 40 percent is the tract containing the Napa State Hospital; this tract has a very small reported population; some persons may be misclassified as being in households (see discussion above regarding this problem regarding the disabled and non-institutionalized population). ACS 2015-2019 shows only 11 children under 18 living in any type of household in this tract. The other tracts showing 30 percent or more of children in female-headed households are scattered throughout the region, typically being the same tracts with a low percentage of children in married couple households.
Figure 65: Percent of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, Unincorporated Napa County

**Income**

As shown in Table 37, for the 2015-2019 ACS survey period the median annual household income in the Unincorporated County, at $108,961, compared to only $83,000 for the North Bay Region. Only 8.3 percent of the Unincorporated County’s households reported incomes below $25,000; while 12.5 percent of those in the overall North Bay Region have incomes at this level. For the upper end of the income scale, over one-third of the Unincorporated County’s households had incomes of $150,000 or more, while only 22.1 percent of the North Bay Region’s households had income in that range.
Table 37: Household Income Distribution and Median Income, 2015-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated Napa County</th>
<th>North Bay Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $14,999</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 and above</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>9,022</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$108,691</td>
<td>$83,206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Incomes are in 2019 dollars.


Figure 67 below shows the geographic distribution of households by median annual household income by block group in Unincorporated Napa County. The lowest median annual income by block group is slightly more than $50,000, and the highest is over $230,000. The highest medians are found in block groups to the east of Napa city and a block group to the northeast of Yountville; there is not a clear pattern as to the location of the low-median block groups. Regionally, median annual household incomes range from less than $10,000 to more than $200,000 (see Figure 68). The lowest household median income is found in the block group containing the Napa State Hospital; the income levels may reflect problematic data where some group quarters population has been improperly
placed in households. Generally speaking, the lower median income levels are found in the more urbanized areas of the North Bay Region, especially Napa city and Santa Rosa.

39 See additional discussion above regarding the problematic data from the block group and census tract containing this group quarters facility.
Figure 67: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, Unincorporated Napa County

Figure 68: Distribution of Median Income by Block Group, North Bay Region


Figure 69 displays additional information regarding income levels in Unincorporated Napa County, showing the percentage of persons in low- to moderate-income households by Census tract. The percentage by tract ranges from 15 percent to 50 percent, with the highest percentage in the tract surrounding Yountville. The North Bay Region shows a broader range, with the percentage of persons in low- to moderate-income households by tract ranging from 9.7 percent to 100 percent, as shown in Figure 70. The tract at 100 percent contains the Napa State Hospital, perhaps leading to data problems once again due to misclassification of persons into households rather than in group quarters. No other tract has more than about 75 percent of its population in households at low and moderate income levels.
Figure 69: Percent of Low to Moderate Income Households by Census Tract, Unincorporated Napa County

Sources: HUD; U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2011-2015 data.
As shown in Figure 71, which displays status by Census tract in Unincorporated Napa County, the percentage of population in poverty ranges from 1.1 percent to 11.3 percent, indicating that while the population in poverty is limited, there are some persons living in poverty in the Unincorporated County. The highest concentrations are in tracts in the south portion of the county, bordering the cities of Napa and American Canyon. Tracts with higher poverty are scattered across the North Bay Region, in both rural and urban areas (see Figure 72). Excluding the tract containing the Napa State Hospital, the percent of population in poverty ranges from 1.1 percent to 23.5 percent.
Figure 71: Poverty Status, Unincorporated Napa County

Note: “Incorporated Jurisdiction Tracts” are defined as those whose population largely resides within incorporated cities and towns and may include some nearby unincorporated areas. Conversely, unincorporated area tracts may include small portions of incorporated jurisdictions.

Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty
The overall distribution of households in poverty by race is discussed in the Housing Needs Assessment chapter. To assist communities in identifying racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (also known as RCAPs and ECAPs), HUD developed a definition that relies on a racial and ethnic concentration threshold, as well as a poverty test. The racial and ethnic concentration threshold requires that an RCAP or ECAP have a non-White population of 50 percent or more. The poverty test defines areas of “extreme poverty” as those where 40 percent or more of the population lives at or below the federal poverty line, or those where the poverty rate is three times the average poverty rate in the metropolitan area, whichever is less. While there are tracts with a non-White population majority, none of the tracts in Unincorporated Napa County or elsewhere in the North Bay Region have more than one quarter of their population below the poverty line, so there are no R/ECAP areas in Unincorporated Napa County or elsewhere in the region.
Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence

R/ECAPs show one side of concentrations by race and wealth. On the other side are “areas of affluence” where non-minority affluent populations are concentrated. HCD devised a measure which calls out Census tracts with relatively high concentrations of both White population and higher household incomes, as detailed in the HCD AFFH Data and Mapping Tool. These areas are designated as “Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence,” or RCAAs.

There are no RCAAs in Unincorporated Napa County or the larger North Bay Region. However, a comparison of the distribution of the non-White population (Figure 43 and Figure 44) with the distribution of median household incomes (Figure 67 and Figure 68) in Unincorporated Napa County and the North Bay Region shows that for the unincorporated county, there is no pattern linking higher concentrations of the non-White population with lower household incomes; for the North Bay Region, though, the urban centers of the two counties tend to have higher proportions of non-White residents and lower median household incomes.

Disparities in Access to Opportunity

The Housing Element must include an analysis of access to opportunities. To facilitate this assessment, HCD and the State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened an independent group of organizations and research institutions under the umbrella of the California Fair Housing Task Force, which produces an annual set of Opportunity Maps. The maps identify areas within every region of the state “whose characteristics have been shown by research to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families – particularly long-term outcomes for children.”

TCAC and HCD created these “Opportunity Maps,” using reliable and publicly available data sources to derive 21 indicators to calculate opportunity index scores for Census tracts in each region in California. The TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map categorizes Census tracts into five groups based on the opportunity index scores:

- Highest Resource
- High Resource
- Moderate Resource/Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)
- Low Resource
- High Segregation & Poverty

Before an area receives an opportunity index score, some Census tracts are filtered into the High Segregation & Poverty category. The filter identifies Census tracts where at least

---

30 percent of population is below the federal poverty line and there is a disproportionate share of households of color. After filtering out High Segregation and Poverty areas, the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map allocates the 20 percent of tracts in each region with the highest relative opportunity index scores to the Highest Resource designation and the next 20 percent to the High Resource designation. The remaining non-filtered tracts are then evenly divided into Moderate Resource and Low Resource categories.

As illustrated in Figure 73, Unincorporated Napa County has no tracts with High Segregation and Poverty, but otherwise has tracts ranging across the other four categories. The highest resource tracts are largely concentrated in the western part of the county and to the northeast of Napa city.

Elsewhere in the North Bay Region tracts cover a broad range of categories, once again with the exception of the High Segregation and Poverty category (see Figure 74). Within Sonoma County, the Highest Resource tracts are concentrated largely to the west of Santa Rosa and Petaluma toward the coast.
Figure 73: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, Unincorporated Napa County

Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2021.
Access to Education

One of the factors used to develop the Opportunity Index discussed previously is education. The Opportunity Index considers three education criteria in equal measure: math proficiency for 4th graders, reading proficiency for 4th graders, high school graduation rates, and the student poverty rate, to create an “Education Domain” score ranging from 0 to 100 percent for each Census tract (or in some cases, rural block group), with a higher score representing better educational opportunities. Figure 75 shows the Education Domain scores for subareas of Unincorporated Napa County. The geographic distribution is very similar to that for the overall Opportunity Index, with the highest scores tending to be found in the western part of the county and tracts to the northeast of the city of Napa, and the lowest scores to the east.

41 The methodology for this can be found in https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2021-hcd-methodology.pdf.
Figure 75: TCAC Education Domain Score, Unincorporated Napa County

Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD, 2021; BAE, 2021.
As illustrated in Figure 76, the level of the scores across the North Bay Region also tend to be mirror the scores of the overall Opportunity Index, with high scores tending toward rural areas and lower scores in the more urbanized areas.

**Access to Employment**

For AFFH reports, HUD has developed the Jobs Proximity Index as a way to measure access to employment. As stated by HUD:

The Jobs Proximity Index quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood (Census Block Group) as a function of its distance to all job locations within a CBSA, [Core-based Statistical Area, an urbanized region as defined by the federal government] with larger employment centers weighted more heavily.

The jobs proximity index quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood as a function of its distance to all job locations within a CBSA, with
larger employment centers weighted more heavily. The higher the index value, the better the access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.\textsuperscript{42}

In Unincorporated Napa County, the highest job proximity indexes are found in block groups surrounding the city of St. Helena (as shown in Figure 77). While this seems counterintuitive, this may be due to limited population relative to the number of jobs in those rural and semi-rural areas due to the wine industry. The North Bay Region similarly shows the highest indexes largely in rural areas or smaller cities, with the exception of Santa Rosa, which has a large population and is also a job center (see Figure 78).

\textsuperscript{42} \url{https://hudgis-hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/HUD::jobs-proximity-index/about}. The index is currently based on U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics data from 2014.
Figure 77: Jobs Proximity Index Score, Unincorporated Napa County

Transportation
Public transit in Napa County is provided by the Vine, operated by Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA). The Vine runs multiple bus routes, ranging from local on-call shuttles to intercity operations within the county, as well as providing connections outside the county in Vallejo, with BART at the El Cerrito Del Norte station, and to Fairfield and Amtrak in Suisun City. Routes operate on a mix of schedules, including weekdays, Monday through Saturday, and seven days a week, excluding holidays.43

43 See https://vinetransit.com/routes/ for complete route and schedule information.
The Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT)\textsuperscript{44} has developed a metric, the H+T (Housing and Transportation) Index that takes into account housing and transportation costs for a typical household. By their metric, in order to remain affordable, housing costs plus transportation costs should equal 45 percent or less of total household income. They

\textsuperscript{44} https://htaindex.cnt.org/. For more on the methodology, see https://htaindex.cnt.org/about/HTMethods_2016.pdf.
estimate this burden at the Census block group level, so disparities in this total estimated cost can be seen at a local or a regional level.

Based on their estimates, for many of the Census block groups for Unincorporated Napa County, the costs of housing plus transportation would be excessively high for what CNT calls a typical moderate-income household, as shown in Figure 80. This means that a household with an income in this range would, on average, be cost-burdened when considering combined housing and transportation costs.

For the North Bay Region the block groups with high housing plus transportation cost burdens tend to be in rural areas; the low costs burdens are found in the urban nodes of the region (see Figure 81).

However, while the costs may represent an undue burden for a “typical” moderate income household, many households have higher incomes and would not necessarily be burdened. These households may be able to sustain these higher housing and transportation costs. However, the combined costs act to restrain the ability of households at moderate and low incomes to live in much of Unincorporated Napa County.
Figure 80: Percent of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in Unincorporated Napa County

Source: Housing + Transportation Index, Center for Neighborhood Technology.
Figure 81: Percent of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in the North Bay Region

Access to a Clean Environment
CalEnviroScreen provides a methodology to assist in identifying whether a local community is disproportionately burdened by pollution. For every Census tract in the state, CalEnviroScreen produces a score using environmental, health, and socioeconomic information derived from government sources, with higher scores associated with a higher pollution burden. The original layer was developed by California’s Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on behalf of the California Environmental Protection Agency and released in early 2017. The analysis here uses the draft CalEnviroScreen version 4.0, released in the first half of 2021. As shown in Figure 82 below, the highest score (indicating the worst environmental conditions) is found in the tract to the east of Napa city and American Canyon. The tract north of Napa city and surrounding Yountville also exhibits a relatively high score.

45 For more information, go to https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen.
Figure 82: Areas of High Pollution in Unincorporated Napa County

Sources: CalEnviroScreen Version 4.0 DRAFT
Regionally, the highest scores tend to be concentrated in or near more urbanized areas, especially Napa city and Santa Rosa. However, for the Unincorporated County and the larger region, with one exception none of the subareas score in the highest/worst quartile, indicating that regionally the area is not so disproportionately burdened for pollution.

Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk
The following section assesses the extent to which protected classes in Unincorporated Napa County, particularly members of racial and ethnic minority groups, experience disproportionate housing needs and are at risk for displacement.

Minority Homeownership Rates
Rates of home ownership often vary widely by race and ethnicity, both within local jurisdictions and throughout larger regions. As shown in Table 38, in Unincorporated Napa County, 77 percent of all households are homeowners. The homeownership rate is
highest for non-Hispanic Whites at 84 percent, and lowest for Hispanic and some other race alone householders\(^46\), at only 44 and 45 percent, respectively. These trends likely reflect a combination of economic factors and historic discrimination in the housing market.

Overall homeownership rates are higher for Unincorporated Napa County than for the entire North Bay Region; the homeownership rates for most race/ethnic groups are higher in the Unincorporated County than in the North Bay Region. The higher rates for the region are due to the higher proportions of multifamily housing in the urban centers such as Napa city and Santa Rosa.

### Table 38: Distribution of Homeowners by Race/Ethnicity, Unincorporated Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Householder by Race</th>
<th>Ownership Rate</th>
<th>Household Tenure</th>
<th>Total Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White Alone</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>6,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone (a)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Races</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>6,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Householder by Race</th>
<th>Ownership Rate</th>
<th>Household Tenure</th>
<th>Total Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>128,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White Alone</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>118,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone (a)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Races</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>147,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^46\) Several minority groups have been combined due to small sample sizes with high margins of error for the individual groups. See table footnote.
**Mortgage Loan Approvals by Race/Ethnicity and Income**

The inability to obtain a mortgage can be a barrier to home ownership; historically, minorities have tended to have more difficulty obtaining loans, creating a significant barrier to homeownership. An analysis of HMDA data for loans in Unincorporated Napa County in 2020 indicates that Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic households have a slightly lower rate of loan approvals than White non-Hispanic applicants. It should be noted, however, that these proportions are based on small numbers of loan applications, especially for the Black households, who showed only 30 applications in 2020. The other minority race category was only responsible for nine applications. As a result, these statistics alone may not be a reliable indicator of discrimination in loan disposition.

**Figure 84: Disposition of Home Loans by Race/Ethnicity for Unincorporated Napa County, 2020**

![Disposition of Home Loans by Race/Ethnicity for Unincorporated Napa County, 2020](image)

Notes:

Hispanic applicants include all persons claiming Hispanic origin regardless of race. Analysis excludes refinance loans and those originated by lenders not subject to HMDA. Excludes applications that were withdrawn and files that were closed due to incompleteness. Includes FHA, FSA/RHS, and VA home loans on 1-4 family and manufactured dwellings by income, race, and ethnicity of applicant.

**Geography of Mortgage Lending**

Figure 85 on the following page illustrates the geographic distribution of originated home loans by Census tract in 2019 in Unincorporated Napa County. The highest rate of loan originations (over 125 per 1,000 units) was found in the tract to the east of Napa city and American Canyon. This tract, however, includes portions of American Canyon with a high concentration of single-family residences, as the tract boundary does not conform to the city boundaries even though most of the tract is in the unincorporated county. There does not appear to be any correlation between concentrations of non-White households and loan origination rates in Unincorporated Napa County.

In the North Bay Region, the highest loan origination rates tend to be in the more urbanized southern areas, either in and around the City of Napa and American Canyon or along the 101 corridor in Sonoma County. However, the highest rates are in more suburban areas, with the urban cores where incomes tend to be lower and the rural areas showing the lowest loan origination rates.
Figure 85: Number of Loans Originated Per 1,000 Housing Units in Unincorporated Napa County by Census Tract, 2019

Sources: HMDA; BAE, 2021
Prevalence of Housing Problems

Table 39 and Table 40 report the relative prevalence of housing problems among households with incomes equal to, or less than, the area median by race and ethnicity. Households of a given racial or ethnic heritage are considered to have a disproportionately greater need for housing assistance if they experience housing problems at a significantly greater rate (ten percentage points or more) than do households within the same income level as a whole, regardless of race or ethnicity. For example, 82.7 percent of all very low-income households (i.e., incomes between 30 and 50 percent of AMI) in Unincorporated Napa County experienced at least one of the four

---

47 See Table 39 and Table 40 for the definitions of “housing problems” as defined for this analysis.
housing problems between 2013 and 2017, as did 100 percent of very low-income Black households. In this case, very low-income Black households exhibit a disproportionately greater need for housing assistance that could help to eliminate their current housing problems. According to these data, Black, Asian, Native American, and Hispanic households experienced housing problems at rates that, at one or more income levels, exceeded the areawide average by at least ten percentage points. The results are similar for severe housing problems, with Black, Asian, Native American, and Hispanic households being disproportionately impacted in at least one income category. Note that the sample size is very small in most instances where the housing problems rate for a given subgroup is greater than the overall Unincorporated County average, so these results should be considered with caution. For example, the CHAS data report only 45 extremely low-income Black households in Unincorporated Napa County, all of whom experienced housing problems.48

Table 39: Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Unincorporated Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>0-30%</th>
<th>31-50%</th>
<th>51-80%</th>
<th>81-100% or Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal, Housing Problems   82.7%  80.1%  52.6%  52.1%  64.5%

Average Rate +10%            92.7%  90.1%  62.6%  62.1%  74.5%

Notes:
Housing problems include lack of complete kitchen; lack of complete plumbing facility; more than one person per room; cost burden greater than 30% of income. Includes all households within incomes at or below 100% of area median income. Figures may not sum to total due to rounding. Cells highlighted in red indicate sub-groups for which the rate of housing problems exceed the average rate of a given income group by ten percentage points or more.


48 Furthermore, the 45 number is actually based on a smaller sample to which a weight has been applied to represent the actual universe of extremely low income Black households.
Table 40: Severe Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Unincorporated Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent of AMI</th>
<th>Total 100% or Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>30-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Housing Problems</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Rate +10%</strong></td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Housing problems include lack of complete kitchen; lack of complete plumbing facility; more than 1.5 persons per room; cost burden greater than 50% of income. Includes all households within incomes at or below 100% of area median income. Figures may not sum to total due to rounding. Cells highlighted in red indicate sub-groups for which the rate of housing problems exceed the average rate of a given income group by ten percentage points or more.


**Housing Cost Burden**

As described in the housing needs assessment, overpayment for housing is defined as a household paying more than 30 percent of its gross income on housing related expenses, such as rent, utilities, or mortgage payments. By this measure 34 percent of all households in Unincorporated Napa County were cost-burdened during the 2015-2019 ACS survey period. This proportion is similar to that for Napa County overall and for the Bay Area. Approximately two-thirds of households earning less than 80 percent of the HAMFI were cost-burdened in Unincorporated Napa County, compared to 21 percent of households with incomes at 80 percent of HAMFI and above.

Figure 87 shows the geographic distribution of overpayment for renters in Unincorporated Napa County and Figure 88 shows the geographic distribution of overpayment for homeowners. Overall, 39 percent of renters overpaid for housing, and the proportion of renters who were overpaying for housing in 2019 ranged from 18 percent to 55 percent by Census tract, (see Figure 87). The highest proportions were found in the northernmost Census tract in the county, and in the tract in the southeastern corner of the county.

Approximately 32 percent of homeowners in the Unincorporated County were overpaying for housing, and as shown in Figure 88, the percentage of those overpaying by tract ranges from 20 percent to 38 percent. The highest proportion is in the northernmost tract, which is rural and not densely populated.
Figure 87: Overpayment by Renters, Unincorporated Napa County

Figure 88: Overpayment by Homeowners, Unincorporated Napa County

For the North Bay Region, the proportion of renters overpaying for housing ranged from 18 percent to 74 percent, as shown in Figure 89 above. The highest proportions (over two thirds of renter households) were found in urban areas in the southern parts of the two counties. For owners (see Figure 90) the proportions range from 16 to 49 percent. The tracts with a low proportion of burdened owners (less than 20 percent) are found around the City of Napa and in scattered locations in southern Sonoma County. The tracts with a high proportion (greater than 40 percent) of burdened homeowners are all in Sonoma County, with some in urban areas and some in more rural areas.
Overcrowded Households
Overcrowding of residential units, in which there is more than one person per room, can be a potential indicator that households are experiencing economic hardship and are struggling to afford housing. All tracts in the Unincorporated County are less than or equal to the statewide average of 8.2 percent overcrowded, ranging from zero to 5.8 percent (see Figure 91).

The North Bay Region has a number of Census tracts where the percentage of overcrowded households exceeds the statewide average of 8.2 percent. Most of these tracts are in urban areas in the region, in both counties (see Figure 92). This is evidence that many households in the county are unable to afford suitable housing.
Figure 91: Overcrowded Households, Unincorporated Napa County


Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.
Resident Displacement

The most significant displacement issue experienced in Unincorporated Napa County is resident displacement from wildfires. Since 2017, wildfires have destroyed 1,329 housing units in the unincorporated area. Within a given area, wildfires are indiscriminate in their effect on racial and ethnic groups. As minorities are under-represented in the unincorporated area, they were likely not disproportionately affected by displacement due to wildfires. Napa County is not aware of any other significant displacement issues in the unincorporated area.

Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors

Napa County is not aware of any specific existing fair housing issues affecting the unincorporated area and its residents and prospective residents. Existing patterns of tenure in the Unincorporated County’s residential areas are primarily influenced by socioeconomic factors, such as the high cost of real estate. It is acknowledged that there is a relatively limited supply of multifamily rental housing within the Unincorporated Area. This is primarily due to the fact that very limited access to community water and sewer systems and reliance on private wells and septic systems limits the ability to build at densities supporting multifamily housing.
development in most locations. This likely limits the ability of lower-income households to secure housing within the Unincorporated Area, and this may have a disproportionate effect on households with disabled and/or minority group members, as these households often have lower incomes compared to the population as a whole.

**Contributing Factors**
Following is an assessment of common factors that could potentially contribute to fair housing issues.

**Land Use and Zoning Laws**
Land use and zoning laws control the type and quantity of housing that can be built in a given location. Historically, unincorporated Napa County has been viewed as a rural area, primarily focused on agricultural production and open space, and the Zoning Ordinance reflects this historic land use pattern. As a result, Napa County has very little land zoned for higher density residential development. This may contribute to fair housing issues, due to the fact that a lack of zoning that allows higher density residential development can preclude multifamily housing development, which is the most common physical form for housing designed to serve lower-income households. This can limit the ability of lower-income households to find suitable housing in the unincorporated areas. To the extent that minorities and households with special needs tend to be disproportionately represented among lower-income households, this may hinder racial/ethnic and socio-economic integration in the community.

**Occupancy Restrictions**
Occupancy standards sometimes can impede housing choice for fair housing protected classes such as families with children or disabled persons. For example, some jurisdictions’ zoning regulations have attempted to limit occupancy to five related persons occupying a single-family home, or to strictly establish an occupancy standard of no more than two persons per bedroom. Such regulations can limit housing availability for some families with children or prevent the development of group housing.

The County Zoning Ordinance complies with fair housing laws. For example, a “family” is defined as "one or more persons living together under a single management conducted by one or more of the persons in the group." Additionally, group housing, including for disabled persons, and transitional and supportive housing is subject to the same restrictions as residential dwellings of the same type.

The County enforces the California Building Standards Code, as adopted by the California Building Standards Commission on behalf of every jurisdiction in the State. The most recent update is the 2019 edition, adopted by Napa County on January 1, 2020. The County adopted the 2019 California Building Standards Code with no additional local amendments. The Building Standards Code is standardized and enforced by most communities without local changes in order to ensure that new construction is safe and sound. Adoption of a standardized building code facilitates housing production because it allows builders familiar with codes in
other areas to easily work in Napa County, thus improving the local availability of qualified housing contractors. This should allow the local housing production capacity to more easily respond to increases in demand for construction services.

**Residential Real Estate Steering**
Steering is infrequently an alleged act in a housing discrimination complaint. Napa County is not aware of any allegations of steering of minorities or other protected classes of prospective residents in Unincorporated Napa County.

**Patterns of Community Opposition**
Community opposition to housing in Unincorporated Napa County does not focus on the characteristics of protected classes of prospective residents; rather, to the extent that it occurs, opposition to housing tends to be related to concerns about wildfire safety, water and infrastructure availability, and protection of agricultural resources.

**Economic Pressures**
Factors such as increased rents or increased land and development costs for new housing could create economic pressures that could contribute to fair housing issues, to the extent that members of protected classes often have lower incomes, which means they are disproportionately affected by high housing costs. As discussed in the Governmental Constraints chapter, the County of Napa has limited direct impact on development costs, with County-imposed fees representing a relatively small proportion of overall costs for developing housing within the Unincorporated Area. The County has limited ability to control other economic pressures, such as increasing land costs, or increasing rents that are largely driven by regional housing supply and demand dynamics that are beyond the County’s control. However, ensuring that the County adequately plans to accommodate its Regional Housing Need Allocation, including providing sites that can accommodate housing for lower-income households is a key responsibility to ensure that the County does not contribute to economic pressures by unnecessarily constraining the local supply of land available for housing development.

**Major Private Investments**
Major private investments have the potential to stimulate changes in the local housing market. For example, major investments that stimulate local employment growth can increase local demand for housing and if the supply of housing does not increase commensurately, this can lead to increased competition for housing and, potentially, increased costs and consequent displacement of lower-income households who may not be able to afford the higher housing costs. Additionally, private investments in the form of redevelopment of existing residential buildings could lead to displacement of existing residents. In these situations, lower-income residents are at greatest risk, as their limited incomes mean that they will have fewer viable choices to secure replacement housing.
In the Unincorporated Area, major private investments take the form of luxury single-family homes, wineries, and visitor accommodations. As indicated above, these types of development create demand for increased numbers of supporting service workers, who tend to have lower wages and consequently struggle to afford market rate housing in the local area. The lack of affordable housing within the Unincorporated Area creates the need for most service workers to commute from other areas with greater housing availability and affordability, which could translate to transportation costs that are disproportionate to incomes, due to limited availability to public transit.

**Municipal or State Services and Amenities**

Unincorporated Napa County has a land area of 716.59 square miles, and a 2020 population of 22,842, according to the 2020 Census. With much of this land area devoted to vineyards preserved as agricultural land, or otherwise undeveloped, the Unincorporated County has maintained a semi-rural environment. Napa County provides municipal services consistent with this character, including General Government services, County Public Works services for maintenance of roadways and other County infrastructure, and the Sheriff’s Department for law enforcement. Fire protection in the Unincorporated area is provided by Napa County Fire under contract with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire).

Residents and visitors enjoy the wineries, agricultural lands, and there are ample opportunities for recreation including cycling, golfing, hiking, and boating. Notable landmarks and points of interest in the county include many wineries (some of them historic structures), fine dining, historic small-town downtowns in the incorporated cities, Lake Berryessa, and Robert Louis Stevenson State Park. Several annual events and festivals occur throughout the year. These venues and events attract many day trippers and overnight guests to the county but also are accessible to local residents for their enjoyment and provide much of the employment base.

Overall, the provision of municipal and state services and public and private amenities appears to be equitable within the unincorporated area.

**Foreclosure Patterns**

For a number of factors, lower-income and minority households are more likely to face foreclosure than others. According to a 2009 presentation by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco49, during the housing boom leading up to the 2008 housing crisis, just over one-fourth of California households received a “high cost” (i.e., subprime) loan, and these loans were more prevalent among minority borrowers than for borrowers as a whole. As of October 2021, RealtyTrac reports 24 properties in Napa County that were in pre-foreclosure, six were subject to auction, and one was a bank-owned property. All of these properties, except one in Silverado, which is in pre-foreclosure, are in the incorporated cities of the county. This

---

indicates that foreclosures are not a significant fair housing issue in Unincorporated Napa County.

Unresolved Violations of Fair Housing or Civil Rights Laws
Fair Housing Napa Valley, Napa County’s contracted fair housing services provider, indicates that of the 48 fair housing “intakes” that the agency handled between July 2018 to present that involved locations in the unincorporated parts of the county, none resulted in submittal of administrative complaints to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or the State Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH); thus, when issues have arisen, any verified violations have been resolved without needing referral to federal or State enforcement agencies. Similarly, as indicated below, information from DFEH and HUD indicates that housing discrimination complaints received directly by those agencies were all resolved.

Support or Opposition from Public Officials
The County operates the Napa County Housing Authority (NCHA), which is focused primarily on the housing needs of farm workers, particularly those in the migrant/seasonal category who, in turn, support the County’s key agricultural industry, through operation of three farm worker centers providing housing. The County Supervisors also support fair housing, as evidenced by the operation of the Napa County Housing Commission (NCHC), an advisory body to the Housing Authority and Board of Supervisors, which was reconstituted in late 2015 to expand its focus from overseeing the three farmworker centers to including reviews of any project requesting funding from the County’s Affordable Housing Fund. The County also maintains a contract with the Fair Housing Napa Valley for various fair housing services (see Housing Element Program H-3b).

Discrimination in the Housing Market
As summarized previously in Table 32, from 2013 through 2021 YTD, there were 43 complaints recorded by the HUD office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) in the entirety of Napa County, with 16 of them resulting in conciliation or settlement, with the remainder dismissed, withdrawn, or found to have a lack of cause. From 2018 through 2021 to date 18 complaints were filed with DFEH; 12 were found to have a lack of cause, three were resolved by voluntary mediation, and three were withdrawn after resolution. As indicated above, although FHNV fielded a number of inquiries involving properties in the unincorporated area, all of the inquiries were resolved without the need for referral to federal of State enforcement agencies.

Lack of Fair Housing Education
Fair housing issues can arise when property owners and/or residents are not fully aware of their rights and responsibilities as they pertain to fair housing. As previously mentioned, Napa County contracts with Fair Housing Napa Valley for fair housing services. FHNV indicates that educational efforts to ensure compliance with fair housing laws by housing providers is vitally important. Program H-3b in the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element calls for Napa County’s contract
with FHNV to specify periodic outreach and educational events to inform rental property managers and Realtors of their fair housing obligations.

**Lack of Resources for Fair Housing Agencies and Organizations**
To ensure the availability of fair housing resources to local residents, prospective residents, and property owners and managers, Napa County maintains its contract with Fair Housing Napa Valley to support its mission to provide these services.

**Disproportionate Housing Needs Among Racial/Ethnic Groups**
These needs were discussed previously under the headers *Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk* and *Prevalence of Housing Problems*. Potential issues identified included:

- Minority homeownership rates in Unincorporated Napa County are above the overall homeownership rate in the North Bay Region, but mortgage loan approval denial rates may be higher for Black applicants and Other Minority Race Applicants as well as for Hispanic applicants. However, the data for non-Hispanic minorities may be unreliable due to relatively small numbers of applicants.
- Black, Asian, Native American, and Hispanic households experienced housing problems or severe housing problems at rates that, at one or more lower income levels, exceeded the areawide average by at least ten percentage points. Note that the sample size is very small in most instances where the housing problems rate for a given subgroup is greater than the overall Unincorporated County average, so these results should be considered with caution.

**Fair Housing Goal, Priorities, and Programs**
Based on the findings from the Housing Needs Assessment, the Assessment of Fair Housing, and input from the public collected during the Housing Element Update process, Napa County has established a fair housing goal, priorities, and programs for the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element.

**Fair Housing Goal**
Napa County’s fair housing goal is expressed in Housing Element Goal H-7: Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by maximizing housing choice and economic integration, and eliminating housing discrimination in unincorporated Napa County based on race, age, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition, marital status, gender, self-identified gender or sexual orientation, or economic status. (See Section 3. Housing Goals, Policies, and Programs.)

**Fair Housing Priorities**
Napa County’s priorities respond to public input received during the Housing Element Update process, and also align with goals and priorities identified by the Napa Sonoma Collaborative and include:
• Reduce Zoning and Land Use Barriers to the Development of Housing That Is Affordable to Low-Income Households, Including Low-Income People of Color and Low-Income Persons with Disabilities
• Meet the Housing Needs of Migrant and Year-Round Farmworkers

**Fair Housing Programs**
The 2023 to 2031 Housing Element includes a number of programs to support the County’s fair housing goal and priorities. These programs incorporate input received in the public engagement activities for the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update as well as program recommendations from the Napa Sonoma Collaborative. The fair housing programs include:

• Program H-1b: Rehabilitation funds for ELI, VLI, and LI housing)
• Program H-2b: Inclusionary Housing
• Program H2-h: Worker Proximity downpayment assistance program
• Program H2-j: Farmworker Housing and Mobilehome Park conservation
• Program H3-d: Farmworker preference in projects receiving Affordable Housing Fund assistance
• Program H3-b: Fair housing services
• Program H3-i: Prioritization of housing with supportive services for disabled and prioritization affordable housing in high resource areas.)
• Program H-4b: Allocation of Affordable Housing Fund monies for projects in the cities with criteria emphasizing AFFH
• Program H-6a: Affirmative Marketing of Affordable Housing Opportunities
• Program H-6b: Partner with the Bureau of Reclamation and private concessionaries to increase employment opportunities for residents of the Lake Berryessa area.
7. PROJECTED HOUSING NEEDS

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

A key component of any Housing Element Update is identifying adequate sites to address the jurisdiction’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determines state-wide projected housing needs and allocates new housing unit target numbers to regional councils of government (COGs). State law (California Government Code Section 65584 et seq.) provides for COGs to then prepare and adopt plans that assign a “fair share” of the region’s housing construction need to each city and county. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the COG that determines fair-share portions of state allocations for the Napa County.

Unincorporated Napa County’s RHNA requirements for the 2023-2031 Housing Element projection period are summarized in Table 41. For the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period the unincorporated county is required to plan to accommodate the development of at least 106 housing units. This includes 45 units for very low-income households, 16 units for low-income households, 14 units for moderate-income households, and 31 units for above moderate-income households. As noted previously, these are adjusted numbers reflecting the reallocation of some need from the unincorporated county to the cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena.

Table 41: Regional Housing Needs Allocation for Unincorporated Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Unincorporated Napa County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30% to 50% of AMI)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50% to 80% of AMI)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income (80% to 120% of AMI)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate Income (&gt;120% of AMI)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABAG, 2022.

Housing Needs for Extremely Low-Income Households

Although the RHNA does not include allocations for extremely low-income households, Housing Element Law requires that jurisdictions estimate the need for housing units affordable to extremely low-income households and plan to accommodate this need. Extremely low-income households are those with income less than 30 percent of area median income. In Napa
County, 30 percent of the AMI is the equivalent to an annual income of $37,850 for a family of four (2022 HUD Income Limits). Households with extremely low incomes have a variety of housing situations and needs. For example, most families and individuals receiving public assistance, such as supplemental security insurance (SSI) or disability insurance, are considered extremely low-income households. Many households with multiple wage earners – including food service workers, full-time students, hotel workers, and farmworkers – can also fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively low wages in these industries.

HCD’s official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making zero to 50 percent AMI) to calculate their projected need to house extremely low-income households. HCD provides three methodologies for estimating this need: 1) allocate the percent of very low-income need to extremely low-income households based on the ABAG region’s proportion; 2) allocate the percent of very low-income need to extremely low-income households based on the current proportion for Napa County; 3) assume that 50 percent of Napa County’s very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households. To estimate the projected housing need for extremely low-income households, 50 percent of unincorporated Napa County’s 45 very low-income RHNA units are assumed to serve extremely low-income households. Based on this methodology, the County has a projected need of 23 units for extremely low-income households over the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period.
8. HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

Section 65583(a)(5-6) of the California Government Code states that the purpose of a Housing Element is to identify nongovernmental and governmental factors (constraints) that inhibit the development, maintenance, or improvement of housing. The Housing Element must analyze “potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including the types of housing identified for persons with disabilities, land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, local processing and permit procedures, and any locally adopted ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of residential development.” Where constraints are identified, the County is required to take action to mitigate or remove them. A thorough understanding of the constraints to development can help to create appropriate policy responses to mitigate constraints and make it easier and more affordable to affirmatively further fair housing development.

In addition to government constraints, this section assesses other factors that may constrain the production of affordable housing in Napa County. These include infrastructure availability, environmental features, economic and financing constraints, and public opinion.

Governmental Constraints
Government regulations can affect housing costs by limiting the supply of buildable land, setting standards and allowable densities for development, and exacting fees for the use of land or the construction of homes. The increased costs associated with such requirements can be passed on to consumers in the form of higher home prices and rents. Potential regulatory constraints include local land use policies (as defined in a community’s general plan), zoning regulations and their accompanying development standards, subdivision regulations, growth control ordinances or urban limit lines, and development impact and building permit fees. Lengthy approval and processing times also may represent regulatory constraints. Since the adoption of the 2015-2023 Housing Element, updated legislation for the State of California has been incorporated into California Government regulations. These regulatory considerations have been incorporated into the analysis and are mentioned throughout in specific instances where governmental constraints are applicable.

Land Use Controls
The County’s General Plan and Title 18 (Zoning) of the Napa County Code guide development and set land use controls related to housing development.
General Plan Land Use Element
The General Plan is the comprehensive planning document that guides physical development throughout a local jurisdiction. The County of Napa General Plan was adopted in June 2008 and has had limited amendments since that time. State law requires that all cities and counties in California have a General Plan that includes a Land Use Element. The Napa County Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element designates the proposed general distribution and location of the extent of the land uses for public and private uses. Relative to Housing, the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element establishes residential land use designations that allow for a mix of housing types, including single-family residences, multifamily residences, and mobile homes. Table 1 outlines the various General Plan land use designations and identifies the associated zoning designations that could support residential development.

Table 42: Napa County General Plan Land Use Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Land Use Category</th>
<th>Appropriate Zoning Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>RC-Residential Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Study area properties shall be subject to site-specific planning prior to rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>IP-Industrial Park, I-Industrial, GI-General Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Institutional</td>
<td>AV-Airport, PL-Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space</td>
<td>AW-Agricultural Watershed, TP-Timberland Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resource</td>
<td>AP-Agricultural Preserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
In addition to the zones listed above, AW-Agricultural Watershed uses and/or zoning may occur in any land use designation. Multiple additional zoning designations currently exist within each General Plan Land Use Category and may remain in place. This table is not intended to constrain the legal use of property consistent with both zoning and General Plan Land Use Category. Also, in the Deer Park Rural Residential area, rezoning from residential districts shall be permitted to achieve minimum parcel sizes consistent with Policy AG/LU-35, and to develop, improve, and expand hospital related facilities through either expansion of the Planned Development zoning district or a future healthcare related zoning district that shall be deemed consistent with the Deer Park Rural Residential area. On parcel 049-160-009 in the Monticello Road area, rezoning to RS may be allowed consistent with Policy AG/LU-35.


Zoning Code
Zoning regulations control local development by establishing zoning districts where residential development is allowed, as well as requirements for residential development related to height, density, lot area, yard setbacks, and minimum parking spaces. Table 43 summarizes the Napa County Zoning Districts where residential development is allowed.
The County has three primary residential zoning designations (RC, RS, RM). In addition, where appropriate, a Planned Development (PD) zoning designation can also incorporate residential development. The RM zoning designation allows for multifamily dwellings and the PD designation could also allow for multifamily dwellings. The Planned Development (PD) designation allows residential uses subject to a use permit and was intended to provide sufficient density and project flexibility to allow builders the economies of scale necessary for production of housing affordable to moderate and below-moderate income households. In addition, limited housing development is allowed in certain other zoning districts, such as farmworker housing in the AP and AW districts, and accessory dwelling units and homeless shelters in MC, I, and GI zones.

Although the County does not currently have any land zoned RM, the requirement for a conditional use permit for multifamily dwellings in the RM (Residential Multiple) district may be viewed as a constraint to housing production for parcels in the housing sites inventory that are proposed to be rezoned to RM, to provide locations to accommodate future demand for lower-income housing. The Housing Element includes a program to make multifamily dwellings a by-right use in the RM zone.
### Table 43: Napa County Zoning Districts Permitting Residential Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Residential Uses Permitted by Right</th>
<th>Residential Uses Permitted Conditionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP (Agricultural Preserve)</td>
<td>One single-family dwelling unit per legal lot; Residential care facilities (small); Family day care homes (small); Family day care homes (large); One guest cottage; Farmworker housing (i) providing accommodations for six or fewer employees, or (ii) consisting of no more than thirty-six beds in group quarters or twelve units designed for use by a single household</td>
<td>Farmworker housing and seasonal farmworker center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW (Agricultural Watershed)</td>
<td>One single-family dwelling unit per legal lot; A second unit; Residential care facilities (small); Family day care homes (small); Family day care homes (large); Farmworker housing (i) providing accommodations for six or fewer employees, or (ii) consisting of no more than thirty-six beds in group quarters or twelve units designed for use by a single household</td>
<td>Farmworker housing and seasonal farmworker centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL (Commercial Limited)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Commercial accessory dwelling units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN (Commercial Neighborhood)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Commercial accessory dwelling units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC (Marine Commercial)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Commercial accessory dwelling units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Industrial)</td>
<td>Emergency shelters</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI (General Industrial)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Caretaker residences; Emergency shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD (Planned Development)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>All residential uses permitted in RC, RS and RM zones; Mobilehome parks; Institutional facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS (Residential Single)</td>
<td>One single-family dwelling unit per legal lot; A second unit; Family day care homes (small); Family day care homes (large); Residential care facilities (small); Residential care facilities (medium); Residential care facilities (large)</td>
<td>Residential care facilities (medium); Residential care facilities (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM (Residential Multiple) (a)</td>
<td>One single-family dwelling unit per legal lot; Family day care homes (small); Family day care homes (large); Residential care facilities (small); Farmworker housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees, or (ii) consisting of no more than thirty-six beds in group quarters or twelve units designed for use by a single household</td>
<td>Multiple-family dwelling units and single room occupancy units; Residential care facilities (medium); Residential care facilities (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC (Residential Country)</td>
<td>One single-family dwelling unit per legal lot; A second unit; Residential care facilities (small); one guest cottage; Farmworker housing (i) providing accommodations for six or fewer employees, or (ii) consisting of no more than thirty-six beds in group quarters or twelve units designed for use by a single household</td>
<td>Residential care facilities (medium); Residential care facilities (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-MUR-W (Mixed Use Residential Waterfront) (a)</td>
<td>Family day care homes (small); Residential care facilities (small); Homeless and emergency shelters; Up to 200 Multi-Family dwellings @ 20 DU/acre; Farmworker housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees</td>
<td>Attached and detached single-family dwelling units and multiple family dwelling units @ 20 DU/acre; Family day care homes; Residential care facilities; Senior housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-BP-W &amp; NP-BP (Industrial/Business Park-Waterfront) (a)</td>
<td>Homeless and emergency shelters</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHCD (Affordable Housing Combination District)</td>
<td>Subject to the requirements of the underlying district; not to include agriculture, watershed and open space, or agricultural resource.</td>
<td>Subject to the requirements of the underlying district; not to include agriculture, watershed and open space, or agricultural resource.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

(a) Although the RM and NP-MUR-W districts exist in the Napa County Zoning Code, no parcels in the County are currently zoned RM or NP-MUR-W.

(b) Per Napa County Code section 18.104.420, transitional and supportive housing (as defined in Health and Safety Code Sections 50675.2(h) and 50675.14(b)) are subject to the same restrictions as residential dwellings of the same type, meaning these uses are permitted in the same zoning districts where other similar residential structures are permitted, and subject to the same land use standards as similar residential structures.

**Source:** Napa County Zoning Code, 2022.
Combination Districts
A combination district is a zoning district which permit expansions of or limitations on the uses allowed or permitted under the regulations of the principal zoning district with which it is combined, or on the development standards or procedural requirements available to or imposed upon property so zoned. The Affordable Housing Combination District (AHCD) at chapter 18.82 of the Zoning Code was created as part of the County’s 2009 (4th Cycle) Housing Element, with the following intentions:

A. Implement the goals of the housing element of the Napa County general plan in regard to the construction of affordable housing by establishing development regulations for identified housing opportunity sites.
B. Apply to specified Priority Housing Development Sites
C. Allow the construction of a variety of affordable housing types on specified Priority Housing Development Sites
D. Establish maximum and minimum densities for the development of affordable housing and allow development by right up to specified densities, as set forth in Chapter 18.82 of the Zoning Code.
E. Permit uses identified in Chapter 18.82 of the Zoning Code as an alternative to the underlying zoning of the identified sites. Parcels may be developed in accordance with standards of the underlying zoning or in accordance with the standards set forth in Chapter 18.82 but not both.

Although Napa County has fielded some inquiries from property owners who have expressed potential interest in developing in accordance with AHCD zoning, none of the designated properties have been developed. In response to this, the 6th Cycle Housing Element Update includes Program H-2g to adjust the inclusionary percentages required when sites designated: AH in the 5th Cycle or earlier are developed under AHCD provisions. This should increase the incentive for owners to develop housing on these properties.

Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types
The Napa County zoning code permits a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs of individuals and households within the unincorporated area.

Multifamily Rental Housing
Multifamily rental housing, including single-room occupancy units, is permitted in the County’s zoning districts that allow multifamily housing, including the RM (Residential Multiple) and AHCD (Affordable Housing Combination District).

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Units
As mentioned above, single-room occupancy units are permitted in the County’s zoning districts that allow multifamily housing.
Emergency Shelters
In 2009 and 2013, the County completed amendments to the zoning ordinance to make emergency shelters a permitted use in the Industrial zoning district. Shelters may accommodate up to 60 beds. As mentioned previously, there are over 350 acres of vacant land zoned for Industrial development in Napa County that could house one or more emergency shelters, which would be more than sufficient to meet the current unmet countywide demand for emergency shelter.

Low Barrier Navigation Centers
AB 101, passed in 2019, requires that a low barrier navigation center be a use allowed by-right in mixed-use zones and non-residential zones permitting multifamily uses if it meets specified requirements. The County of Napa Zoning Code does not currently include a definition of Low Barrier Navigation Centers or regulations regarding the permitting of such facilities; however, the County does not have mixed-use or non-residential zones that permit multifamily development.

Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing
In 2009, the County also amended the zoning ordinance to clarify that transitional or supportive housing is allowed in residential districts and is not subject to any special regulations that are not applicable to other similar residential structures.

Group Homes
State law requires that State-licensed group homes of six or fewer residents be regulated in the same manner as single-family residences for zoning purposes. Napa County Zoning Code section 18.08.540 defines residential care facilities. Within that section, facilities providing for the care of six or fewer persons are defined as “Residential care facility (small).” In the County of Napa, the following residential zoning districts allow these facilities without a use permit:

- Agricultural Preserve
- Agricultural Watershed
- Residential Single
- Residential Multiple
- Residential Country

Small residential care facilities are also permitted with a use permit in the PD zones. Whether a use permit is required or not, in a given zoning category, residential care facility (small) are regulated in the same manner as single residential units. In addition, small residential care facilities must be allowed within mobilehome units and within multifamily dwellings; thus, it will be necessary for Napa County to amend the Zoning Code to allow small residential care facilities in zones where mobilehomes and
multifamily dwellings are allowed. A program is included in the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element to make this amendment.

Napa County classifies group homes with 7 to 12 residents Residential Care Facility (medium) and those with 12 or more residents Residential Care Facility (large). The following regulations apply to these facilities:

A. **Minimum Lot Area Standards.** The lot on which a residential care facility (medium) or (large) is located shall meet the minimum lot area requirements of that district, and it shall contain not less than two thousand square feet for each person served by the facility.

B. **Parking Standards.** Residential care facilities (medium) or (large) shall comply with the following parking and loading area requirements:

1. One off-street parking space shall be provided for each four persons served by the facility.
2. One additional off-street parking space shall be provided for each full-time or part-time employee of the facility.
3. Off-street loading and delivery areas shall be provided for each facility which has a capacity to serve thirteen or more persons, and an additional off-street loading and delivery area shall be provided for each additional one hundred persons or fraction thereof beyond the first one hundred persons.

C. **Large Residential Care Facilities Located in RS (Residential Single) Zoning Districts.** The following additional criteria must be met:

1. Location within five miles of a state-licensed general acute care hospital with supplemental emergency service as defined by the Health and Safety Code Section 1250(a).
2. Not less than forty percent of the site shall be reserved for common use space and shall not be covered by buildings or parking improvements, but may be utilized as required setback, yard and septic system areas.
3. Minimum parcel size shall be two acres.
4. Public water and/or sewer services shall be provided to the site.

D. **Additional Conditions.** Additional conditions to those set forth in this section may be imposed by the planning commission when deemed necessary by the commission to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

As currently written, the Napa County code regarding residential care facilities (medium) and residential care facilities (large) may be construed as an undue constraint. The 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update includes a program to modify the Zoning Code to eliminate the conditional use permit for residential care facilities (medium) in residential zones, and to specify that residential care facilities (medium) and residential care facilities (large) be treated the same as other residential structures of the same type in the same zone.
Housing for Farmworkers
In 2009, Napa County modified the zoning ordinance to clarify that the County’s provisions for farmworker housing in the residential and agricultural zoning districts were consistent with State Health and Safety Code sections 17021.5 and 17021.6, in particular, by allowing up to 12 units on all agriculturally-zoned parcels. These farmworker housing opportunities are in addition to the County’s three existing farmworker housing centers.

Manufactured Housing
Manufactured housing is permitted in residentially zoned areas subject to the same site requirements as any other residential building constructed on a residential lot.

Accessory Dwelling Units
Accessory dwelling units (secondary dwelling units, ADUs) and junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs) are permitted in all zones that allow residential uses, including the RS, RC, AW, RM, and AP districts, with the exception of the AP zone, where only JADUs are permitted. The 2023 to 2031 Housing Element includes a program to amend the zoning code to allow ADUs in the AP zone. The PD zone also allows ADUs and JADUs when the parcel permits a single-family dwelling(s). Second units are also allowable with a use permit in the CI and CN districts. Such units can be up to 1,200 square feet in size. Thus, local policy facilitates and encourages production of this type of housing by allowing a greater range of options for units sized to meet various housing needs. (See the detailed discussion of the County’s ordinance below.)

County PD Zoning
The County PD zoning allows a range of housing types, including single-family, multifamily, and mobilehome parks. This means that PD zoning can also accommodate transitional housing, supportive housing and single-room occupancy units.

Development Standards
Development standards are site or construction conditions and requirements established in the Zoning Code. They include, but are not limited to, minimum lot sizes and dimensions, yard set-backs, lot coverage limits, and building height limits. These standards are summarized in Table 44. The County does not have open space requirements for residential developments.

Of note are the minimum lot areas of the residential zoning districts. The RS and RM districts require 8,000 square feet of lot area, while the RC district requires at least ten acres. The residential zones require a minimum lot width of 60 feet. The maximum building height for residential zones is based on a standard value for all development types of 35 feet. Maximum allowed building coverage is usually around 40 or 50 percent of the total lot area. Site development standards are comparable to requirements in other
similar rural areas and are necessary to ensure a quality living environment for all households and to protect the County’s agricultural and open space areas.

Where land is designated for residential use in the unincorporated area, the County zoning ordinance contains several provisions that remove land use constraints. As mentioned previously, the principal urban residential zoning designations are RS, RM, and RC. In addition, the PD land use designation, designed to provide economies of scale, allows both single- and multifamily housing, limited commercial use and recreational uses, and mobile home parks.

**PD Zone.** Districts zoned PD can potentially offer densities of up to 20 units per acre with a use permit. A developer may choose to utilize the Residential County (RC), Residential Single (RS), or Residential Multifamily (RM) densities.

**AHCD Zone.** In the 4th Housing Element Cycle, the County implemented an Affordable Housing Combination District (AHCD) on parcels identified as appropriate for multifamily housing. This combination district is intended to encourage the production of affordable housing in the areas of Moskwite Corner, Spanish Flat, and Angwin. The following analysis explains the combination district and its application to the qualifying sites.
Table 44: Development Standards in Residential Zoning Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Width (Square Feet)</th>
<th>Minimum Yard (Feet)</th>
<th>Maximum Main Building Coverage</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20 20 20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20 20 20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>1 (e)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20 20 20</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20 20 20</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>35%—50% (d)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>35%—50% (d)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>10 (g)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>varies — 20 20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>20 6 (c) 20</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8000 (b)</td>
<td>20 6 (c) 20</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20 20 20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combination District

| AH - Single-Family | 3,500 | 20 | 6 | 20 (h) | 50% | 35 |
| AH - Multifamily   | 0.9   | 20 | 6 | 20 (h) | 40% | 35 |

Notes:
(a) (Reserved.)
(b) Plus two thousand square feet per unit.
(c) Three feet shall be added to each side yard for each story above the first story of any building. Minimum yard on the street side of a corner lot shall be ten feet.
(d) Up to fifty percent for certain uses.
(e) One-half acre if public water and sewer is available.
(f) Twenty thousand square feet if public water and sewer is available.
(g) In areas with general plan designations agricultural resource or agriculture, watershed and open space.

Source: Table 18.104.010 Napa County Zoning Code.
The AHCD allows the construction of a variety of affordable housing types on parcels specifically identified as opportunity sites. The AHCD allows development of specified densities through an administrative by-right approval process (no use permit requirement) so long as the project complies with design criteria and development standards outlined in the AHCD. Environmental review has been completed and mitigation measures incorporated into the zone’s development standards. The maximum and minimum densities for the development of affordable housing are listed below.

- Moskowite - The density allowed with by right approval is four units per acre, with up to 10 units per acre allowed with a use permit.
- Spanish Flat - The density allowed with by-right approval is four units per acre, with up to 25 units per acre allowed with a use permit.
- Angwin – The density allowed with by right approval is 12 units per acre, with up to 25 units per acre allowed with a use permit.

The AHCD also establishes minimum development allocations based on affordability categories of moderate-, low- and very low-income. The required development allocations would vary for each of the four areas as follows:

- Angwin: The allocation differs for the two Angwin Parcels, A and B. With respect to Parcel A, at least 10 percent shall be affordable to very low-income households, 30 percent affordable to low-income households, and an additional 25 percent to 30 percent affordable to moderate-income households. With respect to Parcel B, at least 50 percent shall be affordable to low and very low-income households.
- Moskowite Corner: At least 25 percent shall be affordable to low- and very low-income households and 25 percent affordable to moderate-income households.
- Spanish Flat: At least 25 percent shall be affordable to low-and very low-income households and 25 percent affordable to moderate-income households.

Under the AHCD, development standards for affordable housing mirror development standards for other development types. Therefore, affordable housing development is not subject to more restrictive development standards. For example, minimum site area, setbacks, and height limits for affordable housing development are similar to those for non-affordable housing projects.

**Density Bonus.** In January, 2010, the County adopted a density bonus ordinance to provide a bonus for projects of five or more units where affordable units are constructed. Pursuant to State law, a density bonus is granted for residential projects of five or more units where affordable units (i.e., target units) are constructed. Because of the numerous changes in state law, the County ordinance, is now out of date.
AB 2345 went into effect in 2021 and increased the maximum possible Density Bonus for projects incorporating affordable housing to 50 percent and also lowered thresholds for projects to request additional concessions and incentives from standard zoning regulations in conjunction with the density bonus. The County has not yet adopted revised density bonus provisions, but State law requires the County to follow the provisions of state law even if it hasn’t updated its local ordinance. The 2023-2031 Housing Element Update includes a program to review and revise the County’s Density Bonus provisions to align with the new State law.

Parking Standards
See discussion of parking requirements below in the On and Offsite Improvements Requirements section.

Unit Size Requirements
The Zoning Ordinance does not impose minimum or maximum unit size requirements on residential developments, except for a maximum 500 square foot size for Junior Accessory Dwelling Units and 1,200 square feet for an accessory dwelling unit.

Other Accessory Dwelling Unit Requirements
To encourage establishment of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) on existing developed lots, State law requires cities and counties to either adopt an ordinance based on standards set out in the law allowing ADUs in residentially-zoned areas, or where no ordinance has been adopted, to allow ADUs on lots zoned for single-family or multifamily use that contain an existing single-family unit subject to ministerial (i.e., staff level) approval (“by-right”) if they meet standards set out by law. Local governments are precluded from totally prohibiting ADUs in residentially-zoned areas except for public safety and traffic flow reasons or for lack of water or sewer. (Government Code, Section 65852.2). As mentioned previously, the County permits ADUs and JADUs in all zoning districts permitting single-family residences, with the exception of the AP zone, where only JADUs are allowed.

Napa County’s ADU and JADU regulations are included in County Code Section 180.104.180. Following are key provisions of the County’s ADU and JADU regulations:

- In addition to a single-family unit, each lot may contain a JADU and/or an ADU, except in the AP district, where only JADUs are allowed.
- JADUs may be up to 500 square feet in size and ADUs may be up to 1,200 square feet in size.
- The County does not consider JADUs separate or new dwelling units and connection fees are not charged for water, sewer, or power.
- Second units are not considered new residential uses for county connection fees or capacity charges for utilities.
- No impact fees are imposed upon the development of a second unit less than 750 square feet and impact fees charged for second units of 750 feet or more are charged proportionately in relation to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.
• All reviews for ADUs and JADUs are ministerial.
• Only building code requirements that apply to single-family dwellings apply to JADUs and ADUs.
• Approval is required where either a private or individual sewage disposal system is used.
• No fire and life safety code requirements apply to JADUs that do not apply to single-family residences in the same zone; fire sprinklers are not required for ADUs if they are not required for the primary residence.
• No parking is required for JADUs and second units are required to have one parking space per unit or per bedroom, whichever is less, and may be provided as tandem parking space and/or in setback areas.
• Parking requirements are waived when second units are located within ½-mile of public transit stop, within an architecturally and historically significant district, when the second unit is part of the existing primary residence or an existing accessory structure, when on-street parking permits are required but not offered to the occupant of the second unit, or when there is a car-share vehicle pick-up located within one block of the ADU.
• No replacement parking is required when the second unit replaces an existing garage, carport, or covered parking structure.
• ADUs and JADUs may not be used for short term rentals and may not be sold separately from the single-family home.
• Limits on lot coverage, floor area ratio, open space, and size must permit or be waived to allow an 800 square foot detached or attached second unit 16 feet high with four-foot side and rear yards, if the proposed second unit is in compliance with all other development standards, including but not limited to front yard setbacks.

The planning director administratively approves ministerial permits for junior accessory dwelling units and second units conforming to the provisions of the County’s ADU and JADU regulations within the time limits specified by Government Code section 65852.22 or 65852.2, as applicable.

Overall, the County’s ADU/JADU regulations comply with are consistent with State law and align with the regulations outlined in HCD’s Accessory Dwelling Unit Handbook (December, 2020).

AB 671 requires local governments to include in Housing Elements plans to incentivize and encourage affordable ADU rentals and requires the State to develop a list of state grants and financial incentives for affordable ADUs. The 2023-2031 Housing Element Update contains Program H-2i to incentivize and encourage affordable ADU rentals, which incorporates the County’s existing JADU loan program as well as the ADU resources provided to prospective property owners through the County’s participation in the Napa Sonoma ADU Center.
In addition, AB 670 makes any governing document, such as a homeowners’ association Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions, void and unenforceable to the extent that it prohibits, or effectively prohibits, the construction or use of ADUs or junior ADUs.

**Transparency of Development Requirements**

State Government Code Section 65940.1 subdivision (a)(1) (A) through (E) requires that certain development standards be posted on the County website, including:

(A) (i) A current schedule of fees, exactions, and affordability requirements imposed by that city, county, or special district, including any dependent special districts, as defined in Section 56032.5, of the city or county applicable to a proposed housing development project.

(ii) The city, county, or special district shall present the information described in clause (i) in a manner that clearly identifies the fees, exactions, and affordability requirements that apply to each parcel and the fees that apply to each new water and sewer utility connection.

Napa County maintains a listing of all permit related fees on its website at the following location (https://www.countyofnapa.org/1726/Fees-Payments). Affordability requirements of affordable housing zones and incentives are maintained in their respective Zoning Code sections; 18.82 Affordable Housing Combination District and 18.107 Affordable Housing and Incentives. The County does not offer water and sewer utility services. Fees to connect to an adjacent municipal water system or the Napa Sanitation District are maintained by those organizations.

(B) All zoning ordinances and development standards adopted by the city or county presenting the information, which shall specify the zoning, design, and development standards that apply to each parcel.

The County’s current Zoning Map and Zoning Code are linked on the Napa County Planning Division page (https://www.countyofnapa.org/1709/Planning-Division).

(C) The list required to be compiled pursuant to Section 65940 by the city or county presenting the information.

Each division within the Planning, Building, and Environmental Services department maintains a list of information required on permit applications. Specifically the Building Division’s lists for certain development applications can be found at: https://www.countyofnapa.org/1890/Building-Documents (i.e., Submittal Checklist: New Residential) and the application forms can be found at: https://www.countyofnapa.org/1826/Planning-Documents.

(D) The current and five previous annual fee reports or the current and five previous annual financial reports, that were required pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 66006 and subdivision (d) of Section 66013.
Annual Fee reports can be accessed through the County Executive Office webpage. (https://www.countyofnapa.org/Archive.aspx?AMID=37)

(E) An archive of impact fee nexus studies, cost of service studies, or equivalent, conducted by that city, county, or special district on or after January 1, 2018. For purposes of this subparagraph, "cost of service study" means the data provided to the public pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 66016.

No impact fee studies, cost of service studies, or documents of similar nature have been done since 2018.

**Local Processing and Permit Procedures**
The Housing Element is required to provide information regarding local processing and permit procedures, including timeframes, permit types and requirements by housing type and zone, decision making criteria/findings, design/site/architectural review process and findings, description of standards, and the residential planned development process. Additionally, each jurisdiction must provide information regarding its process to accommodate SB35 streamline applications and by-right applications for permanent supportive housing and navigation centers.

The Zoning Code sets forth the types of uses allowed in each of the zoning districts in the unincorporated area. Some uses are allowed without a use permit, while other uses require a conditional use permit (CUP), all dependent upon the zoning district and the type of use. Table 43 outlines the site regulations in each zoning district. As demonstrated in the table, single-family residential uses are allowed in most zoning districts in the unincorporated area through a ministerial, non-discretionary process. The County does not have a design review process for residential developments.

In the Angwin, Moskowite Corner, and Spanish Flat areas, the Affordable Housing Combination District allows single-family and multifamily housing by right and subject only to specified development standards, up to specified densities.

In general, development proposals are brought to the Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department for informal discussions prior to submittal or detailed design. This is not required, though it is encouraged, and staff provides this consultation for no cost at this stage of the project. Once plans are solidified and more complete, a formal pre-application meeting is required prior to submittal. Such meetings are scheduled every Thursday afternoon and are generally available for scheduling with only a few days’ notice. Following the pre-application meeting, the application may be filed that day if it is sufficiently complete. For housing permitted by right, once all specified requirements have been met, the applicant may apply for a building permit without any other discretionary review.
In 2012, the County consolidated the various permitting divisions into one Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department. As a result, instead of applications being routed to five separate departments and each providing comments and conditions within 30 days of submittal, new administrative policy requires that all first plan check comments be provided within 28 days, and re-submittals are handled as quickly as possible (with a performance target of 14 days). Because of the departmental consolidation and streamlining, the County has been able to reduce plan set submittal requirements from ten sets of plans to only three sets of plans. Other changes include a substantial expansion of staff resources available for the “same day” permitting process, which is available for smaller projects such as a shed construction, kitchen remodel, or minor tenant improvement.

If a project requires a CUP, the process remains much the same as described above, except that CUPs are approved by the Planning Commission (unless appealed to the Board of Supervisors).

Single-family detached units, second units, and farm labor dwelling units can be developed by right on numerous parcels throughout the unincorporated area.

Should developers choose to propose to develop one of the AHCD sites at a higher density that requires a CUP, the process is such that the CUP application will not act as an undue governmental constraint. This is because environmental review has already been completed for the maximum number of units that may be developed under the AHCD provisions on the AHCD sites.

Once an application for a CUP is made, the Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department will conduct CEQA review (for non-AHCD sites), provide public notice and schedule a public hearing before the Planning Commission. During this time, the CUP application would be processed and the Planning Commission would act on both the CEQA review and the CUP request at the same hearing(s). An appeal of a Planning Commission decision on either environmental issues or CUP approval could add up to 3 months to the process, but it could be less.

Typical findings for a CUP include the following: the project is consistent with the General Plan, the use is compatible with surrounding uses, the use does not have a significant adverse effect on any applicable groundwater basin, and addresses basic public health and safety, and general welfare concerns, and meets all zoning requirements for the district, which include height, setbacks, site coverage and parking standards. In addition, the County has an ongoing policy to expedite permit processing for projects that provide affordable housing for very low-, low-, or moderate-income households (https://www.countyofnapa.org/2750/Accessory-Dwelling-Units-ADUs). Additionally, If the project conforms to all objective standards, the Housing Accountability Act (Government Code § 65589.5) does not allow the County to deny the project or reduce the density unless it can make a finding that there is a “specific adverse impact” that cannot be mitigated.
Typical Processing Timeframes
County staff report that throughout 2021, the average processing time from application to permit issuance for a non-discretionary approval to construct a housing unit was 8.5 months. There is no typical timeframe for discretionary housing applications because they are so rare.

The County is required to determine whether a project application is complete or not within 30 days after submittal. To comply with the Housing Accountability Act, the County must notify the applicant whether a project is consistent with all objective standards within 30 days after the project has been found to be complete, if the project has 150 units or less, or within 60 days if the project has more than 150 units.

Objective Development Standards
The State Legislature has enacted several bills that require jurisdictions to adopt objective design standards under the Housing Accountability Act, a housing development may only be denied or reduced in density if it is inconsistent with objective standards. SB 35, passed in 2017, requires jurisdictions where fewer building permits have been issued than needed to meet their RHNA to provide streamlined, ministerial entitlement process for housing developments that incorporate a required percentage of affordable housing. In Napa, this applies to certain projects with 50 percent affordability to lower income households. Review and approval of these proposed projects must be based on objective standards and cannot be based on subjective design guidelines. No part of unincorporated Napa County is designated as an “affected county,” and consequently the unincorporated area is not subject to the Housing Crisis Act of 2019.

The County of Napa has not revised its design standards to incorporate objective standards. The 2023-2031 Housing Element Update includes a component in Program H-5f to adopt objective design standards.

Senate Bill 35 Mandated Streamlining for Affordable Housing
SB 35 requires the County to provide a streamlined, ministerial entitlement process for housing developments that incorporate 50 percent lower income housing. If a project meets certain requirements, including complying with objective standards and paying prevailing wages, it must be processed ministerially and thus is exempt from CEQA review. The local jurisdiction must make a decision on the project within 90 days of submittal of a qualifying application for 150 or fewer housing units, or within 180 days of submittal of a qualifying application for than 150 units. As of April 2022, the County had not received any applications for SB 35 approval. The 2023 to 2031 Housing Element includes a component in Program H-5f to establish a process for streamlining consistent with SB 35.

AB 2162 Mandated Streamlining for Permanent Supportive Housing
The law requires that supportive housing be permitted by right in zones where multifamily and mixed-use developments are permitted. Local jurisdictions must also streamline the approval of housing projects containing a specified amount of supportive housing by providing for
ministerial approvals, with no requirements for CEQA analysis, conditional use permits, or other discretionary approvals. The 2023 to 2031 Housing Element includes a component in Program H-5f to establish a process for streamlining consistent with AB 2162.

**Preliminary Applications**
The Housing Accountability Act allows a housing developer to submit a “preliminary application” to the County for a housing development project. Submittal of a preliminary application allows a developer to provide a specific subset of information on the proposed housing development before providing the full amount of information required by the County for a housing development application. Submittal of the preliminary application secures the applicable development standards and fees in effect at the time of submittal of all the required materials, subject to limited exceptions.

Each jurisdiction may develop their own preliminary application form or may use the application form developed by HCD. Napa County uses the application form developed by HCD.

**Building Codes and Enforcement**
The County has adopted and implements the 2019 Edition of the California Building Code and the 2019 Edition of the California Residential Code without any modifications. The County anticipates adopting the 2022 Edition of the California Building Code prior to the final adoption of the 2023-2031 Housing Element Update in January of 2023. Adoption of a standardized building code facilitates housing production because it allows builders familiar with codes in other areas to easily work in Napa County, thus improving the local availability of qualified housing contractors. This should allow the local housing production capacity to more easily respond to increases in demand for construction services.

Other than inspections of new construction, the County building code enforcement efforts are in response to complaints of unsafe building conditions and the County seeks compliance with minimum health and safety standards. Please see the Substandard Housing Conditions subsection section of the Housing Needs Assessment section for discussion of code violations.

**On- and Off-Site Improvements Requirements**
The zoning district regulations set forth the basic site improvement requirements. The PD regulations are flexible and can be modified to achieve lower cost housing developments. The other regulations are standard requirements. The County’s standards strike a reasonable balance between adequate protection for health and safety while avoiding excessive requirements. The County also allows for flexibility in meeting standards.

**Parking Requirements**
The 2004 Housing Element identified the County’s Off-Street Parking Code (Section 18.110) as a potential constraint due to a lack of specified parking standards that could create uncertainty for project sponsors. The current Off-Street Parking Code (Section 18.110) was updated before
the 2009 Housing Element, in accordance with the recommendation, to include established parking requirements for multifamily housing consistent with other jurisdictions in California, with the provision that the Planning Commission retains the ability to reduce parking requirements on a case-by-case basis if it finds that reduced parking would adequately meet a project’s needs. The standard or “default” parking requirement for multifamily housing projects is two spaces per unit, plus one guest space for every two units and 1 per second unit or per bedroom, whichever is less, in the second unit, except that no additional parking is needed for the second unit if the conditions in subsection (A)(11) or subsection (A)(12) of Section 18.104.180 (Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit or Second Unit) are met.

These code provisions, in conjunction with the fact that Napa County is a rural area with ample space available for parking, indicates that the parking requirements for multifamily housing do not pose an undue constraint on housing development. Furthermore, for qualifying affordable housing developments, the County complies with State density bonus law, which allows projects that qualify for a density bonus to have reduced parking requirements. Given the flexibility in the parking requirements and the low cost of providing parking in Napa County, the parking standards will not significantly impact the cost of housing production.

The current County Code requires that emergency shelters provide one parking space per employee and one space for every four beds. The provision for one parking space for every four beds is not consistent with Government Code section 65583 4 (a)(4)(A) (ii), which specifies that jurisdictions may require parking sufficient to meet employee needs, but as long as they do not require more parking for shelters than other residential or commercial uses within the same zone. The Housing Element contains a program to eliminate the one space per four beds component of the existing parking requirements.

Pedestrian, Bicycle, and/or Bus Facilities
Napa County road and street standards call for provision of concrete sidewalks on both sides of all roads in high density developments. In low density developments, an improved walkway is required on both sides of urban arterial and collector roads. Where development is located on an existing bus route, the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency recommends bus facilities. The County Engineer may require additional pedestrian or bicycle facilities if in his/her opinion there is a potential for concentrated pedestrian and/or bicycle traffic.

Roads
Roads are required to be paved, with the exception of agricultural special purpose roads and residential driveways. The minimum structural section required is 2 inches of hot mix asphalt over 5 inches of Class 2 aggregate base. The minimum standard right of way for a public street is 40 feet and increases for roads intended to carry higher levels of traffic.

Drainage Facilities
Culverts must be designed to handle a 100-year runoff with a head not higher than the nearest edge of the traveled way.
Curbs and Gutters
Curbs and gutters must be designed to carry a 100-year runoff without over topping the curb or the back of sidewalk.

Best Management Practices
In compliance with Section 402(p) of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA), the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) requires all municipalities subject to storm water permitting requirements to develop and implement a program requiring the use of post-construction runoff management best management practices (BMPs). Effective as of July 2008, the Napa County Post-Construction Management BMP program applies to all discretionary and ministerial projects that submit applications for use permits, building permits, or grading permits.

Overall, the County’s land use regulations and development standards are reasonable and necessary to ensure that new housing development does not have an adverse effect on the environment or on other development. The development standards are tailored to the type of development and the locations and zoning districts in which they apply. The standards and regulations allow housing to be constructed to meet the County’s share of the regional housing need. More typically, the most serious constraint is caused by lack of federal, state, and local funds to expand infrastructure capacity. Program H-2k, implemented in 2009 and continued for the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update, allows the County’s Affordable Housing Fund to be used for this purpose.

Fees and Exactions
This section describes and quantifies permit, development, impact and other fees imposed on housing development in Napa County. Exactions also are discussed.

Fees
Building permit fees are based upon the Uniform Building Code and are set at levels designed to offset the County’s cost to complete plan checks and monitor building construction activities. Local development impact fees are set at levels designed to offset the cost of infrastructure and public facilities that are necessary to serve new development. Costs for other common building projects can be found at: https://www.countyofnapa.org/3296/Example-Fees-For-Common-PBES-Projects. The County does not charge the same range of fees as cities commonly charge. For example, the County does not charge impact fees, such as park fees, or public facilities fees. Roadway impact fees are only charged in the airport area, where residential development does not occur due to non-residential zoning designations. Affordable housing impact fees are only charged for market rate developments. The County waives certain permit and application fees for affordable housing projects, including required inclusionary units in for-sale residential projects. The County fees applicable to residential developments are available online at: https://www.countyofnapa.org/1726/Fees-Payments. Not every residential development project requires all of these fees. Individually, the most common fees are not high.
In addition to County fees, the various school districts serving unincorporated Napa County have adopted school facilities impact fees. For residential development projects, the maximum fee allowed by state law is $4.79 per square foot; however, however, the larger school district serving Napa County, Napa Valley Unified School District, St. Helena Unified School District, and Calistoga Joint Unified School District are all charging $4.08 per square foot. Pope Valley School District’s residential impact fee rate is $2.63 per square foot.

Based on a 2,800 square foot single-family home, the total fees above would amount to $45,322 per unit, or $16.19 per square foot. This represents a relatively limited portion of the overall project cost. The fee amount would represent less than six percent of the average construction cost of $784,000; thus, the County concludes that the fees established by Napa County do not pose an undue constraint to residential development.

*Exactions*

Exactions can only be applied to discretionary project approvals. The County rarely has residential developments requesting discretionary approvals; thus, the County does not have any consistent practice with regard to exactions and residential development projects. Typically, these requirements are determined through the environmental review process.

*Housing for Persons with Disabilities*

Housing for disabled persons is not subject to any requirements not applicable to other similar residential developments.

Small residential care facilities (housing six or fewer persons) are permitted by right in the residential and agricultural zones. Medium residential care facilities (housing between seven and 12 persons) and large residential care facilities (housing 13 or more persons) are allowed with a CUP in the residential and agricultural zones. The 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update includes a component in Program H-5f to modify the County Code to eliminate the CUP requirement for residential care facilities (medium) in residential zones and to clarify that residential care facilities (medium) and residential care facilities (large) are treated the same as other residential structures of the same type in the same zone.

*Concentrating/Siting Requirements for Group Homes*

There are no spacing requirements for small residential care facilities. In December 2009, Napa County implemented Program H-3j of the 2009 Housing Element, which removed the spacing requirement for medium and large residential care facilities and increased the allowable distance from a large residential care facility to a hospital from ½ mile to 5 miles. The provision ensures that large facilities serving the disabled are not located in remote rural areas without access to appropriate medical care. Medium and large residential care facilities are treated more favorably than other comparably sized facilities of a similar nature, such as boarding houses, bed and breakfast inns, and other types of lodging establishments, none of which are allowed in the residential and agricultural zones.
Definition of Family
The zoning code does not distinguish between families and groups of unrelated adults living in the same facility, does not impose any occupancy standards in addition to those imposed by the state law, and does not distinguish on the basis of household income, familial status, or disability (except to allow disabled persons to request a reasonable accommodation). County Code section 18.08.280 defines “family” as one or more persons living together under a single management conducted by one or more of the persons in the group.

Approvals for retrofitting homes for the disabled do not follow a unique local process, but rather are governed by the same rules as other comparable improvements unless a disabled person requests a reasonable accommodation. For example the addition of a ramp is normally treated the same as other miscellaneous yard improvements unless a reasonable accommodation is requested.

Zoning for Group Homes and Community Care Facilities
In relation to residential care facilities that provide services on-site, the zoning code allows for 24-hour non-medical service, and treats residential care facilities providing non-medical services on site the same as all other residential care facilities.

Reasonable Accommodation Procedures
In 2005, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted a Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance. The Ordinance applies to anyone considered disabled under the Federal Fair Housing Act and California Fair Employment and Housing Acts. The Ordinance is generally written to allow any person to request an accommodation, change or waiver of any zoning or building standard, policy, or regulation that affects the disabled person as outlined in section 18.134.030 of the Napa County Code. Under the Ordinance, a disabled person or an agent acting on his or her behalf may request an accommodation by explaining how a change in a specified governmental regulation will make the property accessible to the disabled person. “A request for reasonable accommodation may include a modification or exception to the rules, standards and practices for the siting, development and use of housing or housing-related facilities that would eliminate regulatory barriers and provide a person with a disability with equal opportunity to housing of their choice.”

The Planning Director typically determines whether or not the requested reasonable accommodation should be granted and must make that determination within 45 days of submittal of a request. If the applicant requests the reasonable accommodation be determined concurrently with another discretionary approval, then the body making the decision concerning the discretionary approval will also determine whether the request for reasonable accommodation should be granted. The written decision to grant, grant with modifications or deny a request for reasonable accommodations must be consistent with state and federal fair housing law and must be based on the following: (1) whether the housing will be used by an individual or a group of individuals considered disabled, and that the accommodation
requested is necessary to make specific housing available to the individual or group of individuals with a disability; (2) whether alternate reasonable accommodations are available that would provide an equal level of benefit, or whether alternate accommodations would be suitable based on circumstances of the particular case; (3) whether the requested accommodation would impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the County; (4) whether the requested accommodation would be consistent with the general plan land use designation of the property and the general purpose and intent in the applicable zoning district; (5) whether the accommodation substantially affects the physical attributes of the property. These findings are consistent with fair housing law.

Application of Building Codes and ADA Requirements
The County’s Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance applies to the enforcement of building codes and the issuance of building permits. In addition to the allowances for requesting a reasonable accommodation under the zoning code, the County has a special provision for accessibility retrofits whereby minor expansions, not otherwise permitted, are allowed in order to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Summary
The County’s review of regulations and procedures has shown that there are no apparent undue constraints to housing for the disabled. The County’s existing Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance provides a mechanism for the County to grant an eligible, affected individual equal access to housing if a reasonable accommodation is needed from County regulations and procedures.

Other Locally Adopted Ordinances that Directly Impact Housing Supply
County policies and code regulations that positively and directly impact housing supply are the Inclusionary Housing program, the Density Bonus for Affordable Housing, and the prohibition on Short-Term Rentals. A regulation that could potentially constrain development, and that existed prior to the current Housing Element adoption, is the Growth Management System.

Inclusionary Housing Program
In 2009, Napa County amended its Affordable Housing Ordinance, based on a nexus study and economic feasibility analysis, to require that 20 percent of for-sale detached units and 17 percent of for-sale attached units in new housing projects of five units or more be set aside as affordable housing units. In the case of ownership projects, the inclusionary units are required to be affordable to households earning up to 120 percent of median income. In the case of rental projects, a rental housing impact fee must be paid. To help defray the cost of providing affordable units, the Affordable Housing Ordinance specifies that the County may waive application fees for all inclusionary units that are constructed and, in addition, the developer is eligible for a density bonus and other incentives provided by State density bonus law. Projects of four or fewer units must either provide a unit or pay an affordable housing impact fee. The fee is graduated based on house size, with for-sale units paying $9.00 per square foot for units between 1,200 and 2,000 square feet, $10.75 per square foot for units between 2,001 and 3,000...
square feet, and $12.25 per square foot for units larger than 3,000 square feet. Units less than 1,200 square feet are exempt from paying the fee. Units in rental projects are charged a fee of $5.50 per square foot. The County also assesses a commercial linkage fee on non-residential development, with fees ranging from $3.60 per square foot for warehouse uses to $9.00 per square foot for hotel uses.

As part of the 2009 Affordable Housing Ordinance update, Napa County commissioned a report titled Napa County Affordable Housing Ordinance Revisions Update and Economic Analysis: Residential Component (Keyser Marston Associates, 2009), which determined that the impact fees that are economically justifiable as a result of the demand for affordable housing created by new market rate units was at least $20.00 per square foot; thus, Napa County has chosen to burden market rate housing units substantially less than would be legally defensible. In addition, the study determined that “The strength of the local residential market (under normal market conditions) can readily sustain these fee levels without deterring construction and significantly altering development decisions.” Sufficient above-market rate housing has been developed in the County to meet the County’s fifth cycle RHNA, demonstrating that these requirements have not imposed a constraint on housing production.

The 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update includes Programs H-2c and H-2b that states that the County will complete a nexus and economic feasibility study and amend the inclusionary ordinance to apply an on-site affordable housing requirement to new rental housing, and that the County will also review the current in-lieu and commercial linkage fees, given the significant increases in housing costs since the fees were last adopted.

**Growth Management System**

County voters in 1980 approved, and the Board of Supervisors in November 2000 renewed the Slow Growth Initiative, Measure A. This initiative requires the County Board of Supervisors to adopt a Growth Management System (GMS). As described in the General Plan, the GMS sets a one percent annual residential growth limitation, which translated to 105 new housing permits per year, with exemptions for affordable housing. This system creates an incentive for the development of affordable housing by reserving 15 percent of the annual residential building permit allocation for affordable housing, called Category 4 permits. Unlike permit allocations for market-rate units, unused annual allocations for Category 4 permits can accumulate and carry over indefinitely for use in future years. Unused market rate housing allocations can be carried over for up to three years, allowing projects to exceed the previous one-year ceiling. As a practical matter, the Growth Management System has not limited the County’s ability to issue requested permits for market rate or affordable housing units. Based on the accumulation of unused permits as well as the exemptions moving forward for affordable housing units, the County does not anticipate that the GMS will restrict the development of housing within the unincorporated area; thus, the GMS is does not pose a constraint to housing development. For example, the 105 new permits available in a single year is nearly equal to the County’s 106-unit RHNA for the entire 6th Cycle planning period.
No part of the County is an “affected county” subject to the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 and therefore the Growth Management System may remain in effect.

**Short Term Rentals**
Napa County prohibits short-term rentals of residential properties in the Unincorporated Area for periods of less than 30 days. This helps to preserve the stock of housing units available for long-term residents.

**Article 34**
Article 34 of the State Constitution requires local jurisdictions to obtain voter approval for specified “low rent” housing projects that involve certain types of public agency participation. Generally, a project is subject to Article 34 if more than 49 percent of its units will be rented to low-income persons and includes State or federal funding; however, tax credits do not trigger a need for Article 34 approval. If a project is subject to Article 34, it will require an approval from the local electorate. This can constrain the production of affordable housing, since the process to seek ballot approval for affordable housing projects can be costly and time consuming, with no guarantee of success. Local jurisdictions often place a measure or referendum on the local ballot that seeks authority to develop a certain number of units during a given period of time. To date, Article 34 has not posed a barrier to affordable housing development in Napa County.

**Constraints of Other Governmental Agencies**
State and local LAFCo policies discourage the expansion of urban areas into agricultural and open space lands and encourage development within existing urban areas. LAFCo policies also favor infill development over development in undeveloped areas. LAFCo policies discourage development in the unincorporated areas adjacent to cities and discourage the extension of urban facilities and services into agricultural and open space lands. In addition, LAFCo policies discourage the formation of special districts with limited powers, and instead favor comprehensive service provision. The latter is relevant to developing housing at urban densities in the unincorporated areas because unless the cities agree to extend community water and sewer services to new development in the unincorporated areas, it will be necessary to form new water and/or sewer districts in order to provide these services to new urban development in the unincorporated area, contrary to LAFCo policies. To address this constraint, Napa County is targeting properties for the Housing Element sites inventory where new residential development requiring community water and/or sewer services (e.g., higher density development that would be suitable to accommodate lower-income housing demand) can be served by existing water and sewer systems.

**Non-Governmental Constraints**
A variety of nongovernmental constraints impact the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing in a community. The Housing Element is required to discuss the
availability of financing and development costs such as the price of land and cost of construction.

**Availability of Financing**
The availability of financing is a critical factor that can influence the cost and supply of housing. There are generally two types of financing used in the housing market: (1) capital used for initial site preparation and construction; and (2) capital used to finance the purchase of units by homeowners and investors. Interest rates substantially impact home construction, purchase, and improvement costs. A small fluctuation in rates can make a dramatic difference in the annual income needed to qualify for a loan. While interest rates for development and construction are generally higher than interest rates for home purchase (i.e., mortgages), financing is generally available in the County for new construction, rehabilitation, and refinancing and interest rates remain at very low levels, from a historical perspective.

While financing is generally available for market-rate development, limited availability of funding to subsidize for affordable projects is a key impediment to the construction of affordable housing, not only in Napa County, but throughout California and the U.S.

**Cost of Land**
Often, land costs account for the largest single component of housing development costs. The variable cost of land is influenced by many factors including location, lot size, zoning, accessibility, availability of services, and existing infrastructure. A review of residential lots listed for sale in Napa County via online realty listing services during the winter of 2021 indicated typical asking prices for single-family lots starting at around $35,000 for vacant lots in rural subdivisions in locations such as Berryessa Highlands and Circle Oaks, in the eastern part of the county. Costs for residential building sites on larger acreage or lots in more urbanized areas near cities can be much higher – in the $400,000 to $500,000 range. Due to the limited amount of vacant land available for multifamily housing development in the unincorporated areas of Napa County, there are no examples of recently sold or currently listed multifamily parcels; however, it is likely that land suitable for multifamily residential development would be valued on a per developable unit basis at a cost that would at least be equal to or greater than the lower end of the single-family lot prices.

**Cost of Construction**
Construction costs for residential development are based on the cost of labor and materials, which vary depending on the type of development. Once a vacant parcel is purchased, the contractor is also required to make site improvements before constructing a building on the property. Site improvements can include connections to existing utility systems, rough grading, and installation of water and sewer lines. The cost variation for site improvements depends on the lot size, unit size, and type of residential dwelling. Other factors that can influence costs are the primary infrastructure needed for the site and roadway improvements.
According to construction cost data published by RS Means, the per square foot cost of single-family construction in Napa County is likely to be approximately $253 per square foot, not including site improvement costs. Site improvement costs may be approximately $50,000 per lot or more; however, this can vary substantially due to contributing factors such as the size of the lot, availability of community water and sewer connections versus the need to develop a well and construct a septic system, soil conditions, and other conditions that could drive up costs.

In total, assuming a nominal $50,000 cost for a lot, site improvements, and construction of the home itself could start at around $600,000 for a 2,000 square foot single-family home in a rural area. With the addition of financing costs, permits and fees, other soft costs, and a builder profit of approximately ten percent, the cost to a homebuyer could easily exceed $850,000.

For multifamily development, RS Means indicates that per square foot construction costs in Napa County could be approximately $232 per square foot. Per unit site improvement costs are generally lower for multifamily development than for single-family development. Factoring in $35,000 per unit for land and allowing for $25,000 in site improvement costs per unit, the construction costs for a 950-square foot apartment unit may be approximately $283,000. Adding in financing costs, permits and fees, and other soft costs totaling approximately 30 percent of hard costs, plus a builder profit of around ten percent, the development cost per multifamily unit could be approximately $405,000.

In recent years, several factors have increased cost of materials, including global trade patterns and federal policy decisions, such as tariffs, as well as state and local regulations, such as building codes. Most recently, the elevated construction demand due to wildfire reconstruction has been compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic in influencing the cost and availability of construction labor and materials. Since the recession, California has seen a severe tightening in the construction labor market, especially for workers trained in specific construction trades. The lack of an available labor force drives up the cost of labor and leads to project delays as workers are either unavailable or lost to more profitable projects.

**Difficulty and Cost of Obtaining Fire Insurance**

With more frequent occurrences of catastrophic wildfires throughout the western United States, private home hazard insurance carriers are becoming more cautious about insuring for wildfire risks. As a result, fewer insurance carriers are offering insurance in fire-prone areas and those that do are charging higher premiums to compensate for the risks. The availability and cost of obtaining fire hazard insurance in areas such as unincorporated Napa County that are prone to wildfires can be an indirect constraint on the maintenance and production of housing.

**Requests for Housing Developments at Reduced Densities**

State law requires the Housing Element to include an analysis of requests to develop housing at densities below those anticipated in the sites inventory. The County has not received requests to develop housing sites at densities below those anticipated in the 5th Cycle Housing Element.
Length of Time between Project Approval and Applications for Building Permits
State law requires an analysis of the length of time between receiving approval for housing development and submittal of an application for building permit. County staff indicate that the County does not have recent experience with housing applications requiring discretionary approvals. Based on building permit data, County staff calculated that in 2021 the average time between submittal of a building permit application and issuance of the permit was 8.8 months.

Efforts to Remove Non-Governmental Constraints
Recognizing the high cost of housing and the large gap between affordable housing costs and the level of housing expenses that lower-income households can afford, the County’s primarily efforts to address non-governmental constraints to housing production is the use of Affordable Housing Fund monies to assist in the development of affordable housing units. These efforts are formalized in various Housing Element programs from the 5th Cycle, including: H-2a (prioritization of affordable housing funds for development of AHCD sites); H-2d (NOFA process for affordable housing funds); H-2h (funding for worker proximity housing program for low- and moderate-income workers); Program H-2l (funding for deed restricted ADUs); H-2k (funding for infrastructure improvements on affordable housing sites); H-3e (financial assistance for preservation of private farmworker housing); H-3g (prioritization of funds to support new farmworker housing); H-4b (provide Affordable Housing Fund monies for projects in cities); and H-4e (assist Mid-Peninsula housing in securing subsidy monies for affordable units at Napa Pipe).

Summary
This review of constraints to housing development revealed that, in most cases, restrictions or controls on housing are largely beyond the County’s control (i.e., most non-governmental constraints). In terms of governmental constraints, the County has identified the need to make certain updates based on recently passed State laws and has included components of Housing Element Program H-5f to address these new requirements.

The land use controls including lot coverage, building height, and off-street parking requirements do not appear to unduly constrain housing development in Napa County and do not add significantly to the cost or time needed in order to build housing. Given the combination of the County’s relatively modest RHNA for the 6th Cycle, the Growth Management System’s exemptions for affordable housing units, and accumulated permits available for market rate housing development, the County’s Growth Management System does not pose a constraint to housing development.

In addition to governmental constraints, there may be non-governmental factors which may constrain the production of new housing. These could include market-related conditions such as land and construction costs as well as public support for new development.
9. HOUSING SITES ANALYSIS

Introduction
As required by State law, a Housing Element is to include an inventory of available land that is appropriately zoned and suitable for housing development to accommodate a jurisdiction’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). This inventory for Napa County focuses on sites that are or can be made available for housing development affordable to households of varying income levels. This chapter summarizes the evaluation of potential housing sites, and the adequacy of these sites with their development capacities based on environmental and infrastructure constraints to address the County’s regional housing needs for the 2023-2031 planning period.

Specifically, California law (Government Code Sections 65583 (a)(3)) requires that the Housing Element contain an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites that can be developed for housing within the planning period and nonvacant (i.e., underutilized) sites having potential for redevelopment. State law also requires an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites. While there is a limited amount of land in unincorporated Napa County with access to urban services such as water and wastewater utilities, the analysis presented in this chapter demonstrates that the County has sites to accommodate the County’s housing allocation of 106 units, including housing at all income levels. Napa County is now considering six potential sites to accommodate the County’s RHNA, the combined capacity of which greatly exceeds the County’s RHNA. The County will revise or reduce the list of sites prior to finalizing the Housing Element Update for adoption, depending on comments on the Draft Housing Element Update from HCD, public feedback on the Draft Housing Element Update, the findings of the CEQA analysis being conducted for all of the sites, and further investigation of site feasibility for housing development.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation
The County’s housing target for the 2023-2031 planning period is referred to as its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). In the Bay Area, RHNA are assigned to each city and county by the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG) Council of Governments for the eight-year planning period and includes housing units for specified income groupings. The County’s RHNA as of March 2022 is shown in Table 45 below, and reflects ABAG’s March 17, 2022 approval of RHNA transfers between the County and the cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena.
Table 45: Unincorporated Napa County Regional Housing Needs (RHNA) Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Info</th>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Allocation ( ^{a} )</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: \( ^{a} \) The RHNA allocation shown here was adopted by ABAG on March 17, 2022 with the approval of requested transfers pursuant to California Government Code Section 65584.07. SOURCE: ABAG, March 2022.

Summary of Capacity to Accommodate RHNA

The total realistic development capacity of the unincorporated county, including all sites identified in this chapter, is shown in Table 46 below. The total realistic capacity reflects 230 currently vacant parcels that can accommodate single family homes, projected development of 72 accessory dwelling units (ADUs) over the eight-year planning period, and 483 units on sites that have been identified for rezoning to provide for minimum densities of 20 dwelling units per acre, the “default density” provided in Government Code Section 65583.2(c). In addition to considering the aggregate number of units that the sites can accommodate, this chapter considers the potential for the sites to accommodate housing that is affordable to all income levels, as discussed later in this analysis within the “Evaluation of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels” section.
In total, this 6th Cycle Housing Element Sites Inventory identifies sites that will be rezoned to accommodate development of 483 units. Specifically, the County can accommodate its RHNA allocation for very low and low-income households by:

- Rezoning one site in the Spanish Flat area with a modified version of the Affordable Housing Combining District (AHCD) that applies elsewhere in the Spanish Flat area.
- Rezoning three sites Northeast of the City of Napa and one in the Foster Road area to Residential Multiple (RM) district and adjusting the development standards that would apply.
- Including a surplus State-owned site on Imola Avenue proposed for development of affordable housing.

Within the AHCD and RM zoning districts, rezoning would require a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre so the sites would accommodate housing affordable to lower income households. More information regarding the sites is provided below.

### Sites Selection Process

The County undertook its site selection process by closely examining areas of the unincorporated County with access to water and wastewater utilities, by gathering input from residents and members of the Housing Element Advisory Committee, as well as by using

---

**Table 46: Summary of Capacity to Accommodate RHNA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Info</th>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low and Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County RHNA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential Development Potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU Projection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity on Identified Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Very Low and Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE of Napa – Bishop 1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE of Napa – Altamura</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE of Napa – Big Ranch Corner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Owned Site (Imola Ave)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Road 2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal of Identified Sites</strong></td>
<td><strong>483</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>483</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Unit Potential**

| Total Unit Potential | 499 | 24 | 262 | 785 |

**Surplus (+) / Deficit (-) from RHNA**

| Surplus (+) / Deficit (-) from RHNA | 422 | +10 | +231 | +377 |

**SOURCE:** Environmental Science Associates, March 2022.

1 May include a limited number of pipeline projects (i.e., applications on file).
Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping software from multiple datasets to identify potentially available housing sites. To complement the existing knowledge base of County staff regarding potential sites, the County started with three primary data sources: 1) the sites included in the prior Housing Element inventory, 2) all County parcel data, and 3) housing sites identified as part of prior analysis of vacant and underutilized (i.e., non-vacant) parcels created by ESA in 2018 in anticipation of the Housing Element Update. The 2018 parcel inventory was created using assessor land use codes to identify a selection of sites within the unincorporated County that were zoned or could be zoned to allow for residential development. The team then used online mapping tools, including Google Earth and Google Street View, to verify vacant and underutilized status as identified with County parcel data.

All parcels considered for inclusion in the sites inventory were reviewed for any known environmental constraints, such as flood zones, fire hazard severity zone proximity, steep slopes, and other possible constraints to development feasibility. The County also screened sites prior to inclusion in the inventory to remove parcels that are currently occupied by residential uses. None of the sites are known to have been occupied in the past five years with housing occupied by lower-income residents.

The project team developed the initial inventory of sites over a series of working sessions and verified the sites to be included within the inventory. As staff members have specific knowledge of the current projects in the pipeline and development interest in certain areas of the County, the project team was able to determine the status of each site, access to infrastructure, the likelihood for residential development, and provided feedback on the density and buildout assumptions. Specific parcels were removed because of known site constraints, such as drainage or lack of access, and additional sites were added. Once all sites had been verified, the County applied agreed-upon assumptions to the available sites to calculate housing capacity and confirmed that the calculations resulted in realistic capacity numbers. On certain parcels, particularly large parcels, the County identified a subset of the parcel for rezoning as the developable housing “site” and modified the assumptions to reflect more realistic capacity numbers. Additional methodology regarding site size and capacity can be viewed in Section 2.1.4 General Evaluation Considerations and Section 2.2 Realistic Capacity Evaluation.
Methodology/Evaluation of Possible Sites
To meet its RHNA requirement, the County has evaluated a variety of methods for the identification of housing inventory sites including the evaluation of:

1. Continued development of single-family homes and accessory dwelling units (ADU)
2. Sites from prior Housing Elements
3. Potential sites for lower income housing with access to urban infrastructure (primarily water and wastewater services)

Throughout the iterative evaluation process with input from residents, stakeholders, and members of our Housing Element Advisory Committee it became evident that the most viable sites identified in this analysis, based on HCD requirements, would be those sites ultimately identified for multifamily housing. In identifying potential sites, the County used the following screening criteria as a guide for site selection:

1. Sites must have access to existing or planned water, sewer, and other dry utilities with sufficient capacity available to support housing development (State requirement)
2. Sites must generally be between 0.5 and 10 acres in size (State requirement)
3. Sites must be located outside of areas designated Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space as of September 28, 2007 (the date specified in Measure P, approved by the voters in November 2008). Notwithstanding this requirement, sites within an area designated Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space may be identified for qualifying farmworker housing development and sites identified as an existing commercial establishment on General Plan Figure AG.LU-2: Location of Parcels Subject to Policy AG/LU-45 may be identified for redevelopment. (Local Requirement)

In addition, with input from residents, stakeholders, and our Housing Element Advisory Committee, the County identified a goal to identify sites that are:

1. Located outside of high and very high fire severity zones as designated (in State Responsibility Areas) or recommended (in Local Responsibility Areas) by CalFire
2. Located outside of Zones A through D of the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
3. Proximate to transit routes and/or employment opportunities and services (e.g., groceries) where possible
Evaluating Adequacy of Single Family Residential and RHNA Progress

As part of the process for evaluating the adequacy for residential development within unincorporated Napa County, a GIS exercise was conducted to look at existing parcels with potential for development of single-family homes. The County’s General Plan and zoning ordinance permit construction of one single family home on each legal lot, except for areas that are zoned for industrial use. The GIS analysis considered residually allowable parcels that are vacant (no building on site) and that are deemed buildable based on road access and slope. As a result, this analysis notes potential development of up to 230 single family homes on currently vacant parcels, with the assumption that these homes would provide market rate (rather that affordable) housing suitable for above moderate-income households.

In addition to the sites presented in the sites inventory to accommodate RHNA, the County may also consider those projects that could be built during the projection period and count those units towards the County’s RHNA progress. The County has a number of single-family applications that may be approved during the planning period, and therefore may count towards the County’s RHNA. However, as these applications are for single-family homes, they are assumed to be accommodated within the estimate of 230 units as provided above.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Further evaluation of parcels designated for residential uses considered the development trends of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and the projected number of units to be built within the planning period. ADUs and Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADUs) are small, self-contained dwelling units that provide a kitchen, bathroom and sleeping area. The unit can be attached to the main home with a separate entrance or can be a small, detached unit in the rear yard or above a garage. Frequently smaller in size, ADUs typically rent for less than apartments, and can provide affordable rental options for smaller households, and can provide rental income for the homeowner. The County’s zoning permits one ADU and one JADU per parcel within residentially and Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning. One JADU is permitted in Agricultural Preservation (AP) zoning. HCD guidance suggests that the County may assume that ADUs and JADUs continue to develop at the same pace and affordability levels that has occurred over the last three years. During that same time span, 34 ADUs and JADUs were permitted in Napa County as shown in Table 47 below.

Table 47: Accessory Dwelling Units Permitted in Prior Housing Element Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits Issued</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the annual average of 12.25 ADU permits per year since 2018 and considering the results of a County survey of existing ADUs (as well as the results of ABAG’s survey data) to distribute the projected units by income category as shown in Table 4 below, the County is projecting a yield of approximately 72 ADUs being permitted at a range of income levels over the eight-year planning period of the HEU. While this analysis anticipates that the recent rate of
ADU and JADU production will continue, Napa County will continue to make improvements to its ADU processes, public education, and policies in the coming years to further advance ADU and Junior ADU development (for more information, see the Policies & Programs section of the Housing Element).

**Table 48: Accessory Dwelling Units Projected Over the Planning Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ADUs</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluating Sites from Prior Housing Element(s)**

Table 49 below provides a summary of all prior sites identified in the 5th cycle Housing Element Sites Inventory. None of these prior Housing Element sites have been identified as part of the 6th cycle inventory to accommodate the RHNA for the 2023 to 2031 planning period..

**Table 49: Napa County Summary of Sites from Prior Housing Element**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>APNs</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>Realistic Unit Capacity Total</th>
<th>Reuse Site for 6th Cycle?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A</td>
<td>024-410-007</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B</td>
<td>024-080-029</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskowite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A</td>
<td>032-150-062</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B</td>
<td>032-150-063</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C</td>
<td>032-150-048</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site D</td>
<td>032-150-047</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Pipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites A &amp; B</td>
<td>046-412-005</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Napa Pipe Residential</td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>046-400-030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹ Site A</td>
<td>019-261-038</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹ Site B</td>
<td>019-261-035</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C</td>
<td>019-261-026</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site D</td>
<td>019-261-025</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site E</td>
<td>019-262-001</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site F</td>
<td>019-050-003</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ¹ Sites that were considered for inclusion within the 6th cycle Sites Inventory but removed as part of the evaluation process.

Overall, the sites from the County’s 5th cycle housing element were not carried forward because those sites were deemed unlikely to develop in the planning period due to either existing
development at the site or wildfire hazards and/or housing losses in the area being of concern. More specifically, one particular site included in the County’s 5th cycle was the Napa Pipe site, which has been annexed to the City of Napa. While this site is no longer available to the County, pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.08, the County will report affordable units produced on the site in its Annual Progress Report (APR) each year. The prior identified sites, as listed in Table 5 above, were not considered adequate to accommodate lower income needs for the 6th cycle and were not carried forward for this 6th cycle sites inventory. However, to make these sites more attractive for development in the 6th Cycle, the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update includes Program H-2g which calls for evaluating and modifying (i.e., reducing) the affordable housing requirements on the AHCD sites established in the 5th Cycle or earlier.

**General Evaluation Considerations**

In addition to reviewing sites from prior Housing Elements and opportunities for single-family residential sites, the sites inventory analysis also looked at general evaluation considerations discussed in this section. Identified sites include both vacant and non-vacant sites that have access to (existing or planned) infrastructure and meet a variety of criteria that make them candidates for residential development during the 6th Cycle planning period. The following considerations are covered in this section:

- Infrastructure Availability
- Environmental Constraints including outside very high fire severity zones
- Residential uses
- Site Size
- Public/Private partnerships
- Proximity to transit, employment, and amenities

**INFRASTRUCTURE AVAILABILITY**

The availability of utility infrastructure to a site was one of the main evaluation considerations when working to identify sites for the inventory. Infrastructure availability includes both wet and dry utilities with priority placed on those infrastructure needs for water and wastewater services. As much of unincorporated Napa County does not have access to water and wastewater services, the evaluation of sites was constrained to focus only on those areas of the County where such services are available or could be provided based on proximity to existing services nearby. While several of the sites identified do not currently have water and sewer services available onsite, housing development on the site would be able connect to existing utilities via nearby infrastructure with the approval of agencies with jurisdiction. The Sites Inventory spreadsheet in Appendix D as well as the summary of development sites in the Sites Inventory subsection contains information on the status of water and sewer services for each site.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS**

The analysis of environmental constraints includes a review of all parcels (or portions of parcels) identified in the inventory to determine possible constraints such as fire hazard severity zones, slope ratios, and other possible constraints to development feasibility. While there is an
added cost, fire constraints can be mitigated through design and all sites in the inventory have been deemed suitable for residential development as they fall outside of the very high fire hazard severity zones and are buildable lots with none of the identified parcels encumbered by a Williamson Act contract. Further review of environmental constraints include proximity to Airport Land Use Zones which was considered as part of the sites inventory review process and eliminated sites within zones A through D of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

**RESIDENTIAL USES**
Areas with the greatest potential for residential development during the planning period were evaluated to determine if they could accommodate housing at 20 du/ac with rezoning, focusing on areas with a General Plan land use designations allowing residential uses. Additional local requirements were considered to find sites located outside of areas designated Agricultural Resource (AR) or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS). This consideration was based on a requirement established by County Measure P which prohibits urban uses in areas designated AR or AWOS in the General Plan as of September 28, 2007.

**SITE SIZE**
Per State law, sites smaller than half an acre or larger than 10 acres are not considered adequate to accommodate lower income housing need unless it can be demonstrated that sites of equivalent size were successfully developed during the prior planning period, or other evidence is provided that the site can be developed as lower income housing.

- **Large Sites** - There are five identified sites on parcels over 10-acre in size. However, only a portion of those larger sites are being proposed for inclusion in the sites inventory, with the sites being specifically rezoned to allow for only the vacant portion of the parcel to be developed as a site. All sites in the inventory will accommodate lower income units, with all sites zoned to require minimum densities of 20 du/ac. In most cases a five-acre portion of the larger parcel is proposed for rezoning to either an Affordable Housing Combing District (AHCD) overlay zone or a Residential Multiple (RM) zone, allowing for development on the vacant and least-constrained portion of the parcel.

- **Small Sites** - While the sites inventory does not include any identified sites that total less than one half acre, a screening of individual parcels less than one-half acre was considered for possible parcel consolidation. However, this approach was not carried forward as more effective parcels for development were identified.

**HOUSING SITES CONTROLLED BY AN EXEMPT ENTITY**
As part of the site selection process, a review of possible parcels controlled by exempt entities was conducted. Sites located on land controlled by exempt entities (such as State, Federal, or Tribal) are considered differently from housing capacity planned on sites controlled by the County. In these instances, the County has limited control over the planning and decision-making processes of the site and so demonstrating “sufficient certainty” for housing development can be inexact. Ultimately the goal of analyzing such sites is to determine if an
exempt entity could develop housing within the planning period to meet (or lessen) the requirement for the County to identify adequate sites to meet its RHNA. For planned housing on exempt-entity sites, HCD allows RHNA credit when documentation is provided that demonstrates the likelihood that the planned housing can be developed within the current RHNA/housing element.

One site is included in the County’s sites inventory that is owned by an exempt entity, State of California Department of General Services (DGS). Specifically, DGS has included 20.34 acres of surplus property accessed via Imola Avenue on its Real Estate Excess State Property map, with the Department of State Hospitals identified as the agency with jurisdiction. Based on conversations with staff of DGS, a five-acre site in this area is likely to develop with housing affordable to lower income households during the planning period.

Potential Use of the Adequate Sites Alternative (65583.1(c))

As a possible approach, there are some conditions under which the County could address up to 25 percent of its adequate sites requirement by substantially rehabilitating existing units, converting existing units to affordable units, or where existing unit affordability is preserved (including mobile home spaces). Examples include conversion of hotels or motels to residential use and making them available for people experiencing homelessness or by preserving a mobile home park via acquiring spaces. While this option was considered as part of the site evaluation process, the County determined that this alternative approach would not be viable in meeting the general evaluation considerations or needed to accommodate the County’s RHNA.

Inventory of Suitable Land (65583(a)(3), 65583.2)

Government Code sections 65583(a)(3) and 65583.2 require that the County’s inventory of land suitable for residential development shall be used to identify sites throughout the community that can be developed for housing within the planning period and that are sufficient to provide for the jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need for all income levels. The inventory of suitable land must also look at criteria for vacant and underutilized sites as outlined below:

- Vacant sites that are zoned for multifamily development
- Vacant sites that are not zoned for multifamily development, but that allow such development
- Underutilized sites that are zoned for residential development and capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity
- Sites that are not zoned for residential development, but can be redeveloped for and/or rezoned for multifamily residential development
- Sites owned or leased by the County that can be redeveloped for multifamily residential development within the housing cycle
- Sites controlled by the State, a city/county, or another public agency where there is agreement/documentation that the site can be developed within the housing cycle
- Non-vacant sites require additional justification, and the bar is even higher if more than 50% of lower income RHNA will be accommodated by non-vacant sites.

As provided in section 3.0 “Draft Sites Inventory,” each site identified as part of the Housing Element Sites Inventory has been outlined and a suitability analysis has been provided with a
“Description of the and Factors Supporting Development” at the site, including infrastructure considerations, environmental constraints, and developer interest.

Sites for Rezoning
Government Code section 65583.2(h) requires that if sites are identified for rezoning to accommodate a lower income RHNA shortfall they must fulfill the following requirements:

- Permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses by right for developments in which 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower income households.
- Permit the development of at least 16 units per site.
- Ensure sites permit a minimum of 20 dwelling units per acre.
- Ensure a) at least 50% of the shortfall of low- and very low-income regional housing need can be accommodated on sites designated for exclusively residential uses, or b) if accommodating more than 50% of the low- and very low-income regional housing need on sites designated for mixed-uses, all sites designated for mixed-uses must allow 100% residential use and require residential use to occupy at least 50 percent of the floor area in a mixed-use project.

A rezone program has been included in the Housing Element under Program H-4g to fulfill the above requirements. As presented at the end of Section 3.1, Summaries of Development Sites in Table 7, the County has identified a total of five sites for rezoning to accommodate the Napa County’s RHNA for the 6th cycle. More than half of Napa County’s shortfall in its lower income RHNA will be accommodated on sites designated for exclusively residential use and no sites will be considered mixed use, therefore the County will not be subject to requirements to allow 100 percent residential on mixed use sites.

Affordable Housing Overlay
Affordable housing or zoning overlays are a zoning tool that allows jurisdictions to modify existing zoning to allow for or require certain types of residential development, or development at certain densities, on a parcel without modifying the standards of the underlying zoning district. As part of Housing Element Program H-4g, one of the identified sites will be rezoned in Napa County to include an Affordable Housing Combination District (AHCD) in proximity to an already established AHCD zone, which would require minimum densities of 20 du/ac, with a maximum density of 25 du/ac. Current provisions in Municipal Code Section 18.82.040 regarding the AHCD zone would be amended to include this requirement. AHCD allows for a site specific approach for those sites where we expect multi-family housing to be affordable to lower income households. The County has proposed the AHCD zone for use at the Spanish Flat site because existing parcels in that community have the same zoning, and the ordinance can easily be refined to provide updated development standards for those parcels.

Residential Multiple Zoning
Napa County’s Residential Multiple (RM) zoning has been a zoning district with limited application within the County to date, and therefore represents an opportunity for use in defining density and development standards applicable to sites identified in proximity to the City of Napa. As part of Housing Element Program, H-4g identified sites will be rezoned to the
RM district, which will be modified to require minimum densities of 20 du/ac, with a maximum density of 25 du/ac, and to adjust applicable development standards as needed to encourage provision of housing affordable to lower-income households.

**Realistic Capacity Evaluation**

As required by Housing Element statute, local governments must analyze available sites based on their realistic residential development capacity. This means that the development density that can be achieved on a site might be less than the maximum residential densities permitted by the underlying General Plan land use and zoning. Therefore, to establish realistic capacity, jurisdictions must consider several factors when looking at vacant and underutilized sites where housing is an allowed use. These factors include:

- Land use controls and site improvements
- Site use and if vacant or non-vacant
- Site size and realistic development capacity
- Typical densities of existing or approved residential development at similar affordability levels
- Current or planned availability and accessibility of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities
- Incentives for residential use
- Local or regional development trends

In addition, for any sites that are less than 0.5 acres or greater than 10 acres, the County’s Housing Element must provide an analysis demonstrating the ability to develop the site with housing during the planning period. Evidence can include developer interest, a development proposal, or a track record consolidating and/or developing sites of similar size. Further, within the County must also include policies or incentives within the Housing Element to facilitate development of the identified sites. As provided in section 3.0 “Draft Sites Inventory,” each site identified as part of the Housing Element Sites Inventory would be greater than 0.5 acres and smaller than 10.0 acres, and a suitability analysis has been provided with a description of the factors supporting development at the site, including infrastructure considerations, environmental constraints, and developer interest.

**Evaluation of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels**

One of the most important evaluation considerations of the site selection process is to look at a sites’ ability to accommodate households with varying income levels. To satisfy the RHNA requirement, sites have been identified and analyzed in this section and listed in the Appendix D spreadsheet. In addition to the information and the expected number of units summarized for each site, the assumed affordability levels of units are also considered. Furthermore, the unit capacity must be maintained throughout the 2023-2031 planning period, so the County has identified sites well in excess of its RHNA. If sites listed in the inventory are redeveloped with other uses or different income levels than what is identified, the difference can be made up with the buffer sites to ensure there is “no net loss” of RHNA capacity at each income level.
Affordability Assumptions
This Housing Element relies on State law and HCD guidance to establish the affordability levels of new housing in the County. Affordability assumptions for single family residences (including ADUs) are discussed in Section 2.1.1 and are shown along with identified sites in Table 50.

Table 50: Affordability Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Characteristic</th>
<th>Capacity Assumption</th>
<th>Income Category Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 0.5 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 to 10 acres (and rezoned to allow at least 20 du/ae)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Very-Low and Low-Income Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residential parcels that are vacant (no building on site) and that are deemed buildable based on road access and slope.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Above Moderate-Income Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential parcels that can accommodate Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Very-Low and Low-Income Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Moderate-Income Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Above Moderate-Income Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State law (Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)) establishes a “default density standard” of 20 units per acre for lower-income units in a suburban jurisdiction such as Napa County. This is the density that is “deemed appropriate” in State law to accommodate the County’s lower-income RHNA. Sites identified that are 0.5 acres and larger with zoning or General Plan land use designations that allow for development at 20 units per acre are therefore included in the inventory as lower-income sites.

Accommodating Very-Low and Low-Income Households
As noted above, land zoned at 20 dwelling units per acre (or greater) is assumed to be available to accommodate very-low and low-income housing development. All sites in the inventory are expected to have 20 acres of land zoned for residential development at a minimum of 20 dwelling units per acre. Specifically, including the State controlled Imola site, the available land inventory summary offers additional sites in Spanish Flat, Foster Road, and Northeast of Napa for the production of very low- and low-income housing. These sites are capable of producing 483 units, which exceeds the remaining outstanding RHNA for very low- and low-income households of 61 units by a surplus of 422 sites.

Accommodating Moderate-Income Households
Second dwelling units are frequently affordable to moderate and above moderate-income households. County records indicate that 34 second units have been produced in the unincorporated area from 2017 through 2020. Assuming that this trend continues, the County expects to issue an average of 12 permits per year, for an additional 72 second units before the end of the planning period. While most of these units would accommodate moderate and above moderate-income households, some would accommodate lower income households.
A conservative approach has been taken to determine the unit distribution among income levels based on County survey results on ADU production, with roughly 20 percent attributed to lower income units and 80 percent to moderate and above moderate-income units. With these units, Napa County has more than adequate capacity (24 units) to accommodate its RHNA (14 units) for moderate-income housing units.

**Accommodating Above Moderate-Income Households**

In reviewing existing parcels with potential for development of single-family homes, the County’s General Plan and zoning ordinance permit construction of one single-family home on each legal lot, except for areas that are zoned for industrial use. The parcels available to accommodate construction of a single-family dwelling number are in the thousands. By reviewing those residentially allowable parcels that are considered vacant (no building on site) and that are deemed buildable based on road access and slope, up to 230 single-family homes could be developed on currently vacant parcels, with the assumption that these homes would provide market rate (rather than affordable) housing. Thus, Napa County would accommodate more than its RHNA of 31 units for above moderate-income households.

**Farmworker Housing**

The County’s zoning ordinance permits development of up to 12 individual farmworker housing units as an allowed use by right on every legal parcel in agricultural zones. The County is seeking to encourage additional development of farmworker units and is participating in ABAG’s Farmworker Collaborative to support its objectives for farmworker housing production. Section 3. of this Housing Element Update includes goals, policies, and programs that address farmworker housing needs, with specific objectives identified.

**Non-vacant Sites Analysis**

For nonvacant sites, HCD requires that jurisdictions demonstrate the potential and likelihood of additional development within the planning period. HCD requires that substantial evidence be provided if more than 50 percent of the lower income sites in the inventory are on non-vacant sites. To determine if this is the case, the sum of lower income units on identified opportunity sites were tallied, a methodology consistent with HCD guidance. Based on Napa County’s sites inventory, all of the County’s lower income RHNA would be assumed as being provided on existing non-vacant parcels. However, with rezoning to occur for the sites on vacant portions of the identified parcels, only three of the six sites identified, or roughly 38 percent of the unit capacity assumed for the County’s lower income sites inventory would be on non-vacant sites, which is below the 50 percent threshold and therefore substantial evidence may not be required. While substantial evidence may not be required, the County has identified those sites where development is likely to occur for the following reasons:

- Sites identified are considered underutilized or substantially vacant on the portions of the parcels identified for rezoning.
- Existing uses of sites are considered not economically viable for further development and the County has reached out to property owners for residential development interest.
In the case of the Imola Avenue site, the site has been identified as State surplus property.

- The County has reached out to property owners, and those property owners have expressed interest in residential development, having their parcel being rezoned, and included within the sites inventory.
- County funding would be available to support necessary infrastructure improvements and affordable housing.

Further details and evidence of development interest by site has been described within the Summaries of Development Sites.

**Sites Inventory**

This section provides a listing of all sites identified in the Napa County 6th Cycle Housing Element Sites Inventory for the 2023-2031 planning period and the relevant information for the site. Figure 1 includes an overview map of the identified housing site locations within Napa County, and Section 3.1 provides a synopsis of the realistic unit capacities for each site summarized by geographic groupings for the identified development sites to be included in the inventory. For reference, Appendix D includes the more detailed sites inventory table for submittal to HCD.

**Summaries of Development Sites**

Following are descriptions and justifications of the housing inventory sites, including their realistic unit yields. The sites are organized into five geographic areas: Spanish Flat, Northeast Napa, Imola Avenue, and Foster Road.
Figure 93: Overview of Housing Site Locations
Figure 94: Napa County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Proximity to Sites
Evaluation of Site Location and Data

The County is working with a private developer and the Bureau of Reclamation to reestablish resorts at Lake Berryessa that were closed in 2009. This undertaking is expected to stimulate economic activity and employment in an area that was badly affected by the LNU Lightning Complex Fire in 2020 and will create a need for housing in the small community of Spanish Flat, which is served (water and wastewater) by the Spanish Flat Water District. A 10-acre portion of two separate parcels (one 16.85-acre parcel and another 1.53 acre parcel) in Spanish Flat would be rezoned to the County’s Affordable Housing District (AHCD), and Chapter 18.82 of the County’s Municipal Code regarding this zoning district would be amended to provide site-specific provisions, including a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre unless constrained by site characteristics, a maximum density of 25 dwelling units per acre, and applicable development standards. Both parcels are designated as Rural Residential in the General Plan and currently zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN).
### Site 1 – Portion of APN 019-261-041 and APN 019-261-040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>18.38 acres</td>
<td>18.38 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>CN:AHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20 min. / 25 max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development:** Parcels 019-261-041 and 019-261-040 are privately owned and include sloping terrain such that developable areas are confined to the perimeter of the parcels where slopes are less than 20 percent. The property owner/developer has expressed interest in developing housing on this site, and has provided a site plan showing approximately 100 smaller units along the site perimeter, and 100 units are therefore assumed to represent the realistic unit capacity based on site constraints even with rezoning to allow 20 to 25 units to the acre. Rezoning the site as a 10-acre portion of the parcels to include the AHCD and amending Chapter 18.82 of the Municipal Code to provide minimum densities of 20 dwelling units per acre, maximum densities of 25 dwelling units per acre, and applicable development standards would allow the property owner to realize their vision. While the zoning would theoretically provide for at least 200 units on a 10-acre site, the sloping terrain would constrain development and the realistic unit capacity is therefore 100 units, with the developable area at a density of at least 20 units/acre. The development would obtain water and wastewater services from the Spanish Flat Water District.

<sup>a</sup> Not accounting for ADUs/JADUs
Northeast of Napa (Sites 2, 3, 4)

![Map of Northeast Napa Sites](image)

**Figure 96: Bishop and Altamura Sites – Summary of Parcels**

**Evaluation of Sites Location and Data:**

Three sites have been identified in the unincorporated area northeast of the City of Napa; two are between the city limits and the Silverado Country Club along Monticello Road, and one is at the intersection of Trancas and Big Ranch Road. These sites are outside the City of Napa’s Rural Urban Limit, and within the City of Napa’s Water Service area, where City water may be provided upon approval of the City Council. These sites are also adjacent to wastewater infrastructure owned by the Napa Sanitation District, and service may be provided upon approval of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and the District. Connecting to the wastewater system would require rehabilitating a section of the sewer main and undertaking improvements to decrease peak wet weather flows (i.e., stormwater infiltration). Two of the sites are designated as Rural Residential in the General Plan, with the third identified as Agricultural Resource (although it was designated Rural Residential as of September 28, 2007, the date specified in Measure P, [Figure 97: Big Ranch Corner Site - Parcel Summary](image))
approved by the voters in November 2008). Two of the parcels are within the Residential Country zoning district and the third parcel is within the Planned Development zone and was included in a prior housing element (3rd cycle). All or a portion of each parcel would be rezoned to the Residential Multiple (RM) zoning district, and Chapter 18.60 of the Municipal Code would be amended to provide minimum densities of 20 dwelling units per acre unless constrained by site characteristics, maximum densities of 25 dwelling units per acre, and applicable development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 2 – Bishop 1 - APN 039-320-005</th>
<th>Vacant ☒ or Non-Vacant ☐</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned (Acres)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1 a</td>
<td>20 min / 25 max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development:** The site is privately owned, and the portion of the parcel proposed for rezoning is currently vacant. The housing development would obtain City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater services. Rezoning a five-acre portion of the parcel with access from Hedgeside Avenue to RM would provide for development at a minimum of 20 du/ac.

a Not accounting for ADUs/JADUs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site 3</strong> – Altamura - APN 039-320-016</th>
<th>Vacant ☒ or Non-Vacant ☐</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size Acres</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned (Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1 a</td>
<td>20 min / 25 max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development:** The site is privately owned and is located at the intersection of Monticello Road and Atlas Peak. It currently contains the shell of a large structure that is no longer occupied, and the property owner has long been interested in developing housing on the site. The housing development would obtain City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater services. Rezoning the site to RM would provide for development at a minimum of 20 du/ac unless constrained by site characteristics, however based on past proposals for the site and the expectation that only a portion of the site would be developed, the anticipated development would provide 58 units.

*a* Not accounting for ADUs/JADUs
### Site 4 – Big Ranch Corner – APN 038-190-007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant ☐ or Non-Vacant ☒</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1 a</td>
<td>20 min / 25 max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development:** The parcel is privately owned and is located at the intersection of Trancas and Big Ranch Road. The owner expressed interest in developing housing in the past and rezoning a 1.5-acre portion of the parcel fronting on Big Ranch Road to RM would allow for housing development at a minimum of 20 dwelling units per acre on that site unless constrained by site characteristics. Based on the expectation that an existing single-family home on the property may be retained, the anticipated development would provide 25 units. The housing development would obtain City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater services.

*Not accounting for ADUs/JADUs*
Evaluation of Sites Location and Data:

The State of California has identified a 20.34-acre piece of surplus property in the unincorporated area south and east of the City of Napa adjacent to the Napa State Hospital on a 201.7-acre parcel that makes up a portion of Skyline Park. The 20.34-acre surplus property is included on the Department of General Services, Real Estate Services Division’s map of surplus property identified pursuant to Executive Order N-06-10, Affordable Housing Development, and Department staff has indicated that a 5-acre portion is likely to be developed for affordable housing within the eight-year planning period. The site is outside the City of Napa’s Rural Urban Limit and adjacent to the County Office of Education, Creekside Middle School, and the Napa State Hospital. While water and wastewater infrastructure is located nearby, obtaining water from the City of Napa and wastewater services from the Napa Sanitation District would require approvals from the City, LAFCO, and the District. Also, while the site is designated as Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space in the General Plan and the parcel is currently zoned as Agricultural Watershed with a Skyline Wilderness Park (:SWP) combining district designation, the State is not subject to the County’s General Plan and zoning.
### Site 5 – APN 046-450-041

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant ☐ or Non-Vacant ☒</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>201.7</td>
<td>201.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Surplus Property Identified by DGS (Acres)</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Identified for Housing per DGS Staff (Acres)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>AW:SWP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1 α</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Realistic Unit Capacity**

100

**Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development:** The 20.34-acre site is owned by the State of California and has been identified as surplus property appropriate for the development of housing pursuant to Executive Order N-06-19. Based on conversations with DGS staff, the County understands that five acres of the property will be made available for development of affordable housing within the eight-year planning period. DGS staff was not able to specify the number of units that would be provided, and the County therefore used the “default density” of 20 du/ac specified in Government Code Section 65583.2(c) to determine that the realistic unit capacity would be 100 units. Development of housing on the site would not be subject to the County’s zoning or General Plan and would connect to nearby infrastructure owned by the City of Napa and the Napa Sanitation District. The site is located within land currently included in Skyline Park (which is owned by the State) and is therefore not considered vacant.

α Not accounting for ADUs/JADUs
Evaluation of Sites Location and Data:

Five acres of a 24-acre parcel within unincorporated Napa County along Foster Road south of Imola Avenue would be rezoned to RM, allowing development of housing at a minimum density of 20 du/ac and a maximum density of 25 du/ac. The site is within the City’s Rural Urban Limit (RUL) and the County’s General Plan indicates that parcels within the City’s Rural Urban Limit (RUL) line will not develop without annexing to the City of Napa. Thus, the five-acre site (or the entire 24-acre parcel) would annex to the City prior to occupancy. With annexation, the site would have access to City water, and could connect to nearby infrastructure. Development on the site could also connect to nearby infrastructure for wastewater collection owned by the Napa Sanitation District, subject to approval of LAFCO and the District. The site is designated as Rural Residential in the General Plan and is currently zoned Agricultural Watershed. The parcel is also identified within the Urban Reserve combing district which stipulates that uses or actions other than permitted uses first require an...
application for annexation to be processed before proceeding. Planning for housing at the site would involve collaboration between the property owner, the City and the County, and could serve as a “pilot” project, testing development standards that could apply to the broader Foster Road area. Currently, the City of Napa’s proposed General Plan Update proposes that this area would be designated for a mix of uses with residential densities allowed at densities up to 10 units per acre. The County’s proposal for higher residential densities conforms with the “default density” provided in Government Code Section 65583.2(c) and is intended to ensure that the site could accommodate lower income households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 6 – APN 043-062-008</th>
<th>Vacant □ or Non-Vacant □</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned (Acres)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>AW:UR</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1 a</td>
<td>20 min / 25 max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The site is within the City of Napa RUL, which is an area of the unincorporated County long identified for annexation and development within the City of Napa. The City of Napa’s ongoing General Plan Update anticipates this happening over time and proposes policies to govern planning, development, and future annexation. By identifying a relatively small site within this larger area for rezoning, the County would provide the property owner with the opportunity to advance plans for housing on a portion of their parcel, construct housing, and pursue annexation in the near term. The property owner has expressed an interest in development in the past. The five-acre site would be rezoned to the Residential Multiple (RM) zoning district, and Chapter 18.60 of the Municipal Code would be amended to provide minimum densities of 20 dwelling units per acre, maximum densities of 25 dwelling units per acre, and applicable development standards. The development would connect to nearby infrastructure owned by the City of Napa (potable water) and the Napa Sanitation District (wastewater) and would annex to the City prior to occupancy.

* Not accounting for ADUs/JADUs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Address/Intersection</th>
<th>Assessor Parcel Number</th>
<th>General Plan Designation (Current)</th>
<th>Zoning Designation (Current)</th>
<th>Zoning Designation (Proposed)</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Assumed Site Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Lower Income Capacity (Units)</th>
<th>Moderate Income Capacity (Units)</th>
<th>Above Moderate-Income Capacity (Units)</th>
<th>Realistic Capacity Total (Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish Flat</td>
<td>4322 Berryessa Knoxville Rd</td>
<td>019-261-041 019-261-040</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop 1</td>
<td>1806 Monticello Rd</td>
<td>039-320-005</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Altamura</td>
<td>1011 Atlas Peak Rd</td>
<td>039-320-016</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Big Ranch Corner</td>
<td>2030 Big Ranch Rd.</td>
<td>038-190-007</td>
<td>Agricultural Resource</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Imola Ave</td>
<td>2121 Imola Ave</td>
<td>046-450-041</td>
<td>Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space</td>
<td>AW:SWP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>201.7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Foster Road</td>
<td>1298 Foster Road</td>
<td>043-620-008</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>AW:UR</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>277.41</td>
<td>77.33</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Sites Inventory Through the Lens of AFFH

AB 686 (Santiago) created a new requirement for local jurisdictions to evaluate their Housing Element sites inventories through the lens of affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH). The law requires that the site inventory be used to identify sites throughout the community, consistent with the local jurisdiction’s duty to affirmatively further fair housing. HCD’s guidance on implementation of the requirement for the sites inventory analysis states that it should address:

- **Improved Conditions**: A discussion of how the sites are identified in a manner that better integrates the community with a consideration for the historical patterns and trends, number of existing households, the magnitude (e.g., number of units) of the RHNA by income group and impacts on patterns of socio-economic and racial concentrations.

- **Exacerbated Conditions**: Similar to above, an explanation of identified sites relative to the impact on existing patterns of segregation and number of households relative to the magnitude (e.g., number of units) of the RHNA by income group.

- **Isolation of the RHNA**: An evaluation of whether the RHNA by income group is concentrated in areas of the community.

- **Local Data and Knowledge**: A consideration of current, planned and past developments, investment, policies, practices, demographic trends, public comment and other factors.

- **Other Relevant Factors**: Any other factors that influence the impacts of the identification of sites to accommodate the regional housing need on socio-economic patterns and segregation.

The following discussion explores how the housing sites inventory for the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element addresses these concerns.

**Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)**

Unincorporated Napa County does not have any areas that qualify as R/ECAPs (nor does it have any areas that qualify as Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs). Further, the sites inventory spreads the sites targeted for lower-income housing across five different areas of the County, ensuring that the County would not overly concentrate new lower-income housing in any single area. Thus, there is no concern about the distribution of lower-income RHNA sites potentially exacerbating existing R/ECAPS or failing to better integrate existing RCAAs. See Figure 100, below.
Figure 100: Housing Sites Relative to R/ECAPS
Areas with Concentrations of Minority Residents (% of Population Non-White)
Unincorporated Napa County is nearly 70 percent White non-Hispanic. To the extent that minorities are disproportionately represented in lower-income households, developing new housing for lower-income households would help to better integrate the unincorporated areas. The distribution of lower-income housing sites across five locations will help to ensure that no new concentrations of minority residents will be created. See Figure 101, below.
Figure 101: Housing Sites in Relation to Existing Non-White Population
Concentrations of Poverty (% of Population with Income below poverty level)
No Census Tract in unincorporated Napa County has more than 11.3 percent of households with incomes below poverty level; thus, by spreading sites identified to accommodate the County’s lower-income RHNA across multiple areas, Napa County will ensure that the Housing Element will not create any concentrations of poverty. See Figure 102, below.
Figure 102: Housing Sites in Relation to Concentrations of Poverty
Environmental Conditions (CalEnviroscreen)
As shown in Figure 103, the lower-income sites are distributed across Census Tracts which have a range of overall CalEnviroscreen scores, ranging from very good (11th percentile) to good (36th percentile) with the Census Tract for the Imola Avenue site having no overall ranking due to a small existing population and limited data. This information indicates that the housing sites inventory targets locations where lower-income residents would generally have access to a healthy living environment.
Figure 103: Housing Sites in Relation to Environmental Conditions
Access to Opportunity (TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas)
With locations that span from urban to rural, Napa County’s sites inventory for lower-income households targets housing locations that also span the range of opportunity areas, as rated by TCAC/HCD’s opportunity area maps. See Figure 104. The Spanish Flat site is in a low resource area, due to its rural nature. By virtue of being near the City of Napa, the Northeast Napa sites are in moderate to high resource areas. The Imola Avenue site is in an area with insufficient data to provide an opportunity rating, while the Foster Road site is identified as a low resource area.
Figure 104: Housing Sites in Relation to Areas of Opportunity
Transportation Access (Housing + Transportation Cost as % of Income)
Due to Napa County’s relatively high housing costs, combined with relatively limited transit access, most areas of Napa County score relatively poorly on the Housing + Transportation (H+T) cost index, requiring relatively high percentages of income to cover these key household costs, as shown in Figure 105. The Spanish Flat site is located in one of the most affordable areas within the County by this metric, as are the Bishop and Altamura and Big Ranch Corner sites in Northeast Napa, and the Foster Road site. There is insufficient data for the Imola Avenue site to have a H+T index score. Generally, the sites located on the periphery of the City of Napa will offer residents the best alternative transportation options, because Napa County’s Vine transit service is most concentrated in this area and the more urbanized nature of the City of Napa means that concentrations of jobs and services are in closer proximity, making walking and bicycling more viable means of transportation for those who do not have access to private vehicles.
Figure 105: Housing Sites in Relation to Housing + Transportation Cost
Access to Jobs (Jobs Proximity Index)
As shown in Figure 106, Napa County’s lower-income housing sites are distributed across areas that have a range of jobs access quality. As the most rural location, the Spanish Flat site has the poorest job access, according to the jobs proximity index; however, the intent of the Spanish Flat site is to provide housing options to the expected influx of workers who would be employed at the revitalized Lake Berryessa resorts, who would otherwise have limited housing options in close proximity to their workplaces near the lake. Through Housing Element Program H-6b, the County is taking a place-based approach to stimulating job growth in the Lake Berryessa area and improving access to jobs for existing as well as future residents in Spanish Flat and other areas surrounding the lake. The other sites closer to the City of Napa would have reasonably good access to jobs, since the City of Napa represents the largest concentration of jobs in the county. The Imola Avenue site is relatively close to large concentration of jobs in the Napa Airport Industrial Area, just to the south of the City of Napa. Further, jobs in and around the City of Napa are made more accessible by the fact that Vine provides the most transit options in the City of Napa area, to connect workers with jobs.
Figure 106: Housing Sites in Relation to Job Access
Local Data and Knowledge
Overall, unincorporated Napa County has had limited opportunities for lower-income households to live in the unincorporated area. Thus, the existing population tends to be White and relatively low-income. By distributing lower-income housing sites across multiple locations, the Housing Element sites inventory will help to distribute lower income households into the unincorporated area, which will likely also help to racially and ethnically diversify the unincorporated area population. While the Spanish Flat site may appear to be disadvantageous for lower-income households by some measures, the intent of the site is to encourage affordable housing options for employees of the recreation and hospitality sector in close proximity to revitalized resorts near Lake Berryessa. Key data are missing to evaluate the benefits of the Imola site; however, residents of affordable housing at this site will have access to jobs and services in the City of Napa, as well as proximity to Creekside Middle School and the open space amenities of Skyline Park.

Summary of Conclusions and Approach to Policies and Programs
Overall, the housing sites inventory does not exacerbate fair housing issues such as contributing to R/ECAPS, RCAAs, or racial or ethnic isolation or segregation. It does not overly concentrate lower income housing opportunity sites in any single area of the unincorporated county; nor does it concentrate lower-income housing opportunity sites in areas that already have significant concentrations of poverty or areas of racial or ethnic isolation or segregation. In contrast, opportunities for housing development for lower-income households are identified in areas where the new housing will likely help to better integrate areas that are currently predominantly White and upper income. Although the Spanish Flat site is in an area of lower opportunity, the County is actively working to increase opportunity in this area via Housing Element Program H-6b by providing better access to jobs through an RFP process to bring new concessionaires to the Lake Berryessa area, who will need employees to work in their businesses. Further, the new concession operations will bring additional services and amenities that can benefit area residents as well as their primary tourist clientele.

The County of Napa’s housing sites inventory, which fully accommodates the County’s RHNA for the 2023 to 2031 planning period, along with a substantial buffer, also helps to affirmatively further fair housing from a regional perspective by creating opportunities for housing development for households at all income levels within a region that is generally not as diverse as the larger San Francisco Bay Area, but which offers a desirable quality of life.
APPENDIX A: OUTREACH PLAN AND SUMMARY MATERIALS
COMMUNITY OUTREACH PLAN
Napa County 6th Cycle Housing Element Update

Background

California State law requires that all cities and counties develop a compliant Housing Element as part of their General Plan. As part of this compliance, cities and counties regularly update their Housing Element. Most cities and counties, including Napa County, are required to update their Housing Element every eight years. The County’s current Housing Element (2015-2023) was developed by the County and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in 2014. Since the current Housing Element was adopted, updates to State laws have been adopted that will have to be taken into account for this Housing Element Update process. Community engagement will also be a key part of the process.

Government Code 65583(c)(7) requires: "The local government shall make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort." Assembly Bill 686, signed in 2018, established new requirements to Government Code Section 65583 requiring cities and counties to facilitate deliberate action to relieve patterns of segregation to foster inclusive communities, a process referred to as affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH). With the adoption of this new law, AB 686 requires jurisdictions to include a summary of their fair housing outreach capacity and to integrate this process into a jurisdictions Housing Element outreach program.

Government Code 65584.04(d) requires: “Public participation and access shall be required in the development of the methodology and in the process of drafting and adoption of the allocation of the regional housing needs. Participation by organizations other than local jurisdictions and councils of governments shall be solicited in a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community as well as members of protected classes under Section 12955.”

Purpose

This Community Outreach Plan is for Napa County's 6th Cycle Housing Element Update (2023-2031). State law (Section 65583[c][9]) of the California Government Code) requires cities and counties to make a diligent effort to achieve public participation that includes all economic segments of the community. This Plan describes strategies for community workshops, online engagement, and public meetings. This is a discussion draft document that will be finalized in draft form after consultation with County Staff, with input from stakeholders, and will ultimately guide the County in planning for housing to serve all segments of the community. Given the current COVID-19 restrictions on in-person meetings, this outreach plan may be revised as circumstances change based on guidance from County Staff. Community outreach is a critical part of updating the housing element and the County is committed to soliciting input from a broad cross-section of the community on how Napa County can address housing constraints, increase housing opportunities, and affirmatively further fair housing.
Goals and Objectives

The goal of the community outreach and engagement program outlined here is to inform community members about the Housing Element Update and solicit input on housing goals, objectives, policies, and implementation programs. The objectives for the community outreach and engagement program include:

- Building public awareness of the Housing Element, its requirements, and the County’s vision and goals for housing development, and progress since the previous Housing Element.
- Engaging community members and key stakeholder groups from diverse backgrounds to provide input on potential strategies, policies, and programs that will equitably and inclusively align with the needs of Napa County residents.
- Facilitating and developing deliberate action in the form of programs to relieve patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities through actions that affirmatively further fair housing.
- Partnering with community members in identifying how and where new housing should be located within the County to address concerns related to natural hazards and infrastructure considerations.
- Providing the Napa County Board of Supervisors and Commissions with updates from public outreach and engagement activities during the Housing Element Update; and
- Informing concurrent planning activities related to the County’s Safety Element intended to reflect the contents of the recently updated Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Outreach Strategy

There are several outreach strategies planned for the Housing Element as outlined in this document. Community outreach efforts are planned to begin in late September or early October 2021 and continue through the review of the Public Review Draft Housing Element. Community members will have ample opportunities to provide input through a variety of methods designed to engage a wide representation within the community.

Below is a description of the community outreach and engagement strategies that the project team will implement in order to obtain input and build awareness throughout the Housing Element Update. Each strategy will encourage participation, facilitate meaningful dialogue with the community, and build awareness of the challenges and opportunities of implementing housing strategies that will meet the State’s requirements. Strategies implemented as part of the Housing Element Update outreach activities will also be used to inform the County’s Safety Element through opportunities for information sharing and incorporating mutually applicable community input with the Housing Element.

The approach to community outreach described within this document is detailed to provide a clear direction, while remaining flexible enough to adjust for specific engagement needs when necessary through adaptive management practices. Additional focus will be given to engaging members of the community who may
not be able to, or be comfortable with, participating in traditional community outreach methods. Creative methods to engage all groups and stakeholders are included within this strategy. Each specific strategy is outlined in the sections below, with additional detail provided in the following section for a recommended schedule of the topics to be addressed during this Housing Element Update process.

I. Housing Element Advisory Committee

Newly formed by the Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS), the Housing Element Advisory Committee (HEAC), would be tasked with providing input on the Housing Element Update process for Napa County. The HEAC would be made up of 13 total community members appointed by the BOS and would include five community members, two Planning Commissioners, a Housing Commissioner, a Commissioner on Aging, and advocates for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), homelessness services, affordable housing, and residential development.

**Purpose and Intent**

The purpose of the HEAC is to act as the collective body for consolidating and discussing input to be provided by participating in the Housing Element Update process via community workshops, and stakeholder interviews, sufficiently ahead of formal hearings of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. There will be a minimum of six (6) virtual meetings of the HEAC with ESA to assist County staff by preparing necessary agendas, presentation materials, surveys, or questionnaires. In addition to advising the project team throughout the development of the Housing Element, the HEAC (with ESA as the lead) will also provide progress reports on the Housing Element to their commissions and the BOS, and assist with responding to various stakeholder outreach activities such as surveys, interviews, or questionnaires. The HEAC may also be invited to provide Housing Element Update communication support in reaching the broader Napa County community, specifically in communication efforts to the community regarding participation in the Housing Element Update. Based on the feedback, comments, and concerns generated from community workshops and stakeholder interviews, the HEAC will provide input to the Planning Commission and BOS to assist in the decision-making and adoption process. To minimize the review process, all input received from the HEAC will be directly incorporated into planning documents by Staff and proceed to Planning Commission and BOS review.

The six HEAC virtual public meetings will be focused on the following topics:

1. Housing Element requirements, past performance, and key issues.
2. Sites inventory analysis.
3. Feedback on the Housing Element updates – Policies and Program
4. Feedback on the Housing Element updates – Follow up Consultation
5. Feedback on Housing Element Updates prior to Planning Commission Review
6. Public Meeting to Provide Overview of HEU Status and Process
II. Stakeholder Interviews

As part of the prescribed outreach efforts, and upon input received from the HEAC and County staff, two rounds of engagement facilitation will be conducted utilizing a one-on-one stakeholder interview format, specifically interviewing any community members, stakeholders, or Community Based Organizations (CBO), including The Napa Valley Community Organizations Active in Disaster (COAD), that were identified by the HEAC and/or County staff. The HEAC may also be invited to provide support in stakeholder interview efforts.

Purpose and Intent

The purpose of the stakeholder meetings and interviews is to engage key stakeholders in one-on-one or small group sessions that allow for more detailed and focused discussions, and in the case of individual stakeholders, more private conversations to solicit more detailed and targeted input for the Housing Element Update process. In addition, certain stakeholders may help to represent the interests of key groups comprising individuals, such as those with limited English proficiency, who may not otherwise participate in public planning processes. Stakeholder interviews would also be used as a place for representatives of CBOs focusing on fair housing practices to share fair housing data specific to Napa County. This data would complement readily available state and federal data in order to ensure that the AFFH analysis developed to further fair housing in Napa County is robust and effective.

Outreach and interviews will include interactions with community groups and other interested parties. An initial list of stakeholders will be developed in consultation with the HEAC and will be further expanded and maintained throughout the process with input from the interviews.

The stakeholder interview format is an effective approach focused on gathering input from a wide array of stakeholders and community members that may not otherwise provide input to the planning process. Reaching out to the specific stakeholders and CBOs identified by the HEAC will allow for a diverse and comprehensive set of perspectives as the Housing Element is updated.

All outreach activities and interviews will be documented for inclusion in the draft Housing Element Update. County staff will provide translation services for outreach notices/meeting materials, at meetings, and in stakeholder meetings on an as needed basis and will be available upon request. In addition to addressing topics related to the provision of housing, the stakeholder interviews will also be used as a forum to gather input related to the update of the County’s Safety Element, specifically as it relates to natural hazards.

October, 2021 (Rev March 2022)
III. Community Workshop

To facilitate adequate dialogue and allow a forum for community input to be received, there will be one (1) community workshop held for community members and the HEAC to provide input on the Housing Element Update process. The community workshop will be held virtually unless/until State and local regulations permit public gatherings. If and when in-person meetings are permitted, the community workshop and any other public outreach events specified by the County will be held at varying locations to increase community participation.

In order to further facilitate participation for those portions of the community with limited technology use and access, Napa County staff will work with CBOs to identify the specific language services that community members may expect to be provided. When Napa County is hosting public meetings in a particular geographic area with a known, significant Spanish speaking population specifically, the following should be done:

1. Meeting notices should be produced and distributed in Spanish, encouraging community members to participate. In addition, participants can request interpreter services 48 hours in advance of the meeting, if needed; and
2. Napa County will provide at least one qualified interpreter at these meetings who is fluent in the designated language(s).

Purpose and Intent

The community workshop will provide an opportunity for community members and stakeholders to learn about and provide input on the 2023-2031 Napa County Housing Element. The purpose of the Community Workshop will be to introduce the HEAC, and provide a community forum to:

- Inform the community about housing element requirements as defined by State law and the Housing Element Update process,
- Engages participants in a discussion about housing needs, and
- Solicit input on contents of the Housing Element Update.

IV. Communication and Engagement

To supplement the HEAC meetings and Community Workshop, online engagement and social media posts will be utilized to provide community members with direct access to information. Because on-line forums can be a catalyst for generating positive or negative feedback, it is crucial that it be done correctly, and transparently, and in conjunction with the face-to-face interactions described above (meetings, stakeholder interviews, and the workshop).

In addition to online engagement and social media, the outreach strategy for the Housing Element will utilize phone, email, public media (English/Spanish) and strategic partnerships with local CBO’s to assist in the message distribution effort. Napa County staff will continue to communicate with partner CBOs, as well as other County Departments, and take advantage of CBOs’ ability to support Napa County public participation methods. However, care would be taken to consider the most strategic and targeted use of CBOs’ resources so as to avoid placing an undue burden on the same organizations. Incentives for community-based organizations to honor support provided in public participation efforts for vulnerable communities may be provided as part of the communication and engagement process.
All content produced in the outreach and engagement process will be translated into Spanish and will be readily available at the Napa County Planning Department for public review, if desired. Phone and mail outreach will seek input from communities without access to online participation.

Through the community engagement process, jurisdictions and community members are better able to provide feedback while also developing an understanding of the complexities involved with land use planning and housing development. In conducting public outreach, the focus will be on engaging all stakeholders (including underrepresented stakeholders), while using a wide variety of outreach methods.

Methods of Communication

**Website**

The project team will develop the content to be hosted on the County’s website. The content will include a project overview, schedule of activities, and information on how the public can get involved. The webpage will be updated as needed with information on upcoming outreach opportunities, and relevant project documents and summaries to provide the community with an overview of the planning process, next steps, and ways to participate.

**Digital Flyers, Presentation Materials, and Meeting Recaps**

The project team will utilize digital notifications to update community members and stakeholders on upcoming outreach opportunities, and other relevant project information. Project information will be distributed through the County’s existing communication links and email distribution lists, with the project team to produce presentation materials and meeting recaps for distribution and reference by community members.

**Online Survey**

An online survey/questionnaire will be made available to the community during the first round of outreach, and developed in consultation with County staff to complement the Stakeholder Interviews Using an adaptive approach, after the online survey, the team will evaluate the outreach activities outlined here at a mid-point in the HEU process to determine whether or not the engagement strategies are effectively engaging all members of the community including farmworkers, people living in disadvantaged communities, non-English speaking residents, tenants, and members of underrepresented groups. For those members of the community with limited internet access, the online survey/questionnaire will be made available at several locations around the County, including government buildings, local public libraries, and CBO office spaces. As necessary, the project team in collaboration with County staff and the HEAC will modify the outlined strategies.
**Joint Meeting with Policy Makers**

Preparation and facilitation of a joint informational workshop and study session with the Planning Commission and BOS (prior to the formal public hearings) will provide an opportunity for decision makers to receive an update on the project and community engagement. Members of the HEAC, as well as other stakeholders, will have the ability to review and comments on the draft work products and will be notified on how best to offer feedback, and how community members can provide input and access project materials.

**CEQA Process and Public/Agency Review of Draft Work Products**

The Housing Element Update will be subject to environmental review in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a process which provides for community input. There will also be an opportunity for the public and governmental agencies to review and comment on the public review draft of the Housing Element Update and the Safety Element Update before these documents are revised and presented to County decision makers for their review and approval.

**Types of Interest Groups to Engage**

- County residents of all income levels.
- Elected and appointed officials.
- Non-profit and for-profit housing developers.
- Fair Housing agencies and organizations
- Public agency representatives.
- Major employers.
- Housing and Un-Housed advocates.
- Business groups.
- Farmworkers.
- Wine/Farming industry groups.
- Hospitality industry groups.
Recommended Schedule of Topics

To kick off the outreach process for the Housing Element Update, the project team will work with the County staff and the HEAC to establish a timeline and a schedule of topics for the housing advisory committee, as well as a live virtual community workshop with community members of Napa County. The topics to be addressed via the HEAC and at the community workshop will also serve as a way for community members to share their challenges around finding safe, affordable, and accessible housing in Napa County and provide input about addressing these challenges via housing element policies and programs.

### Fall 2021

#### 1st Round of Outreach

- **Housing Element Advisory Committee Session #1 – Initial Consultation**
  
  *Address HEU requirements, the County’s past performance, the Community Outreach Plan and developing a list of Stakeholders – October 26, 2021*

- **Housing Element Advisory Committee Session #2 – Sites Inventory**
  
  *Consultation regarding site inventory analysis – November 15, 2021*

- **Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors – Initial Consultation on Key Issues**
  
  *Study Session – One Round with Each – December 15, 2021*

### Winter/Spring 2022

#### 2nd Round of Outreach

- **Virtual Community Workshop – Housing Element Process**
  
  *Initial Consultation, Housing Needs Assessment – January 20, 2022*

- **Stakeholder Interviews (SEU and HEU)**
  
  *Input on the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment and SEU – February-March 2022*

- **Housing Element Advisory Committee Session #3 – HEU policies and programs**
  
  *Review and refine the updated HEU policies and programs – March 2022*

- **Housing Element Advisory Committee Session #4 – Follow-up Consultation**
  
  *Feedback on the Housing Element updates – April 2022*

- **Housing Element Advisory Committee Session #5 – Public Review**
  
  *HAEC input prior to Planning Commission Meeting – May 2022*

- **Planning Commission Review #1 – Review of the Public Draft HEU**
  
  *Public Meeting to Provide Feedback on the Housing Element updates prior to submittal to HCD for statutory review – May 2022*
**Summer 2022**
- Housing Element Advisory Committee Session #6 – Public Review
  
  *Public Meeting to Provide Overview on the HEU Status – August 2022*

**Fall 2022**
- Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors – Recommendation and Adoption of the Final HEU
  
  *One Public Meeting with each*
  
  1)  *Planning Commission recommendation for Final HEU to the Board of Supervisors – November 2022*
  
  2)  *Board of Supervisors adoption of the Final HEU – December 2022*

- Submittal to the California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) for certification
Napa County Housing Element Advisory Committee Meeting #1

26 October 2021
Presentation Topics & Discussion

Agenda Item 3 & 4
• Regulatory Requirements
• Summary of Housing Update Process
  - 5th Cycle effectiveness
  - Housing Needs Assessment
  - Constraints and Opportunities
  - Regional Housing Needs Assessment
  - Next Steps
• HEAC Discussion

Agenda Item 5
• Working Draft -- Outreach Plan and Strategy
• HEAC Discussion
3. Regulatory Setting and Requirements
Key Housing Element Components

• Review Accomplishments/Effectiveness of Existing Housing Element
• Assess Needs
• Evaluate Resources, including Land to Accommodate Housing
• Evaluate Opportunities to Remove Constraints
• Identify Sites to Accommodate RHNA
• Establish Goals, Quantified Objectives, Programs
• Ensure Consistency with Other General Plan Elements (include update to Safety Element)
# Recent Laws Affecting Housing Elements

| SB 9: Lot splits and Duplexes in Single Family Zones | SB 10: Upzoning near Transit |
| AB 215: Housing Element Review/ Implementation | AB 1398: HE Deadlines/Site Rezoning |
| AB 744: Density Bonus | SB 35: Streamlining of housing approval |
| AB 1934: Mixed Use Development Bonus | AB 771: RHNA |
| AB 2208: Residential Land Inventory | AB 686: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing |
| AB 2685: Housing Element Adoption | AB 2162: Supportive Housing |
| SB 229: Accessory Dwelling Units | AB 2372: Floor Area Ratio Bonus |
| SB 166: Residential Density and Affordability | AB 2797: Density Bonus |
| SB 540: Workforce Housing Opportunity Zone | AB 3194: Housing Acct Act: Approvals |
| AB 1505: Inclusionary Zoning | SB 828: RHNA |
| AB 72: Housing Element Compliance | SB 1227: Density Bonus |
| AB 678/ SB 167: Housing Accountability Act | AB 587: Separate Sale/ Conveyance of ADUs |
| SB 330/ SB8: Housing Crisis Act | AB 1783 H02A: Worker Housing |
|  | AB 879: Housing Development Fees |
Substantial New Requirements to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH)

• Conduct Assessment of Fair Housing
• Assess patterns of segregation/isolation
• Evaluate housing sites through lens of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing
• Include goals, policies, and actions to AFFH
Planning Process

- Review and Revise the Existing Housing Element
- Provide Opportunity for Public Comment on the Draft Housing Element (at least 30 days)
- Consider Public Input and Revise (at least 2 weeks)
- Submit to HCD for Formal Review (90 days)
- Review and Consider HCD Comments; Prepare Final Draft
- Board of Supervisor Adopts Final Draft
- Submit to HCD for Certification Review (60 days)
- Adopt legally compliant HEU within 120 days of statutory deadline to avoid requirement that necessary rezones be competed within one year of statutory deadline (1/15/23).
4. Housing Element Overview and Process
4.a. 5th Cycle Housing Element Effectiveness

5th Cycle Housing Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>5th Cycle RHNA</th>
<th>5th Cycle Progress</th>
<th>Units Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.a. 5th Cycle Housing Element Effectiveness, cont.

5th Cycle Program Implementation

- 5th Cycle Housing Element Contains 40 Programs
  - Rehabilitation
  - Housing Affordability
  - Special Needs Housing
  - Housing Development
  - Removal of Governmental Constraints
  - Energy and Water Conservation

- Programs are either complete or partially complete and ongoing
4.b. Housing Needs/Assessment of Fair Housing

- Disparity in homeownership rates – lower for Asian/API and much lower for Hispanic/Latinx

- About 1/3 of households live in neighborhoods where there is risk of displacement or undergoing gentrification

- 13.2 percent of households live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely to be excluded due to high costs

- Typical home value has increased 48% since 2001

- Rents have also increased sharply in the unincorporated area
4.b. HNA/AFH, cont.

- Unincorporated area has seen a decline in population between 2000 and 2020
  - Wildfire displacement
  - Conversion of housing to 2\textsuperscript{nd} homes
  - Possible Census counting issue related to Napa State Hospital

- Aging population – median age 48 yrs.

- Area is becoming more diverse; fewer Whites and more Hispanic/Latinx and multi-racial persons

- Number of jobs is increasing – creating demand for housing and increasing need for commuting in from surrounding areas
4.b. HNA/AFH, cont.

- 18 percent of households have moderate housing cost burdens (30%+ of income spent on housing)
- 16 percent have severe cost burdens (50%+ of income)
- % with moderate to severe cost burdens increases substantially as income levels go down
- Overcrowding is generally not significant in unincorporated area, but the problem increases as income levels go down; also, much more prevalent among minority households
- While overall # of farmworkers has gone down, farm work continues to transition from seasonal to year-round, creating need for permanent housing
4.b. HNA/AFH, cont.

- Metrics of segregation in the unincorporated area are not reliable due to small number of minority households; however, the available data indicate that segregation and isolation may be increasing
  - The general lack of minority representation in the unincorporated area suggests that Napa County should consider “mobility strategies” to create more opportunity for minority groups to live in the area

- Areas of poverty are concentrated in the south part of the county, concentrated near Napa and American Canyon, suggesting that place-based strategies to increase opportunity could be focused in these areas
4.b. HNA/AFH, cont.

- No R/ECAPs or RCAAs in unincorporated area

- County does not have tracts that are considered High Segregation and Poverty, but there is geographic variation in the level of Opportunity (Highest and Higher opportunity areas tend to be in western part of County or northeast of City of Napa)
  - It will be important to consider these factors when evaluating the location of sites identified for future lower-income housing development

- Data are not statistically reliable; however, they suggest that minorities may experience disproportionate housing problems.
4.c. Non-Governmental and Governmental Constraints

- Availability of water and sewer services to support multifamily housing
- Potential for land use conflicts
- Land costs, construction costs, financing
- Fire risk and evacuation

- County and State policies that support the preservation of farmland and open space in the unincorporated area
- Land Use controls (General Plan, zoning, building codes, required site improvements)
- Fees
- Permit process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low (&lt;50% of AMI)</th>
<th>Low (50 to 80% of AMI)</th>
<th>Moderate (80 to 120% of AMI)</th>
<th>Above Moderate (&gt;120% of AMI)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th Cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th Cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.e. For Discussion at the Next Meeting

- Status of the Final RHNA
- Use of RHNA Transfer Agreements
- Single family homes & accessory dwelling units (ADUs)
- Multifamily housing sites
  - Proposed Screening Criteria
  - Existing Sites
  - Potential New Sites
5. Outreach Plan and Strategy
Outreach Strategy

• Housing Element Advisory Committee
• Stakeholder Interviews
• Community Workshop
• Communication and Engagement
  - Website
  - Digital Flyers, Presentation Materials, and Meeting Recaps
  - Online Survey
  - Joint Meeting with Policy Makers
  - CEQA Process and Public/Agency Review of Draft Work Products

- HEAC Input & Assistance Needed -
Meeting Minutes
Napa County Housing Element Advisory Committee

Joelle Gallagher  Terry Scott (Chair)  David Morrison, Secretary-Director
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Ron Rhyno  Jenna Bolyarde

Tuesday, October 26, 2021  9:00 AM  Virtual Meeting

1. WELCOME/REVIEW OF THE MEETING FORMAT (Video timestamp 00:00:14)

County Housing Element Project Manager and County Staff John McDowell welcomed committee members, members of the public, and reviewed the meeting format. He provided an overview of process for providing public comment and referred to the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20. It was noted by Mr. McDowell that the meeting was being recorded and live streamed, with the video recording and additional resources available on Napa County Housing Element website.

2. INTRODUCTIONS/CALL TO ORDER AND IDENTIFICATION OF MEMBERS PRESENT (Video timestamp 00:02:08)

Committee Members Present: Chair Terry Scott, Vice-Chair Keri Akemi-Hernandez, Joelle Gallagher, Megan Dameron, Tom Gamble, Ron Rhyno, Teresa Zimny, Mike Swanton, Heather Stanton, Jenna Bolyarde, Kellie Anderson (arrived during item 4)
Committee Members Excused: Alternate Anne Cottrell
Staff Present: David Morrison, John McDowell, Trevor Hawkes, Alexandria Quackenbush
Consultant Staff: Hillary Gitelman, ESA, Evan Wasserman, ESA, Matt Kowta, BAE

A. Oath of Office

Committee Members were sworn in by John McDowell. Mr. McDowell noted he had been deputized by the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Neha Hoskins, to administer the oath of office.

B. Brown Act Overview

County Counsel office, Silva Darbinian, provided an overview of the Brown Act as a presentation to committee members, how the Brown Act applies to the HEAC, and the rules that the HEAC
members must follow to be compliant with Brown Act requirements. Because the HEAC is an advisory body created by the Napa County Board of Supervisors, Brown Act rules and regulations apply to the HEAC. It was noted that any questions related to the Brown Act may be directed to John McDowell or Silva Darbinian at any time before, during, or after the meeting as it pertains to questions regarding the Brown Act. The presentation on the Brown Act can also be accessed via County Staff.

C. Election of Officers

Committee Members voted to elect Terry Scott as Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Members voted to elect Keri Akemi-Hernandez as Vice-Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Overview of Committee’s Bylaws

County Housing Element Project Manager and County Staff John McDowell County Counsel identified the bylaws governing the HEAC and explained that they were standard for bodies like the HEAC. Mr. McDowell and County Counsel Silva Darbinian explained that Staff will be able to provide members for their reference/review after the meeting.

E. Overview of Meeting Calendar

John McDowell provided an overview of the meeting calendar with discussion. The next regular meeting will be held on November 15, 2021. No action taken.

3. REGULATORY SETTING AND REQUIREMENTS – HOUSING ELEMENT PROCESS (Video timestamp 00:37:53)

BAE Consultant Matt Kowta provided an overview of the Housing Element, including updates to Housing Element State rules and regulations for the 6th Cycle, an overview of the regulatory requirements for housing elements and updates to State rules and regulations that will need to be considered as part of the 6th Cycle Update, and the overall planning process for updating and adopting the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

Member Comments: None
Public Comment: None
4.  SUMMARY OF HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE PROCESS AND COUNTY RHNA
   (Video timestamp 0:48:55)
   High level overview of the Housing Element update process and Napa County RHNA. BAE and
   ESA representatives discuss overall project workflow and individual components of the project.

   A. 5TH Cycle Housing Element Effectiveness/Housing Production

   (Video timestamp 00:48:46)
   BAE Consultant Matt Kowta explained housing production and program implementation
   success in the 5th Cycle.

   Member Comments: None
   Public Comment: None

   B. Housing Needs Assessment/Assessment of Fair Housing

   (Video timestamp 00:52:33)
   BAE Consultant Matt Kowta provided a summary of the substantial new requirements to
   Affirmatively Further Fair Housing as well as preliminary findings that will be included in
   the Needs Assessment.

   Member Comments: Committee Member Stanton; and Committee Chairperson Scott.

   Committee Members requested that they receive information presented by staff/consultants
   before the meeting to allow for them to develop questions or ask for clarifications
   beforehand.

   Public Comment: None

   C. Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints

   (Video timestamp 1:06:35)
   ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided an overview of non-governmental and
   governmental constraints and opportunities that will be considered in the Housing Element
   Update.

   Member Comments: Committee Member Stanton; and Committee Chairperson Scott.

   Committee Members made note of the unique challenges that Napa County faces in
   comparison to other counties in California, including the consideration that Napa County has
   more visitors than it does residents, in addition to a disproportionate amount of visitor
   serving facilities, and many property owners (from outside Napa County) with second or
   third homes in the County. Further clarification was requested on the County RHNA and
   Napa County’s ability to meet the RHNA, with a comparison of the data between County
   allocation and the differences between jurisdictions. ESA Consultants and Staff collectively
summarized the County’s stance on the RHNA allocation and described that challenge of any potential appeals process being successful, with any successful appeal leading to the reallocation of units to other jurisdictions.

Public Comment: None

D. 6th Cycle RHNA

(Video timestamp 1:09:26)
ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided a brief overview of 6th Cycle RHNA that must be accommodated with adequate sites for development of housing at a range of densities, as compared to the 5th Cycle RHNA.

Member Comments: None
Public Comment: None

E. HEAC Feedback/Discussion of Housing Needs and Constraints

(Video timestamp 1:09:26)
ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided insight into discussion items for HEAC Meeting #2, which includes updates on status of the final RHNA, use of RHNA transfer agreements, development of single-family homes and accessory dwelling units, and potential multifamily housing sites. Hillary explained that the HEAC will provide feedback on these items at Meeting #2.

Member Comments: Committee Member Stanton; Committee Member Akemi-Hernandez; Committee Member Anderson; Committee Member Rhyno; and Committee Chairperson Scott.

Committee Members asked for clarification on constraints and environmental considerations such as water/groundwater, cultural resource considerations, and wildfire, with consultant and County staff summarizing that those considerations are all being reviewed throughout this process with the acknowledgment that the State has specific requirements that need to be met. Further discussion was had on how housing and jobs growth would factor into the site selection process as well as development in isolated and rural areas without services. Consultants and County staff noted that further information regarding site selection would be presented at the next HEAC meeting. Committee Members also requested the demographic data of residents be presented in the Housing Element, with County staff indicating how members could obtain a copy of the current Housing Element.

Public Comment: None

5. OUTREACH PLAN AND STRATEGY (Video timestamp 01:34:25)

A. Summary of the Outreach Strategy for the Housing and Safety Element Update
ESA Consultant Evan Wasserman provided a summary of the Outreach Plan and strategies presented within the Plan and the HEAC’s role in the outreach process. Local governments are required to make a diligent effort in community outreach efforts in preparation of the Housing Element. The Outreach Plan is a living document that will be updated throughout the Planning process.

B. HEAC Discussion of Stakeholders and Outreach

Committee Members held discussion and advised Staff on public outreach strategies including identifying community based organization to engage with outreach efforts.

Member Comments: Committee Member Gallagher, Committee Chairperson Scott, Committee Member Akemi-Hernandez, Committee Member Anderson, Committee Member Zimny, and Committee Member Bolyarde.

Committee Members provided input on specific community-based organizations for the County to reach out to and stated that the County should be proactive in providing translation services rather than waiting until members of the Public request it.

Public Comment: None

6. NEXT STEPS (Video timestamp 01:53:35)

John McDowell provided a summary of the next steps as part of the Housing and Safety Element Update with discussion.

Member Comments: Committee Member Rhyno, Committee Member Stanton, Committee Chairperson Scott.

Committee Members requested clarification on how information should be shared between committee members, if the Zoom chat function could be used, and how that information should be funneled to the appropriate people. County staff clarified that due to Brown Act requirements any information should be first shared with the County staff and that it will be staff responsibility to disseminate the information to members and to make sure that the information is added to the agenda for future meetings.

Public Comment: None

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned to November 15, 2021 regular meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vote: JG = Joelle Gallagher; MD = Megan Dameron; KA = Kellie Anderson; TG = Tom Gamble; RR = Ron Rhyno; TS = Terry Scott; KA-H = Keri Akemi-Hernandez; TZ = Teresa Zimny; MS = Mike Swanton; HS = Heather Stanton; JB = Jenna Bolyarde; AC = Anne Cottrell (Alternate)

Notations under vote: Y = Yes; N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused; 1st = 1st motion; 2nd = 2nd motion

Example

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JG</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>KA-H</td>
<td>TZ</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Topics to Discuss

- Meeting Overview
- Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)
  - Development & Status of the Draft RHNA
  - Availability & Use of RHNA Transfers (65584.07)
- Sites Inventory Components
  - Single Family Dwellings & ADUs
  - Farmworker Housing
  - Potential Use of the Adequate Sites Alternative (65583.1(c))
  - Inventory of Suitable Land (65583(a)(3), 65583.2)
- Proposed Site Selection Criteria
- Exploration of Possible Sites
- Next Steps
Overview of the Housing Element Update

The Housing Element Update
• Updated Housing Needs Assessment
• Updated goals, policies, and programs to address the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing and affirmatively further fair housing
• A Housing Inventory that meets the County’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) plus a buffer

Related Actions
• Conforming amendments to other elements of the County’s General Plan to maintain internal consistency
• Amendments to the Safety Element of the General Plan to improve consistency with the 2020 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and comply with recent changes in State law
• Amendments to the County’s zoning map and zoning ordinance as necessary
• Environmental Review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Other
• Community Outreach
• State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) review and certification required
• January 31, 2023 Deadline!
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

- Represents each jurisdiction’s share of a region-wide allocation provided to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) by HCD for the period between January 2023 and January 2031.
- Assigned to each jurisdiction by ABAG based on a methodology developed with input from a housing methodology committee.
- Much larger for this 6th housing cycle than for the last cycle in recognition of the region’s housing challenges.
- Allocations are considered drafts until finally adopted by ABAG following a decision on pending appeals (Dec 16).
- Includes numbers broken down by income group and represents the number and affordability of new units each jurisdiction must plan for.
Napa County’s Draft RHNA

### Napa County Draft RHNA for the 6th Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft RHNA</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Draft RHNA represents a substantial increase over the 5th cycle RHNA of 180 total units.
- The Draft RHNA is subject to final adoption by ABAG in December 2021 and may change depending on the outcome of appeals.
RHNA Transfer Agreements

- Section 65584.07 of the California Government Code allows unincorporated counties to reduce their RHNA if cities within the County agree to an equivalent increase
- ABAG must approve any transfer sometime between issuance of the final RHNA and January 31, 2023
- Napa County has pursued this option since 2010, entering into multiple agreements with cities that can be submitted to ABAG for approval once the RHNA is finalized
- Requesting transfers in early 2022 would facilitate updating the County’s Housing Element based on an adjusted RHNA
- Caution against transferring 100%
# Available RHNA Transfer Agreements

## Table 2. Available RHNA Transfer Agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Date of Agreement</th>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Canyon (2010)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Canyon (2017)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena (2017)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Napa (2019)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>374</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Unit distribution by income group may be adjusted via negotiations between the parties if needed to ensure that the transfer of low and very low units is proportional to the transfer of moderate and above moderate as required by CGC Sec. 65584.07(a)(3).

Numbers in the 2010 American Canyon Agreement add up to 186, but the agreement references 168 units.
RHNA Transfer Agreements

• Just because the County could theoretically request a transfer of 100% of its RHNA to the cities, does not mean that this is the wisest course of action

• The County’s request will require careful consideration based on a number of factors, including an understanding of all Housing Element requirements

• Whatever the request, the transfer must be approved by ABAG in a public forum

• The resulting final and adjusted RHNA will provide a basis for the sites inventory component of the Housing Element Update
Sites Inventory Components
Sites Inventory Components/Considerations

Sites Inventory Components

• Single Family Dwellings & ADUs
• Farmworker Housing
• Potential Use of the Adequate Sites Alternative (65583.1(c))
• Inventory of Suitable Land (65583(a)(3), 65583.2)

Considerations

• The sites inventory must provide sites suitable for lower income housing; the law specifies a “default density” of 20 DU per acre
• HCD recommends that the housing element provide a buffer in addition to simply providing sites to meet the RHNA
• Due to recent changes in State law, a generous buffer will also reduce the risk of having to identify additional sites before the next housing element update
Sites Inventory Components/Considerations

Considerations (Cont.)

- Per AB 686, sites must be evaluated through the lens of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, meaning that we must ensure that the sites inventory doesn’t concentrate sites for lower-income housing development in areas of low opportunity or contribute to segregation/isolation of racial and ethnic groups or creation or exacerbation of racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs). Ideally, lower-income housing sites should be located in areas of higher opportunity.
Single Family Dwellings and ADUs

- County zoning permits one single family dwelling (SFD) on each legal parcel (industrial zones excluded).
- In addition, one Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and one Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) are permitted within residential zoning and Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning. Agricultural Preserve permits one JADU.
- The Housing Element Update can assume development of SFDs based on the number of developable vacant parcels.
ADUs

• HCD allows the Housing Element Update to assume development of ADUs and JADUs at the existing pace and level of affordability or a projection if increases are expected/supported.

• The annual average for the last three years is used in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADUs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Draft projection based on annual average production 2018-2020
Farmworker Housing

- County zoning permits up to 12 individual farmworker housing units (or 36 beds in group quarters) as an allowed use by right on every legal parcel in agricultural zones. Additional farmworker housing may be allowed with approval of a Use Permit.
- Track record of minimal production in the last housing cycle limits ability to project unit production in upcoming cycle
- County is participating in the ABAG Farmworker Collaborative
- The County can include implementation programs in the Housing Element Update to encourage production & identify sites, although it remains to be seen what HCD will “count”
Adequate Sites Alternative (CGC Section 65583.1(c))

- There are some conditions under which, the County could address up to 25% of its adequate sites requirement by substantially rehabilitating existing units, converting existing units to affordable units, or where existing unit (including mobile home spaces) affordability is preserved.

- Examples include conversion of hotels/motels to residential use and making them available for people experiencing homelessness, or preserving a mobile home park by acquiring spaces.
Inventory of Suitable Land

• Vacant sites that are zoned for multifamily development
• Vacant sites that are not zoned for multifamily development, but that allow such development
• Underutilized sites that are zoned for residential development and capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity*
• Sites that are not zoned for residential development, but can be redeveloped for and/or rezoned for multifamily residential development*
• Sites owned or leased by the County that can be redeveloped for multifamily residential development within the housing cycle
• Sites controlled by the State, a city, or another public agency where there is agreement/documentation that the site can be developed within the housing cycle

*Non-vacant sites require additional justification, and the bar is even higher if more than 50% of lower income RHNA will be accommodated by non-vacant sites.
Inventory of Suitable Land (cont.)

A sites suitability analysis must demonstrate how the projected residential development capacity of the sites can be realistically achieved and consider such things as:

- Land use controls and site improvements
- Site size and realistic development capacity
- Typical densities of existing or approved residential development at similar affordability levels
- Current or planned availability and accessibility of sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities
- Incentives for residential use
- Local or regional development trends

For any sites <0.5 acres or >10 acres, the housing element must provide an analysis demonstrating their ability to develop with housing during the planning period. Evidence can include developer interest or a development proposal, or a track record consolidating and/or developing sites of similar size. The housing element must also include policies or incentives to facilitate development of these sites.
Existing Housing Element Sites Inventory for 2014-2022

(many changes in State law since 2014!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>APN/ Location</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>Allowed Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Realistic Unit Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angwin – Site A</td>
<td>024-410-015 and 016</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>12 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>11.4 (a) (entire site= 18.5 ac)</td>
<td>114 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwin – Site B</td>
<td>024-080-035 and 036</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>12 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>7 (a) (entire site= 44.5 ac)</td>
<td>77 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>024-080-033 part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>024-080-028 part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>024-300-027 part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskwitelte Corner – Site A</td>
<td>032-150-062</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 10 du/ac</td>
<td>1 (a) (entire parcel= 8.7 ac)</td>
<td>3 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskwitelte Corner – Site B</td>
<td>032-150-063</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 10 du/ac</td>
<td>2 (a) (entire parcel= 11.4 ac)</td>
<td>6 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskwitelte Corner – Site C</td>
<td>032-150-048</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 10 du/ac</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>83 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskwitelte Corner – Site D</td>
<td>032-150-047</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 10 du/ac</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>45 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat Site A</td>
<td>019-261-038</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>1.5 (a) (entire parcel= 6.2 ac)</td>
<td>7 (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat Site B</td>
<td>019-261-035</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>5 (a) (entire parcel= 6.7 ac)</td>
<td>25 (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat Site C</td>
<td>019-261-026</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8 (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat Site D</td>
<td>019-261-025</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4 (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat Site E</td>
<td>019-262-001</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>3 (a) (entire parcel= 27.3 ac)</td>
<td>15 (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat Site F</td>
<td>019-050-003</td>
<td>AHCD</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4 - 25 du/ac</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>40 (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Pipe</td>
<td>046-412-005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Napa Pipe Residential (NP-MUR- W/AC) (f)</td>
<td>20 du/ac</td>
<td>43.5 ac (entire parcel = 63 ac)</td>
<td>700 - 945 (f) (304 units must be built at a minimum density of 20 du/ac; of these, 202 units are allowed by right)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2014-2022 Housing Element Sites Inventory

**TABLE H-G:**

**SUMMARY OF RHNA AND RESIDENTIAL SITES CAPACITY, 1/1/2014 - 9/30/2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability of Sites</th>
<th>Very Low and Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original RHNA Allocation (Units)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Units Produced Since 1/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Homes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Units Already Produced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Remaining Outstanding RHNA</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit Capacity on Identified Sites**

- SFR Capacity on Vacant Parcels (a): 0
- Projected Additional 2nd Units: 0
- Napa Pipe (b): 304
- Angwin Sites (c): 191
- Moskowite Corner Sites (d): 25
- Spanish Flat Sites (e): 99

**Total Unit Capacity on Identified Sites:**

- 619 (g)
- 100 (g)
- 958 (h)
- 1,677

**“Buffer” or Excess Capacity:**

- 538
- 68
- 891
- 1,497
Proposed Site Selection Criteria
Proposed Screening Criteria

1. Sites must have access to existing or planned water, sewer, and other dry utilities with sufficient capacity available to support housing development; *(Source: State requirement)*

2. Sites must generally be between 0.5 and 10 acres in size; *(Source: State requirement)*

3. Sites must be located outside of areas designated in the General Plan as Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space as of September 28, 2007 (the date specified in Measure P, approved by the voters in November 2008). Notwithstanding this requirement, sites within these areas may be identified for qualifying farmworker housing development and sites identified as an existing commercial establishment on General Plan *Figure AG.LU-2: Location of Parcels Subject to Policy AG/LU-45* may be identified for redevelopment.

Additional Goals

4. Located outside of high and very high fire severity zones as designated (in State Responsibility Areas) or recommended (in Local Responsibility Areas) by CalFire

5. Located outside of Zones A through D of the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

6. Proximate to transit routes and/or employment opportunities and services (e.g. groceries)
Exploration of Possible Sites
Exploration of Possible Sites

Review Sites from the 2014-2023 Housing Element (Figure H-1-1)
Exploration of Possible Sites

General Plan Figure AG/LU-3

Examine General Plan & Zoning

General Plan Figure AG/LU-2
Exploration of Possible Sites

Sample General Plan Figure from p. AG/LU-47

Examine General Plan & Zoning
Exploration of Possible Sites

Assess Availability of Water & Sewer (maps by Napa County LAFCO)
Exploration of Possible Sites

Parcel-Specific Investigation/Screening

- Potential for water/sewer
- Fire danger
- Ownership
- Current uses
- Size
- Likelihood of developing
- Access to services

(ESA Map from 2018)
Exploration of Possible Sites

- Possible farm worker housing sites or incentives
- One or more existing housing element sites with additional incentives
- One or more small sites in the vicinity of Carneros Resort if utilities can be provided
- One or more sites between Foster Road & SR 29 w/in the City of Napa RUL
- One or more sites needing State agreement (Napa State Hospital)
- 9.8-acre former Stonebridge School site in Carneros
- One or more sites in the Silverado area
- One or more sites proximate to planned resorts at Lake Berryessa
- Other?? HEAC input needed!
Next Steps
Next Steps

• December 16 – ABAG Finalizes RHNA

• December 7, 2021 Board of Supervisor’s Meeting

• December 15, 2021 County Planning Commission Meeting

• Late December or January -- County Issues Notice of Preparation (NOP) to start the EIR process

• January or February – County Requests RHNA Transfer Approval by ABAG

• Ongoing Community Outreach

• March -- Next HEAC Meeting
Meeting Minutes

Napa County Housing Element Advisory Committee

Joelle Gallagher  Terry Scott (Chair)  David Morrison, Secretary-Director
Megan Dameron  Keri Akemi-Hernandez (Vice-Chair)  Silva Darbinian, Committee Counsel
Anne Cottrell (Alternate)  Teresa Zimny  John McDowell, Supervising Planner
Kellie Anderson  Mike Swanton  Alexandria Quackenbush, Committee Clerk
Tom Gamble  Heather Stanton
Ron Rhyno  Jenna Bolyarde

Monday, November 15, 2021  1:30 PM  Virtual Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL (Video timestamp 00:00:23)
   Committee Members Present: Joelle Gallagher, Megan Dameron, Kellie Anderson, Ron Rhyno,
   Terry Scott, Keri Akemi-Hernandez, Teresa Zimny, Mike Swanton, Heather Stanton, Jenna
   Bolyarde (arrived during item 7A).
   Committee Members Not Present: Committee Member Anne Cottrell
   Staff Present: David Morrison, John McDowell, Trevor Hawkes, Alexandria Quackenbush

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (Video timestamp 00:02:01)
   John McDowell led the salute to the flag.

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Video timestamp 00:02:45)
   None.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Video timestamp 00:03:00)
   The Clerk of the Committee request approval of Minutes for the meeting held on:
   October 26, 2021 (All Commissioners Present)

   The vote to approve minutes for the meeting held on October 26 and November 15, 2021, was
   continued until the next regular scheduled meeting.

   Member Comments: Committee Member Stanton requested that meeting minutes be provided
   to the Committee as a summary format in order to provide more detail and context on discussion.

5. AGENDA REVIEW / MEETING OVERVIEW (Video timestamp 00:07:25)
John McDowell gave the review.

6. DISCLOSURES (Video timestamp 00:10:13)
None.

7. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Adoption of Resolution Authorizing Continue Use of Remote Teleconferencing Meetings – Action Item (Video timestamp 00:10:37)
Committee Members voted to adopt Resolution authorizing continue use of remote teleconferencing meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) – Discussion Item (Video timestamp 00:14:35)

ESAs Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided a summary of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). Hillary provided additional context regarding the Housing Element Update components, planning process, and related actions that will occur along with the Housing Element Update. Related to the Housing Element, the items to be included in the Housing Element update are an updated Housing Needs Assessment, updated goals, policies, and programs to address the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing in Napa County, while working to affirmatively further fair housing.

**Member Comments:** Committee Member Stanton; and Committee Chairperson Scott.

Committee Members requested clarification on the statewide Housing Element update process and whether Housing Element Updates consider water/utilities availability in the update process. ESA Consultants and Staff collectively explained the housing update process and that the planning for groundwater resources and housing happens concurrently.

**Public comment:** None

*Development & Status of the Draft RHNA (Video timestamp 00:23:40)*

ESAs Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided a summary of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process and highlighted the Draft RHNA for Napa County in the 6th Cycle, as compared to the 5th Cycle allocations. Hillary explained that these allocation figures are considered draft until formally adopted by ABAG following decision on pending appeals.
Availability & Use of RHNA Transfers (65584.07) (Video timestamp 00:26:04)

ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided a summary of the transfer agreement process, as allowed by California Government Code Section 65584.07. Hillary explained that unincorporated counties can reduce their RHNA if cities within the County agree to an equivalent increase in units across income groups. Additionally, ABAG must approve any transfer before the issuance of the final RHNA and January 31, 2023. Hillary explained that Napa County has pursued this option since 2010, entering into multiple agreements with cities in Napa County.

Member Comments: Committee Member Gallagher, Committee Chairperson Scott, Committee Member Akemi - Hernandez, Committee Member Anderson, Committee Member Zimny, Committee Member Swanton, and Committee Member Bolyarde

Several Committee Members requested clarification on the mechanics of the RHNA transfer agreement process, including the impact of previous development projects on the County's RHNA obligations and previous RHNA agreements made with Napa County cities after the 5th Housing Cycle. County staff explained that RHNA transfer agreements with American Canyon and St. Helena will apply to the current Housing Element cycle. County staff also explained that negotiations with Cities in the County for RHNA transfer agreements are an ongoing process.

Committee Members also requested clarification on the definition of housing affordability levels. County staff explained that affordability levels are defined and provided by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Public comment: None

C. Sites Inventory Components – Discussion Item (Video timestamp 00:57:37)

ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman identified the components of the site inventory and other considerations and requirements that must be identified and met due to existing Napa County regulations and changes in State Housing law. At the minimum, the site inventory must include the following components:

a. Single Family Dwellings & ADUs
b. Farmworker Housing
c. Potential Use of the Adequate Sites Alternative (65583.1(c))
d. Inventory of Suitable Land (65583(a)(3), 65583.2)

ESA Consultant Hillary also provided a summary of the 2014 – 2022 Housing Element Sites Inventory.

Member Comments: Committee Member Gallagher, Committee Chairperson Scott,
Committee Member Akemi – Hernandez, Committee Member Anderson, Committee Member Zimny, Committee Member Swanton, and Committee Member Bolyarde

Committee Members requested clarification on the types of housing that are counted towards a jurisdiction’s RHNA and provided discussion on specific sites and development projects occurring in Napa County. Committee Members also provided feedback on considerations for site selection.

Furthermore, Committee Members requested clarification on the outreach process to property owners for those properties that are identified in the site inventory. Lastly, one Committee Member requested maps of the County and boundary lines for future reference.

As part of this discussion, County staff also identified considerations for site selection moving forward that the County would like Committee feedback on.

Public comment: None

D. Proposed Site Selection Criteria – Discussion Item (Video timestamp 01:36:00)

ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman described the proposed screening criteria that would be used in the site inventory analysis developed by consultants and County staff. The site criteria presented included state mandated requirements such as access to utilities, site size, location of sites outside of high and very high fire severity zones, and proximity to transit routes, employment opportunities, and services.

E. Exploration of Possible Sites – Discussion Item (Video timestamp 01:39:52)

ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided further explanation on the process for the exploration of possible sites, including a list of the specific sites and incentives that are being considered by the consultant team and Napa County Staff. Hillary requested input on these sites from the Committee as well as input on the proposed site selection criteria.

Member Comments: Committee Member Gallagher, Committee Chairperson Scott, Committee Member Anderson, Committee Member Zimny, and Committee Member Swanton

Committee Members requested additional meetings with County Staff between HEAC Meeting #2 and HEAC Meeting #3. Committee Members also provided discussion on specific sites and requested clarification on requirements for specific housing types and programs, including preservation of affordable housing stock, incentivizing development, redevelopment of government owned sites, and rebuilding after natural disasters. Committee Members identified sites in the City of American Canyon and the City of Napa as possible conversion sites, but County Staff reiterated that they wanted feedback on sites in the unincorporated County, with the understanding of site constraints.

Public comment: None
8. **NEXT STEPS / STAFF AND COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS (Video timestamp 02:09:27)**

   ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman outlined the next steps in the Napa County Housing Element Update process, including interim dates and deadlines between the next HEAC meeting.

   **Member Comments:** Committee Chairperson Scott

   Commissioners requested additional meetings with County Staff between HEAC Meeting #2 and HEAC Meeting #3. County staff explained that additional analysis will be prepared in between HEAC Meeting #2 and Meeting #3 and will be able to provide additional feedback and updates later in the planning process. Commissioners asked for final feedback and clarifications on the RHNA transfer agreement process, prior to adjournment.

   **Public comment:** None

9. **ADJOURNMENT (Video timestamp 02:14:19)**

   Meeting adjourned.
Vote: JG = Joelle Gallagher; MD = Megan Dameron; KA = Kellie Anderson; TG = Tom Gamble; RR = Ron Rhyno; TS = Terry Scott; KA-H = Keri Akemi-Hernandez; TZ = Teresa Zimny; MS = Mike Swanton; HS = Heather Stanton; JB = Jenna Bolyarde; AC = Anne Cottrell (Alternate)
Notations under vote: Y = Yes; N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused; 1st = 1st motion; 2nd = 2nd motion

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Element
Advisory Committee

ALEXANDRIA QUACKENBUSH, Clerk of the Committee

NOVEMBER 15, 2021
Live Interpretation Available

• On-site interpreters for the workshop are available for Spanish language translation
• Select the following interpretation icon on the toolbar to get the desired language

• Intérpretes in situ para el taller están disponibles para la traducción al español
• Seleccione el siguiente icono de interpretación en la barra de herramientas para obtener el idioma deseado
Workshop Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Housing Element Process
3. Housing Needs Assessment
4. Public Discussions and Feedback
5. Closing and Next Steps
1. Welcome and Introductions
Project Team

Napa County:
• David Morrison, Director of Planning, Building, and Environmental Services
• Trevor Hawkes, Planner III

Consultant Team:
• Matt Kowta, BAE
• Hillary Gitelman, ESA
• Mary Laux, ESA
• Evan Wasserman, ESA
• Justin Klaparda, ESA
How Will The Meeting Be Facilitated?

RAISE HAND VIRTUALLY THROUGH PARTICIPANTS TOOL

CHAT FUNCTION

Open the Chat window and leave a message here for the meeting facilitator to recognize and address.

AS A REMINDER, PLEASE REMAIN ON MUTE DURING THE PRESENTATION PORTION OF THE WORKSHOP
2. Housing Element Process
What is the Housing Element?

County plan to meet housing needs

- Address and meet community needs
- Provide access to opportunity

One Element of the General Plan

Required for every City and County in California

- Updated every 8 years
- Approved by State Department of Housing & Community Development

Bay Area jurisdictions’ Housing Elements cover 2023-2031
# Key Housing Element Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Analysis of demographic &amp; housing trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Prior Housing Element</td>
<td>Report on progress during the last 8-year cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Sites Inventory</td>
<td>Identify sites where new housing can be built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints Analysis</td>
<td>Analyze possible barriers to addressing housing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Policies, &amp; Programs</td>
<td>Establish a plan to address housing needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Process

1. **Review and Revise the Existing Housing Element** (at least 30 days)
2. **Provide Opportunity for Public Comment on Draft Housing Element** (at least 2 weeks)
3. **Consider Public Input and Revise**
4. **Submit to HCD for Formal Review** (90 days)
5. **Revise in Response to HCD Comments**
6. **Board of Supervisor Adopts Final Draft**
7. **Adopt legally compliant HEU within 120 days of statutory deadline to avoid requirement that necessary rezones be completed within one year of statutory deadline (1/15/23)**
Key Housing Element Objectives

- **Housing Production:** Accommodate projected (RHNA-allocated) housing units, particularly affordable housing

- **Housing Preservation:** Protect & rehabilitate affordable housing

- **Affirmatively Further Fair Housing:** Foster an inclusive community that provides equal access to opportunity

- **Housing for All:** Promote housing for all income levels and special-needs populations
What is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)?

• Number of housing units that Napa County must plan for over the next 8 years
• Projected Statewide need allocated to each region, then to each city and county
• Housing Element must show the City’s ability to meet the RHNA
  - By identifying sites for development & removing barriers
  - County is not required to build the units
• 2023-2031 RHNA for the Bay Area: 441,176 units
## Bay Area RHNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME LEVEL</th>
<th>2015-2023 Allocation</th>
<th>2023-2031 Allocation</th>
<th>Percent of 2023-2031 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW INCOME (&lt;50% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>46,680</td>
<td>114,442</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW INCOME (50-80% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>28,940</td>
<td>65,892</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE INCOME (80-120% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>33,420</td>
<td>72,712</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE MODERATE INCOME (&gt;120% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>78,950</td>
<td>188,130</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>187,990</td>
<td>441,176</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Napa County’s RHNA (Compared to 5th Cycle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME LEVEL</th>
<th>2015-2023 Allocation</th>
<th>2023-2031 Allocation</th>
<th>Percent of 2023-2031 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW INCOME (&lt;50% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW INCOME (50-80% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE INCOME (80-120% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE MODERATE INCOME (&gt;120% Area Median Income)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Housing Needs Assessment
## Recent Laws Affecting Housing Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 9: Lot splits and Duplexes in Single Family Zones</th>
<th>SB 10: Upzoning near Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 215: Housing Element Review/ Implementation</td>
<td>AB 1398: HE Deadlines/Site Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 744: Density Bonus</td>
<td>SB 35: Streamlining of housing approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1934: Mixed Use Development Bonus</td>
<td>AB 771: RHNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2208: Residential Land Inventory</td>
<td>AB 686: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2685: Housing Element Adoption</td>
<td>AB 2162: Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 229: Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>AB 2372: Floor Area Ratio Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 166: Residential Density and Affordability</td>
<td>AB 2797: Density Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 540: Workforce Housing Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>AB 3194: Housing Acct Act: Approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1505: Inclusionary Zoning</td>
<td>SB 828: RHNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 72: Housing Element Compliance</td>
<td>SB 1227: Density Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 678/ SB 167: Housing Accountability Act</td>
<td>AB 587: Separate Sale/ Conveyance of ADUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 330/ SB8: Housing Crisis Act</td>
<td>AB 1783 H02A: Worker Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB 879: Housing Development Fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantial New Requirements to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH)

- Conduct Assessment of Fair Housing
- Assess patterns of segregation/isolation
- Evaluate housing sites through lens of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing
- Include goals, policies, and actions to AFFH
Housing Needs/Assessment of Fair Housing

- Disparity in homeownership rates – lower for Asian/API and much lower for Hispanic/Latinx

- About 1/3 of households live in neighborhoods where there is risk of displacement or undergoing gentrification

- 13.2 percent of households live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely to be excluded due to high costs

- Typical home value has increased 48% since 2001

- Rents have also increased sharply in the unincorporated area
HNA/AFH, cont.

- Unincorporated area has seen a decline in population between 2000 and 2020
  - Wildfire displacement
  - Conversion of housing to 2nd homes
  - Possible Census counting issue related to Napa State Hospital

- Aging population – median age 48 yrs.

- Area is becoming more diverse; fewer Whites and more Hispanic/Latinx and multi-racial persons

- Number of jobs are increasing – creating demand for housing and increasing need for commuting in from surrounding areas
HNA/AFH, cont.

- 18 percent of households have moderate housing cost burdens (30%+ of income spent on housing)

- 16 percent have severe cost burdens (50%+ of income)

- The percent with moderate to severe cost burdens increases substantially as income levels go down

- Overcrowding is generally not significant in unincorporated area, but the problem increases as income levels go down; also, much more prevalent among minority households

- While overall number of farmworkers has gone down, farm work continues to transition from seasonal to year-round, creating need for permanent housing
HNA/AFH, cont.

• Metrics of segregation in the unincorporated area are not reliable due to small number of minority households; however, the available data indicate that segregation and isolation may be increasing
  - The general lack of minority representation in the unincorporated area suggests that Napa County should consider “mobility strategies” to create more opportunity for minority groups to live in the area

• Areas of poverty are concentrated in the south part of the county, concentrated near Napa and American Canyon, suggesting that place-based strategies to increase opportunity could be focused in these areas
HNA/AFH, cont.

- No R/ECAPs or RCAAs in unincorporated area

- County does not have tracts that are considered High Segregation and Poverty, but there is geographic variation in the level of Opportunity (Highest and Higher opportunity areas tend to be in western part of County or northeast of City of Napa)
  - It will be important to consider these factors when evaluating the location of sites identified for future lower-income housing development

- Data are not statistically reliable; however, they suggest that minorities may experience disproportionate housing problems.
Non-Governmental and Governmental Constraints

Constraints to Housing Production

- Availability of water and sewer services
- Potential for land use conflicts
- Land costs, construction costs, financing
- Fire risk and evacuation
- Land Use controls
- Fees
- Permit Process
4. Public Discussions and Feedback
General Questions

- Any questions on the presentation?
  - Housing Element Process
  - Housing Needs Assessment

- Please utilize the raise hand function to ask your question
General Comments

Policy and action items for property owner outreach and retention and preservation of low income/affordable units

Lack of affordable housing for workforce

Rent stabilization of mobile homes

Consider farmworker housing to accommodate changing workforce

Consider land use and policy changes for affordable housing
Discussion Questions

• Feedback on 5 specific discussion prompts:

  1. What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Napa County?
  2. What do you think Napa County should do to address housing needs or goals?
  3. What characteristics do you want to see in housing over the next 10 years?
  4. What do you think Napa County should do to protect existing renters and homeowners?
  5. Is there anything else that you would like to add?
Discussion Questions: Prompt 1

What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Napa County?

- Lack of Affordability Factor/Affordable Housing, affordable rental units
- Need for Workforce Housing
- Transitional Housing for homeless population
- Housing near urban areas/ goods and services/ public services and facilities
- Permit Streamlining
- Missing Middle Housing, Apartments, Co-housing, ADUs and JADUs
Discussion Questions: Prompt 1

*What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Napa County?*

- Preservation of agricultural and open space and building in the more densely populated areas
- Lack of rental units
- Balance between affordable rental units, below market rate housing units, and market rate housing units
- Limited residential zoning set for large, single family residential zones
What do you think Napa County should do to address housing needs or goals?

- Affordable dwelling units for large employer development approval
- Financial incentives/programs to preserve existing low income units.
- Public health priority/goal(s) for housing
- Rehabilitate and reuse sites not formerly utilized for housing
- Consider land use and policy changes for affordable housing and developer accountability
- Unincorporated islands within city limits as sites
Discussion Questions: Prompt 2

What do you think Napa County should do to address housing needs or goals?

- Additional infrastructure to areas that could be developed
- Mixed use conversion, higher density, co-op housing, tiny homes and incentives
Discussion Questions: Prompt 3

What characteristics do you want to see in housing over the next 10 years?

- Inclusive housing at a mix of income levels
- Walkability, access to services, and cultural elements
- Environmentally sensitive design – water resources
- Innovative housing types – cohousing and especially multigenerational housing
- Co-housing, aging in place
- European model/Communal space
Discussion Questions: Prompt 4

What do you think Napa County should do to protect existing renters and homeowners?

- Rent stabilization/control, ownership
- Rent stabilization/Control for mobile homes
- Essential workforce development/retention/aging population retention
- ADUs as a tool for protecting housing
- Homeowner assistance/information
- Private rehabilitation loans
Discussion Questions: Prompt 4

What do you think Napa County should do to protect existing renters and homeowners?

- Zoning changes to preserve mobile home parks.
- Permit Streamlining
- Implement and strengthen workforce retention programs
- Collaboration with cities and the County/private sector to help people understand the home improvement process (i.e. window retrofit programs)
Discussion Questions: Prompt 5

Is there anything else that you would like to add?

- Indigenous involvement/cultural considerations – cultural easement
- Consider all demographic and housing needs – North Napa County and South Napa County
- Housing Impact Funds for rural property owners to support ADU development
- ADU housing impact fund information sharing
5. Closing and Next Steps
How to Stay Involved

For additional information and updates visit https://www.countyofnapa.org/3250/2022-Housing-Element-Update

Please share with your friends and neighbors.

Upcoming Events:

NOP Scoping Session on 2/16 at 9:00am
Trevor Hawkes
Planner III
Planning, Building, & Environmental Services
County of Napa | 1195 Third Street, Room 210 | Napa, CA 94559
(707) 253-4388 | trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Date: January 24, 2022
To: Agencies and Interested Parties
From: Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department
Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Napa County Housing Element Update
Review Period: January 24, 2022 to 5:00 PM on February 25, 2022

Napa County (County) proposes to prepare and adopt a comprehensive update to the Housing Element (of the General Plan) for Napa County for the period from January 2023 to January 2031 as required by State law. As part of the Housing Element Update (HEU or the project), the County also proposes to prepare and adopt limited amendments to other elements (or chapters) of the General Plan and the County’s zoning map/regulations to maintain consistency with the updated Housing Element, and to improve consistency of the Safety Element with the 2020 Napa County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and comply with recent changes in State law.

Amendment of the County’s General Plan is a discretionary action subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The County will serve as the lead agency under CEQA and will prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) for the project to satisfy the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the EIR will be a program EIR, allowing the County to consider the impacts of adoption and implementation of the HEU as well as program wide mitigation measures. Subsequent discretionary actions would be evaluated to determine whether their impacts fall within the scope of the program EIR or whether additional environmental review is required.

PURPOSE OF THIS NOTICE OF PREPARATION

In accordance with the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15082, the County has prepared this notice of preparation (NOP) to inform agencies and interested parties that an EIR will be prepared for the above-referenced project. The purpose of an NOP is to provide information about the project and its potential environmental impacts sufficient to allow agencies and interested parties the opportunity to provide a meaningful response related to the scope and content of the EIR, including mitigation measures and alternatives that should be considered (CCR Section 15082[b]). The project location, description, and potential environmental effects are summarized below.

Planning Division Building Division Engineering & Conservation Environmental Health Parks & Open Space
(707) 253-4417 (707) 253-4417 (707) 253-4417 (707) 253-4471 (707) 259-5933
PROJECT LOCATION

Napa County is located in the northern San Francisco Bay area, approximately 50 miles due west of Sacramento, California. The County is bordered by Lake County to the north, Yolo and Solano County to the east, Sonoma County to the west, and San Pablo Bay to the south (Exhibit 1). The planning area for the Housing Element Update is the same planning area that was considered by the 2008 General Plan, which encompasses all unincorporated land in Napa County (Exhibit 2). The unincorporated County includes approximately 9,022 residential dwelling units and comprises 789 square miles.

BACKGROUND

The Napa County General Plan was comprehensively updated in 2008 and contains goals and policies that guide land use decisions in unincorporated Napa County. The General Plan contains eight principal chapters or "elements" including an Agricultural Preservation & Land Use Element, a Housing Element, and a Safety Element. The County’s Housing Element was last updated and adopted in 2014.

State law requires local jurisdictions to update their housing elements on a regular schedule and to maintain consistency between the housing element and other elements of the general plan. Each city and county in the Bay Area must update their current housing element to the satisfaction of the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) by January 31, 2023 and must plan for a number of new housing units referred to as their Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

A RHNA is generally assigned to each jurisdiction by the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG) Council of Governments for the eight year planning period and includes housing units at various levels of affordability (very low income, low income, moderate income, and above moderate). The County’s RHNA as of December 2021 is shown in Table 1, below and is subject to modification via transfer agreements with incorporated jurisdictions as described further below.

| Table 1. Napa County Regional Housing Needs (RHNA) Allocation as of December 2021* |
|---------------------------------|----------|---------|---------|--------|-------|
|                                 | Very Low | Low     | Moderate| Above  |
|                                 |          |         |         | Moderate|       |
| RHNA Allocation                 | 369      | 213     | 120     | 312    | 1,014 |
| % of Total                      | 36%      | 21%     | 12%     | 31%    | 100%  |

Notes:
*The RHNA allocation shown here was adopted by ABAG on December 16, 2021 and may be modified via transfers pursuant to California Government Code Section 65584.07.

Source: ABAG, December 2021.

Over the past 12 years, the County has entered into agreements with the City of American Canyon, the City of Napa, and the City of St. Helena, that would allow the County to transfer portions of its RHNA allocation to these jurisdictions pursuant to California Government Code Section 65584.07. These agreements reflect a shared commitment by the County and incorporated jurisdictions to agricultural preservation and urban centered growth, and the County is in the process of requesting ABAG’s approval of RHNA transfers on the basis of these agreements, which are shown in Table 2 below.
**Table 2. RHNA Transfer Agreements Available for Use by the County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction and Date of Agreement</th>
<th>Units by Income Group(^a)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Napa (December 17, 2019)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of American Canyon (May 25, 2010)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of American Canyon (May 2, 2017)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Helena (June 26, 2017)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers Available</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- \(^a\)Transfer agreements reflect agreement by the County and an incorporated jurisdiction to use the RHNA transfer process contained in Government Code Section 65584.07. Transfers are subject to ABAG approval during the period between ABAG’s adoption of the final RHNA allocation in December 2021 and January 2031.
- \(^b\)Except in the City of American Canyon May 25, 2010 agreement, the distribution of units by income group is not specified within the agreements and is presented here based on the distribution of units in the County’s December 2021 RHNA.
- \(^c\)Numbers in this agreement add up to 186, but the agreement specifically references 168 units.

Source: Napa County, January 2022

The County’s request for a transfer pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07 will seek to transfer approximately 90% of the County’s RHNA based on the executed agreements and factors/circumstances that will be outlined in the request. If approved by ABAG, the transfers will modify the County’s RHNA as shown in Table 3 below and the Housing Element Update will plan for that RHNA plus a buffer.

**Table 3. Napa County Regional Housing Needs (RHNA) Allocation Based on Proposed Transfers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2021 RHNA Allocation</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Transfers(^b)</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised RHNA(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation if Transfers are Approved</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- \(^a\)The County is in the process of requesting transfers pursuant to California Government Code Section 65584.07 which – if approved by ABAG – would modify the County’s RHNA as shown.
- \(^b\)The proposed transfers would be based on signed agreements between the County and the cities of American Canyon, Napa, and St. Helena, although they would not transfer all of the units allowed for under all agreements.


**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project analyzed in the EIR would update the County’s Housing Element, including goals, objectives, policies, and implementation programs that address the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing in unincorporated Napa County. In addition, the HEU would identify sites appropriate for the development of multifamily housing, and the County would rezone those sites as necessary to meet the requirements of State law. The project would
also include amendments to other elements of the County General Plan in order to maintain internal consistency, to improve consistency of the Safety Element with the 2020 Napa County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and to comply with recent changes in State law.

The HEU will be the subject of community outreach and will evolve based on community input before being submitted to HCD for review and before being considered for adoption by the County Board of Supervisors prior to January 31, 2023. Given the time needed to prepare an EIR, certain assumptions are being made about the contents of the HEU in order to initiate the environmental review process. Specifically, the County assumes and the EIR will analyze an HEU that would meet all legal requirements and:

1. include an updated housing needs assessment;
2. include updated goals, policies, and programs that address the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing and affirmatively further fair housing;
3. include a housing inventory that meets the County’s final RHNA following transfers pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07 and provide a buffer of additional housing development capacity, including sites for multifamily housing development within the unincorporated area;
4. require limited amendments to the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element of the General Plan as/if needed to acknowledge the housing sites;
5. require limited amendments to the County’s zoning map and zoning ordinance to rezone the housing site(s); and
6. require limited amendments to the Safety Element of the General Plan to improve consistency of the Safety Element with the 2020 Napa County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and comply with recent changes in State law.

The County proposes to use a variety of methods to meet its RHNA requirement, including continued development of single family homes and accessory dwelling units (ADU), a program to encourage development of farmworker housing units, and identification of multifamily housing sites.

The County’s General Plan and zoning ordinance permits construction of one single family home on each legal lot, with the exception of areas that are zoned for industrial use. HCD guidance suggests that the County’s HEU may assume development of market rate single family homes on currently vacant and buildable parcels.

The County’s zoning also permits one Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and one Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) per parcel within residentially and Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning. One JADU is permitted in Agricultural Preservation (AP) zoning. HCD guidance suggests that the County may assume that ADUs and JADUs continue to develop at the same pace and affordability levels that has occurred over the last three years, yielding approximately 72 units at a range of income levels over the eight year planning period of the HEU.

The County’s zoning ordinance permits development of up to 12 individual farmworker housing units as an allowed use by right on every legal parcel in agricultural zones. The County is seeking to encourage additional development of farmworker units, is participating in ABAG’s Farmworker Collaborative, and has not established a goal for unit production during the planning period.

The County is proposing to meet the balance of its RHNA and provide a “buffer” by identifying sites for development of multifamily housing at a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre. This is the “default density” considered affordable to lower income households under State law for unincorporated Napa County.

In identifying potential sites, the County is proposing to use the following screening criteria:

1. Sites must have access to existing or planned water, sewer, and other dry utilities with sufficient capacity available to support housing development; (Source: State requirement)
2. Sites must generally be between 0.5 and 10 acres in size; (Source: State requirement)
3. Sites must be located outside of areas designated Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space as of September 28, 2007 (the date specified in Measure P, approved by the voters in November 2008). Notwithstanding this requirement, sites within an area designated Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space may be identified for qualifying farmworker housing development and sites identified as an existing commercial establishment on General Plan Figure AG.LU-2: Location of Parcels Subject to Policy AG/LU-45 may be identified for redevelopment.

In addition, the County’s goal is to identify sites that are:

4. Located outside of high and very high fire severity zones as designated (in State Responsibility Areas) or recommended (in Local Responsibility Areas) by CalFire.

5. Located outside of Zones A through D of the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

6. Proximate to transit routes and/or employment opportunities and services (e.g. groceries).

Sites identified during development of the HEU will be evaluated using these criteria/goals and analyzed to determine their ability to meet State requirements plus a buffer.

An initial screening of potential sites has identified the following potential sites for additional analysis and community input:

1. Possible farmworker housing sites or incentives;

2. One or more existing housing element sites with additional incentives;

3. One or more small sites in the vicinity of Carneros Resort if utilities can be provided;

4. One or more sites between Foster Road and State Route 29 within the City of Napa Rural Urban Limit (RUL);

5. One or more sites needing State agreement (e.g. a site at Napa State Hospital);

6. The 9.8-acre Stonebridge School site in Carneros;

7. One or more sites in the Silverado Area if utilities can be provided;

8. One or more sites proximate to planned resorts at Lake Berryessa; and

9. Other sites to be identified via additional analysis and community input during preparation of the HEU.

Sites included in the HEU will be proposed for rezoning by applying the Affordable Housing Overlay Zone in Section 18.82 of the County’s zoning ordinance to selected site(s) on the County’s zoning map. This provision of the zoning ordinance would be amended to allow selected sites to develop at 20 dwelling units per acre without a use permit. Selected sites and HEU implementation programs may also require small adjustments to language or figures included in the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element of the General Plan to maintain internal consistency between the elements.

In conjunction with updates to the Housing Element itself, the project would include targeted updates to the Safety Element of the General Plan to improve consistency of the Safety Element with the 2020 Napa County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and to comply with recent changes in State law.
POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Pursuant to CEQA and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, the discussion of potential effects on the environment in the EIR shall be focused on those impacts that the County has determined may be potentially significant. The EIR will also evaluate the cumulative impacts of the project when considered in conjunction with other related past, current, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. The County has determined that the project could result in potential environmental impacts in the following topic areas, which will be further evaluated in the EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Historical Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Energy
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

No initial study has been prepared, however the EIR will focus on those issue areas where potentially significant impacts may occur. Feasible mitigation measures will be identified to reduce any potentially significant and significant impacts.

ALTERNATIVES TO BE EVALUATED IN THE EIR

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (CCR Section 15126.6), the EIR will describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that are capable of meeting most of the project’s objectives and that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The EIR will also identify any alternatives that were considered but rejected by the lead agency as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons why, and will identify the environmentally superior alternative. Among the alternatives being considered for inclusion in the EIR are the No-Project Alternative (required by CEQA), and an alternative that would include one or more different housing sites than those selected for inclusion in the HEU.

DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

This NOP is available for public review at the following locations:

- Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department
  1195 Third Street, Suite 210
  Napa, CA

- Napa Main Library
  580 Coombs Street
  Napa, CA

- St. Helena Library
  1492 Library Lane
  St. Helena, CA

This NOP is also available for public review online at https://www.countyofnapa.org/2876/Current-Projects-Explorer and has been provided to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) “Clearing House” and the Napa County Clerk for posting along with a Notice of Completion.

The County is seeking input on the HEU as well as on the scope of the EIR. Project materials can be viewed online at: https://www.countyofnapa.org/3250/2022-Housing-Element-Update. To review materials in Spanish please contact Staff to request materials using the contact information below.
PROVIDING COMMENTS

Agencies and interested parties may provide the County with written comments on topics to be addressed in the EIR for the project. Because of time limits mandated by State law, comments should be provided no later than 5:00 p.m. on February 25, 2022. Please send all comments to:

Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department
Attention: Trevor Hawkes
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
Email: Trevor.Hawkes@countyofnapa.org

Agencies that will need to use the EIR when considering permits or other approvals for the project should provide the name, phone number, and email address of the appropriate contact person at the agency. Comments provided by email should include “Housing Element Update NOP Scoping Comment” in the subject line, as well as the name and physical address of the commenter in the body of the email.

All comments on environmental issues received during the public comment period will be considered and addressed in the Draft EIR, which is anticipated to be available for public review in mid-2022.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

The Napa County Planning Commission will hold a public scoping meeting to inform interested parties about the proposed project and to provide agencies and the public with an opportunity to provide comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The meeting time and location are as follows:

Wednesday, February 16, 2022, at 9:00 a.m.
Napa County Administration Building Third Floor
Board Chamber
1195 Third Street
Napa, CA 94559

This meeting will be conducted via teleconference using the Microsoft Zoom program in order to minimize the spread of the COVID-19 virus, in accordance with the State of Emergency proclaimed by Governor Newsom on March 4, 2020, Executive Order N-29-20 issued by Governor Newsom on March 17, 2020, and the Shelter in Place Order issued by the Napa County Health Officer on March 18, 2020, as may be periodically amended. To participate in the public scoping meeting, the public are invited to observe and address the Commission telephonically or electronically. Instructions for public participation will be included in the agenda for the meeting, which will be available one week prior to the meeting date.

The meeting space is accessible to persons with disabilities. Individuals needing special assistive devices will be accommodated to the County’s best ability. Assistive listening devices are available for the hearing impaired from the Clerk of the Board; please call (707) 253-4580 for assistance. If an American Sign Language interpreter or any other special arrangement is required, please provide the Clerk of the Board with 48-hour notice by calling (707) 253-4417.
OVERVIEW

• CEQA Process
• Purpose of the Scoping Meeting
• Program EIRs
• Environmental Issues
• Environmental Review Process
• EIR Public Participation Opportunities
• Reminder: What is a Scoping Comment
• Public Comments
CEQA Process: Steps for an EIR

1. Initial Study
2. Notice of Preparation / Scoping Meeting
3. Draft EIR
4. Public Comment Period
5. Response to Comments
6. Final EIR
7. Adequacy of EIR Analysis
8. Certification Hearing
9. Adequacy of Responses
10. Scope of EIR
Purpose of Scoping Meeting

Receive comments from the public and agencies regarding the scope of the environmental document, including:

• Key environmental issues of concern
• Potential mitigation measures
• Potential alternatives for consideration

In short, what should we be looking at in the EIR?
What is a *Program EIR*?

• A Program EIR is an EIR that considers a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project that are related either:
  - Geographically;
  - Logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions
  - Considers general criteria to govern conduct of a continuing program
  - Activities with similar environmental effects and mitigations

• Preparing a Program EIR allows for consideration of the HEU’s impacts more broadly than a project-specific EIR and for identification of program wide mitigation.
Environmental Issues

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology, Soils, & Paleontology
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Population & Housing

- Public Services & Recreation
- Utilities & Service Systems
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Wildfire
# Environmental Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish Notice of Preparation (NOP)</td>
<td>January 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIR scoping session</td>
<td>February 16, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of NOP comment period</td>
<td>February 25, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish Draft EIR</td>
<td>Late-June, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIR comment session</td>
<td>Mid-July, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Draft EIR comment period</td>
<td>August, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish Response to Comments on Draft EIR</td>
<td>October, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR Certification Hearing</td>
<td>November/December, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EIR Public Participation Opportunities

• Speak at today’s meeting
• Provide written scoping comments no later than 5:00 p.m. on February 25, 2022 to:

  Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department
  Attention: Trevor Hawkes
  1195 Third Street, Suite 210
  Napa, CA 94559
  Email: Trevor.Hawkes@countyofnapa.org

• Provide comments on the Draft EIR
• Participate in public hearings
Reminder: What is a Scoping Comment

Looking for comments regarding the scope of the environmental document, including:

- Key environmental issues of concern
- Potential mitigation measures
- Potential alternatives for consideration
Comments?
Napa County Housing Element Advisory Committee Meeting #3

15 March 2022
Topics to Discuss

• Meeting Overview

• Policies and Programs
  • Overview of Existing Policies and Programs
  • Exploration of New Policies and Programs

• Sites Inventory Analysis
  • Status Update

• Next Steps
### Key Housing Element Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Needs Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of demographic &amp; housing trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Prior Housing Element</strong></td>
<td>Report on progress during the last 8-year cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constraints Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Analyze possible barriers to addressing housing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals, Policies, &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>Establish a plan to address housing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Sites Inventory</strong></td>
<td>Identify sites where new housing can be built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals, Policies, and Programs
Housing Element Analysis Requirements: Policies and Programs

Per HCD, each jurisdiction must identify specific programs in their Housing Element that will allow it to implement the stated policies and achieve the stated goals and objectives. Policies and programs must include the following considerations:

- Specific action steps the locality will take to implement its policies and achieve its goals and objectives
- Specific timeframe for consideration
- Identify the agencies or officials responsible for implementation
- Describe the jurisdiction’s specific role in implementation
- Identify specific, measurable outcomes (wherever possible)
Existing Goals

GOAL H-1: Plan for the housing needs of all economic segments of the population residing in unincorporated Napa County.

GOAL H-2: Coordinate non-residential and residential goals, policies, and objectives with the cities and towns in Napa County to direct growth to urbanized areas, preserve agricultural land, and maintain a County-wide jobs/housing balance.

GOAL H-3: Support agricultural industries with a policy and regulatory environment that facilitates the provision of permanent and seasonal farmworker housing.

GOAL H-4: Maintain and upgrade the County’s housing stock and reduce the number of housing units lost through neglect, deterioration, or conversion from affordable to market-rate or to non-residential uses.

GOAL H-5: Maximize the provision of new affordable housing in both rental and ownership markets within unincorporated Napa County.

GOAL H-6: Maximize housing choice and economic integration, and eliminate housing discrimination in unincorporated Napa County based on race, age, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition, marital status, gender, self-identified gender or sexual orientation, or economic status.

GOAL H-7: Maintain an orderly pace of growth that helps the County preserve the public health, safety, and welfare and provide needed public services.

GOAL H-8: Increase energy efficiency and water conservation in new and existing residential structures in unincorporated Napa County.
Exploration of Possible Goal Updates

• Possible new goal related to reconstructing housing lost in wildfires.

• Possible modification of Goal H-6 to more explicitly reference Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

• Possible new goal related to removing constraints to housing production (and maintenance and conservation).

• **Other?? HEAC input needed!**
Existing Policies

• Rehabilitation Policies
• Housing Affordability Policies
• Special Needs Housing Policies
• Housing Development Policies
• Policies Regarding Removal of Government Constraints
• Energy and Water Conservation Policies
Exploration of Possible Policy Updates

- Potential New Fire Reconstruction Policies
- Potential New Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Policies
- Other?? *HEAC input needed!*
Existing Programs

- Rehabilitation Programs
- Housing Affordability Programs
- Special Needs Housing Programs
- Housing Development Programs
- Energy and Water Conservation Programs
Exploration of Possible Program Updates

- Housing Sites Rezoning for RHNA
- Affirmative Marketing of Affordable Housing Opportunities
- No Net Loss Monitoring
- Provide Housing Element copy to water and sewer providers
- SB 9 Updates
- Low-Barrier Navigation Centers (AB 101)
- Density Bonus Update (AB2345)
- Transparency for Fees on Housing
- Objective Development Standards/Streamlining (SB 35/SB330)
- Streamlining for Affordable Housing Projects (SB 35)
- Other?? HEAC input needed!
Update on Sites Inventory Analysis
Sites Inventory Status Update

Recap of Info from the Previous HEAC meeting – 11/15/2021

• Presentation on RHNA and Use of Transfers
• Summary of the Housing Element Requirements
• Summary of the Sites Inventory Requirements
• Feedback on Areas of Focus for Sites Inventory
Sites Inventory Status Update

Status since last HEAC meeting

• Community Workshop – January 20, 2022
  – Roughly 30 to 40 community members in attendance

• Stakeholder Input – Questionnaires
  – Sent to 12 different organizations with focus on housing

• Initiating RHNA Transfer Process
  – ABAG estimated to provide decision on transfers March 17, 2022

• Community Input on the Scope of the Environmental Impact Report
  – Received input on housing inventory sites

• Narrowing down sites to include in the inventory
  – From roughly 30 potential parcels, narrowed down to roughly 10 to 13

• Drafting Sites Inventory Analysis
Sites Inventory Status Update

RHNA Transfer Process

- State law allows unincorporated counties to transfer a portion of their RHNA to willing cities; transfers are subject to approval by ABAG

- County requesting transfers which if approved by ABAG would substantially reduce the County’s RHNA

- Napa County has pursued this option since 2010, entering into multiple agreements with cities

- Transfers would be based on signed agreements between the County and the cities of American Canyon, Napa, and St. Helena
Site Inventory Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Very Low Income Units</th>
<th>Low Income Units</th>
<th>Moderate Income Units</th>
<th>Above Moderate Income Units</th>
<th>Total Units*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2021 RHNA Allocation</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Requested Transfers</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County’s Revised RHNA (if Approved)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The County must plan for the total number of units by income category plus a buffer.
Sites Inventory Status Update

Sites Inventory Considerations

• HCD recommends that the housing element provide a buffer in addition to simply providing sites to meet the RHNA which will also reduce the risk of having to identify additional sites before the next housing element update

• The sites inventory must provide sites suitable for lower income housing; the law specifies a “default density” of 20 DU per acre

• Per AB 686, sites must be evaluated through the lens of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing
  – Evaluating the sites inventory for the ability to accommodate lower-income housing located in areas of higher opportunity
Site Selection Criteria

1. Sites must have access to existing or planned water, sewer, and other dry utilities with sufficient capacity available to support housing development; (*State requirement*)

2. Sites must generally be between 0.5 and 10 acres in size; (*State requirement*)

3. Sites must be located outside of areas designated in the General Plan as Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space as of September 28, 2007 (the date specified in Measure P, approved by the voters in November 2008). Notwithstanding this requirement, sites within these areas may be identified for qualifying farmworker housing development and sites identified as an existing commercial establishment on General Plan Figure AG.LU-2: Location of Parcels Subject to Policy AG/LU-45 may be identified for redevelopment. (*Local Requirement*)

Additional Goals Considered

4. Located outside of high and very high fire severity zones as designated (in State Responsibility Areas) or recommended (in Local Responsibility Areas) by CalFire

5. Located outside of Zones A through D of the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

6. Proximate to transit routes and/or employment opportunities and services (e.g. groceries)
Sites Inventory Status Update

Sites Inventory Process

1) **Identify Sites** (and describe the characteristics of suitable sites including zoning, infrastructure availability, and environmental constraints)

2) **Very-low and low-income RHNA accommodation analysis**

3) **Capacity Analysis**

4) **Determine Adequate Sites** (determination of whether sufficient sites exist to accommodate RHNA or if there is a shortfall requiring a program to rezone additional sites.)
Sites Inventory Status Update

Sites Inventory Outline

1) Introduction
   • Regional Housing Needs Allocation – Context / Transfer Summary
   • Summary of Capacity to Accommodate RHNA
   • Summary of Sites Inventory Meeting AFFH

2) Sites Selection Process
   • Methodology/Evaluation of Possible Sites
     • Review of Prior HE Sites
     • Review of Single Family Residential and ADUs
     • Review of Vacant / Nonvacant Sites
     • Farmworker Housing
     • Infrastructure/Environmental Constraints
     • Sites for Rezoning
   • Realistic Capacity of Sites
   • Review of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels

3) Draft Sites Inventory
   • List of Sites / Figures
   • Summaries of Development Sites
   • Evaluation of Sites Inventory and AFFH

• Appendix – Detailed Sites Inventory for HCD Submittal
Sites Inventory Status Update

General Areas of Focus for Sites:

• Spanish Flat
• Northeast of Napa
• Carneros
• Foster Road
• Public/Private Partnerships
• Opportunities (or Incentives) for Farmworker Housing Sites
Sites Inventory Status Update

Example: Spanish Flat Sites

- Up to 3 or 4 possible sites
- Review for:
  - Environmental Constraints
  - Infrastructure Constraints
  - Ownership / Potential for Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN 019-261-035</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Acreage</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>AW:AH</td>
<td>AW:AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Allowable Density (units/acre)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unit Potential</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (with Proposed)</td>
<td><strong>55 to 68 TBD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development: The site is publicly owned and would be served by the existing infrastructure at the site and has no apparent environmental constraints other than proximity to a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. This site was identified as a site in the prior housing element.
Next Steps
Housing Element Progress

January – County Requests RHNA Transfer Approval by ABAG

EIR and CEQA Process
Ongoing Community Outreach
Updated Policies and Programs
Site Inventory
Future HEAC Meetings
January 31, 2023 HCD Deadline
Next Steps

- Draft Housing Element Update Circulated for Public Review
- Meetings of the HEAC, Planning Commission, & Board of Supervisors
- *Revised* Draft Housing Element Update submitted to HCD for Review
- Draft EIR Circulated for Public Review
- Meeting of the HEAC to Review HCD Comments
- *Re-Revised* Draft Housing Element Considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors
- Adopted Housing Element Submitted to HCD for Certification
Meeting Minutes

Napa County Housing Element Advisory Committee

Joelle Gallagher Terry Scott (Chair) David Morrison, Secretary-Director
Megan Dameron Keri Akemi-Hernandez (Vice-Chair) Silva Darbinian, Committee Counsel
Anne Cottrell (Alternate) Teresa Zimny Trevor Hawkes, Planner III
Kellie Anderson Mike Swanton Alexandria Quackenbush, Committee Clerk
Tom Gamble Heather Stanton
Ron Rhyno Jenna Bolyarde

Tuesday March 15, 2021 9:00 AM Virtual Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL (Video timestamp 00:00:21)
Committee Members Present: Joelle Gallagher, Kellie Anderson, Ron Rhyno, Terry Scott, Teresa Zimny, Heather Stanton, Alternate Committee Member Anne Cottrell, Keri Akemi-Hernandez (arrived after Item 4A).
Committee Members Not Present: Jenna Bolyarde, Mike Swanton, Megan Dameron.
Staff Present: David Morrison, Trevor Hawkes, Alexandria Quackenbush, Robert Mone.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (Video timestamp 00:01:34)
Chair Scott led the salute to the flag.

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Video timestamp 00:02:10 and 00:04:36)
Public comment: Larry Kromann, Esbeidy Pina.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Video timestamp 00:02:45)
The Clerk of the Committee request approval of Minutes for the meetings held on:
October 26, 2021 (All Commissioners Present) and November 15, 2021 (All Commissioners Present).

Committee Members voted to approve minutes for the meetings held on October 26 and November 15, 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD/AC</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>X/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. AGENDA REVIEW / MEETING OVERVIEW (Video timestamp 00:03:10 and again at 00:8:15)
Trevor Hawkes gave the review.

A request for clarification was made by members on the purpose of the HEAC, the role of committee members, and future meeting locations/format (in-person/virtual).

**Member Comments:** Committee Member Stanton, and Member Anderson.

6. DISCLOSURES (Video timestamp 00:20:35)
None.

7. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Policies and Programs – Discussion and Advisory Item (Video timestamp 00:21:00)

Development of Housing Element Policies and Programs.

BAE Consultant Matt Kowta provided a summary of the update process for the County’s Housing Element and the status of reviewing the existing goals, policies, and programs as well as gathering input from HEAC members on developing draft goals, policies and programs for the Housing Element update. Specifically, Mr. Kowta summarized the requirements/considerations when developing goals, policies, and programs and solicited feedback from HEAC members on the existing goals, policies, and programs with further discussion had between members about possible new goals or modifications to the exiting goals.

**Member Comments:** Chairperson Scott, Member Gallagher, Member Stanton, Member Zimny, Member Rhyno, Member Anderson, Member Gamble, Member Cottrell, Member Akemi-Hernandez.

Committee Members provided guidance to staff and consultants on which goals, policies, and programs should be included as part of the Housing Element update and the overall areas of focus to consider while developing the goals, policies, and programs. The attachments for this meeting were reviewed (Programs Summary sheet, Potential Goal and Policy Revisions) and the presentation of those goals, policies, and programs was provided with discussion by members and staff throughout. Areas of focus for goals, policies, or programs that were mentioned by HEAC members, and the public included:

- Local employee preference for rent or workforce housing (possible ordinance)
- Further address a better jobs and housing balance
- Facilitate opportunities for farmworker housing and workforce housing
- Improved tracking of progress with regards to meeting housing goals
- Specific and inclusive polices to directly address AFFH
- Improved marketing of affordable housing developers/opportunities for affordable housing

Committee Members requested that staff provide background information via the County’s Annual Progress Reports (APRs) to all members, so they can review the progress on the specific Housing Element items and consider revisions.

**Public comment:** Angelica Chavez, Esbeidy Pina.

**B. Development and Status of the Sites Inventory Analysis – Discussion and Advisory Item (Video timestamp 01:49:40)**

ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided a status update and summary of the Housing Element update process for the inventory of possible sites to accommodate housing for the planning period. The update summarized the content covered at the prior HEAC meeting as well as those tasks accomplished since the prior meeting. Hillary provided context regarding the Housing Element Update components, planning process, and related actions that will occur along with the Housing Element Update (such as the RHNA transfer process). Further, Ms. Gitelman outlined the approach for the sites inventory analysis and the process taken to evaluate sites for inclusion in the sites inventory. An example was provided of a possible site and the evaluation process considered as part of the review.

**Public comment:** None

**Member Comments:** Member Cottrell, Member Anderson, Member Rhyno.

Committee Members requested additional clarification on the methodology behind the site selection process and information on the possible sites with focus requested on providing justification for why a site was selected and why it has not developed in previous cycles.

**8. NEXT STEPS / STAFF AND COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS (Video timestamp 02:19:30)**

County Staff Trevor Hawkes outlined the next steps in the Napa County Housing Element Update process, including interim dates and deadlines between the next HEAC Meeting (noting three remaining HEAC meetings) and future input provided to the planning Commission and Board of Supervisors with submittal/review of the revised Housing Element by HCD.

**Member Comments:** Committee Member Anderson, Chairperson Scott, Member Gallagher, Member Stanton.

Committee members requested additional information (at least four or five days prior to the next HEAC meeting) for use in review of the goals, policies, and programs as well as consideration of in-person meetings for future meetings.
County staff will send the additional materials to HEAC members for their reference (to include draft the Housing Needs Assessment and draft Assessment of Fair Housing documents). County staff also indicated that comments and input on the Housing Element can continue to be sent through Trevor Hawkes.

Public comment: None

9. ADJOURNMENT (Video timestamp 02:29:14)
Meeting adjourned.

ALEXANDRIA QUACKENBUSHER, Clerk of the Committee

Key
Vote: JG = Joelle Gallagher; MD = Megan Dameron; KA = Kellie Anderson; TG = Tom Gamble; RR = Ron Rhyno; TS = Terry Scott; KA-H = Keri Akemi-Hernandez; TZ = Teresa Zimny; MS = Mike Swanton; HS = Heather Stanton; JB = Jenna Bolyarde; AC = Anne Cottrell (Alternate)
Notations under vote: Y = Yes; N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused; 1st = 1st motion; 2nd = 2nd motion

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics to Discuss

- Meeting Overview
- Input on Housing Needs Assessment and AFH
- Sites Inventory Analysis
- Goals, Policies, and Programs
- Next Steps
# Key Housing Element Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Analysis of demographic &amp; housing trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Prior Housing Element</td>
<td>Report on progress during the last 8-year cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints Analysis</td>
<td>Analyze possible barriers to addressing housing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals, Policies, &amp; Programs</td>
<td>Establish a plan to address housing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Sites Inventory</td>
<td>Identify sites where new housing can be built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Needs Assessment and AFH
Feedback on Housing Needs Assessment and AFH

Feedback / Discussion

• Comments on the previously presented Housing Needs Assessment (HNA/AFH)
Update on Sites Inventory Analysis
Sites Inventory Summary

Recap of Info from the Previous HEAC meeting – 3/15/2021

• Presentation on RHNA and Use of Transfers

• Review of Existing Goals, Policies, and Programs

• Exploration of New Goals, Policies, and Programs

• Status Update on the Sites Inventory
Sites Inventory Summary

Status since last HEAC meeting

• RHNA Transfer Process
  – ABAG approved RHNA transfers March 17, 2022

• Stakeholder Input – Questionnaires
  – Sent to 12 different organizations with focus on housing
  – Received input from 10 of 12 organizations

• Community Input on the Scope of the Environmental Impact Report
  – Received input on housing inventory sites

• Narrowing down sites to include in the inventory
  – From roughly 13 potential parcels, narrowed down to 6 sites

• Completed Admin Draft of Sites Inventory Analysis
Sites Inventory Summary

Napa County’s RHNA

- County requested transfers which were approved by ABAG to reduce the County’s RHNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low Income Units</th>
<th>Low Income Units</th>
<th>Moderate Income Units</th>
<th>Above Moderate Income Units</th>
<th>Total Units*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County’s RHNA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The County must plan for the total number of units by income category plus a buffer.*
## Sites Inventory Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Info</th>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low and Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County RHNA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential Development Potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU Projection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity on Identified Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Flat</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE of Napa – Bishop</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE of Napa - Altamura</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE of Napa – Big Ranch Corner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Owned Site (Imola Ave)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Road</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal of Identified Sites</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unit Potential</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (+) / Deficit (-) from RHNA</td>
<td>+422</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites Inventory Summary

1. Spanish Flat
2. Bishop
3. Altamura
4. Big Ranch Corner
5. Imola Avenue
6. Foster Road
Sites Inventory Summary

1. Spanish Flat
2. Bishop
3. Altamura
4. Big Ranch Corner
5. Imola Avenue
6. Foster Road
Sites Inventory Summary

Spanish Flat Site (Site 1)

- Two parcels comprise one site proposed for rezoning
- Privately owned
- Developer interest expressed
- Sloping terrain
- Spanish Flat Water District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 1 - Vacant ☐ or Non-Vacant ☒</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portion of APN 019-261-041 and APN 019-261-040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>18.38 acres</td>
<td>18.38 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>CN:AHCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 min. 25 max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites Inventory Summary

Northeast of Napa Sites

Bishop (Site 2)

- One parcel, with portion proposed for rezoning
- Privately Owned
- Developer Interest Expressed
- Would need City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 2 – Vacant ☐ or Non-Vacant ☒</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN 039-320-005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites Inventory Summary

Northeast of Napa Sites

Altamura (Site 3)

- One parcel proposed for rezoning
- Privately Owned
- Developer Interest Expressed
- Would need City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 3 – Vacant ☐ or Non-Vacant ☒</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN 039-320-016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites Inventory Summary

Northeast of Napa Sites

**Big Ranch Corner (Site 4)**

- One parcel, with portion proposed for rezoning
- Privately Owned
- Developer Interest Expressed
- Would need City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater

### Site 4 – Vacant ☐ or Non-Vacant ☒

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to be Rezoned</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1 20 min 25 max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity (With Rezoning)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APN: 038-190-007

Parcel Size: 3 acres

Site Size: 1.5 acres
**Sites Inventory Summary**

**Imola Avenue (Site 5)**

- One parcel, with 20.34-acre portion designated surplus property by DGS
- State Owned and interest expressed for development on 5 acres
- Would not be subject to County zoning or General Plan
- Would need City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 5 – Vacant ☐ or Non-Vacant ☒</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN 046-450-041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>201.7</td>
<td>201.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Surplus Property Identified by DGS (Acres)</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Identified for Housing per DGS Staff (Acres)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>AW:SWP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites Inventory Summary

Foster Road (Site 6)
- One parcel, with a portion proposed for rezoning
- Privately Owned and interest expressed for development
- Inside the City of Napa SOI & RUL
- Would need City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 6 – Vacant ☑ or Non-Vacant ☐</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN 043-062-008</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size (Acres)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Identified for Housing per DGS Staff (Acres)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>AW:UR</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Density (Units/Acre)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Unit Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals, Policies, and Programs
Status of Goals, Policies, and Programs

Update Since Last HEAC

• Status of adjustments to preliminary goals, policies, and programs discussed at the last HEAC meeting
Next Steps
Housing Element Progress

- January – County Requests RHNA Transfer Approval by ABAG
- EIR and CEQA Process
- Ongoing Community Outreach
- Updated Policies and Programs
- Site Inventory
- Future HEAC Meetings
- January 31, 2023 HCD Deadline
Next Steps

• Board of Supervisors Study Session (May 3)

• Draft Housing Element Update Circulated for Public Review (May 13 to June 13)

• Meetings of the Planning Commission (June 1)

• HEAC Meeting (June 13?)

• Revised Draft Housing Element Update submitted to HCD for Review

• Draft EIR Circulated for Public Review

• Meeting of the HEAC to Review HCD Comments

• Re-Revised Draft Housing Element Considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors

• Adopted Housing Element Submitted to HCD for Certification
1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL (Video timestamp 00:00:17)
   Committee Members Present: Kellie Anderson, Terry Scott, Teresa Zimny, Heather Stanton, Tom Gamble, Megan Dameron, Mike Swanton, Keri Akemi-Hernandez, Joelle Gallagher (Joined at Agenda Item 4), and Ron Rhyno (Joined after Agenda Item 5).
   Committee Members Not Present: Jenna Bolyarde, and Anne Cottrell (Alternate)
   Staff Present: David Morrison, Trevor Hawkes, Alexandria Quackenbush

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (Video timestamp 00:02:09)
   Chairperson Scott led the salute to the flag.

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Video timestamp 00:02:40)
   Public comment: Ryan O’Connell, Marcus Helmer, Esbeidy Pina.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Video timestamp 00:05:14)
   The Clerk of the Committee requested approval of minutes for the meeting held on: March 15, 2022.
   Minutes were approved unanimously by the members present.

5. AGENDA REVIEW / MEETING OVERVIEW (Video timestamp 00:06:25)
   Trevor Hawkes provided the review and summary of the documents attached to the agenda packet for further discussion under Agenda Item #7 Business Items.
A request was made by members and the public on the need for translation services at HEAC meetings, as well as comments regarding the timing of future meetings and services provided for those meetings (request for evening meetings).

**Member Comments:** Committee Member Stanton, Member Scott, Member Anderson, Member Akemi-Hernandez, Member Gallagher, Trevor Hawkes, and Director Morrison.

6. **DISCLOSURES (Video timestamp 00:19:45)**

   None.

7. **BUSINESS ITEMS**

   **A. HEAC Feedback on Housing Needs Assessment/AFH documents provided previously – Discussion and Advisory Item (Video timestamp 00:20:05 and later discussed at Video Timestamp 02:11:20 due to technical issues)**

   County Planner Trevor Hawkes provided a summary of this item and requested that committee members use this time as a period to discuss the draft HNA and AFH supporting documents attached to the agenda. BAE Consultant Matt Kowta provided a summary of the feedback received on the two documents (HNA and AFH) with the focus on member comments submitted prior to the meeting which addressed the following:

   - Review current and future areas of proposed annexation by LAFCO. Including Browns Valley areas and other County islands.
   - Demographic statistics
   - Opportunity areas and low resource areas
   - Information related to CalEnviroScreen data
   - Displacement issues related to mobile home parks
   - Proximity to services and amenities

   **Member Comments:** Member Anderson, Director Morrison, Member Stanton, Chairperson Scott, Member Gamble, Member Zimny, and Member Akemi-Hernandez.

   **Public comment:** Esbeidy Pina (via chat).

   **B. Status of the Sites Inventory Analysis – Discussion Item (Video timestamp 00:43:00)**

   ESA Consultant Hillary Gitelman provided a status update and summary of the Housing Element update process for the inventory of possible sites to accommodate housing for the planning period. The update summarized the status of the RHNA transfer process as well as the update on the sites analysis since the last HEAC meeting on March 15, 2022. Hillary provided the context for the sites inventory analysis and the process taken to evaluate sites for inclusion in the sites inventory to accommodate the County’s updated RHNA. Further, Ms. Gitelman opened up the discussion for members to give input on the sites identified and
the site information slides presented for evaluation and review. Member discussion focused on how the County’s RHNA will be addressed using estimates for single family housing units and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as well as discussion on farmworker housing. A list of topics addressed by members during this item include:

- ADUs
- Farmworker Housing
- City of Napa RUL and SOI and the provision of services to identified sites
- Fire Hazard Severity Zones and Insurance
- Affordability Assumptions for sites
- The use of previously identified sites in the last Housing Element Cycle.
- Mobile Home Parks
- Further clarifications on specific sites via coordination with different agencies/jurisdictions on services and number of housing units potential accommodated (Imola Ave site and Foster Road site).

Public comment: Ryan O’Connell.

Member Comments: Member Stanton, Member Gamble, Member Anderson, Member Gallagher, Member Swanton, and Member Rhyno.

C. Goals, Policies and Programs – Discussion and Advisory Item (Video timestamp 01:44:25)

BAE Consultant Matt Kowta provided a summary of the update process for the County’s Housing Element and the status of reviewing the existing goals, policies, and programs and Mr. Kowta opened up the floor and solicited feedback from HEAC members with discussion of the supporting document attached to the agenda. Areas of focus for goals, policies, or programs that were mentioned by HEAC members, and the public included:
- Facilitate opportunities for farmworker housing and workforce housing
- Enacting zoning changes at mobile home parks to preserve their use and affordability and rent stabilization.
- Specific and inclusive polices to directly address AFFH

Member Comments: Chairperson Scott, Member Anderson, Director Morrison, Member Gallagher, Member Zimny, Member Rhyno.

Public comment: None.

D. Schedule of Next Steps – Discussion and Advisory Item (Video timestamp 01:59:38)

Trevor Hawkes provided an overview of the HEU process and the next steps for future HEAC meetings.
Tentative Dates:

- Board of Supervisors Study Session (May 3)
- Draft Housing Element Update Circulated for Public Review (May 13 to June 13)
- Meetings of the Planning Commission (June 1)
- HEAC Meeting (June 13?)
- *Revised* Draft Housing Element Update submitted to HCD for Review
- Draft EIR Circulated for Public Review
- Meeting of the HEAC to Review HCD Comments
- *Re-Revised* Draft Housing Element Considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors
- Adopted Housing Element Submitted to HCD for Certification

**Member Comments:** Member Anderson, Director Morrison, Member Rhyno, Chairperson Scott.

Question by members about the guidelines for communication with other committee members. It was clarified that communication can occur between less than 6 HEAC members.

**Public comment:** None.

8. **NEXT STEPS / STAFF AND COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS (Video timestamp 02:11:20)**

The committee members circled back to agenda item 7A about a question by Member Anderson on the analysis of high pollution areas. Consultant Matt Kowta clarified that the data comes from the Cal EnviroScience website and a link to that info was provided to Member Anderson for reference.

**Public comment:** None

9. **ADJOURNMENT (Video timestamp 02:14:40)**

Meeting adjourned.
Key
Vote: JG = Joelle Gallagher; MD = Megan Dameron; KA = Kellie Anderson; TG = Tom Gamble; RR = Ron Rhyno; TS = Terry Scott; KA-H = Keri Akemi-Hernandez; TZ = Teresa Zimny; MS = Mike Swanton; HS = Heather Stanton; JB = Jenna Bolyarde; AC = Anne Cottrell (Alternate)
Notations under vote: Y = Yes; N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused; 1st = 1st motion; 2nd = 2nd motion

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JG</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>KA-H</th>
<th>TZ</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity Working Group Findings and Recommendations Report
3/28/2022
Napa Sonoma Collaborative
Report prepared by Toccarra Nicole Thomas, AICP, Deputy Director
Staff Support: Luke Lindenbusch, Housing Planner

Executive Summary

The Equity Working Group (EWG) was convened by the Napa Sonoma Collaborative to engage community members in the Housing Element Update process within the Napa Sonoma region. The EWG also had the secondary purpose of exposing jurisdictions to community members outside of the formal public participation process. Over the course of six sessions the EWG discussed barriers, obstacles, and constraints to providing affordable housing within the Napa Sonoma region as well as developed recommendations for how to address these issues. The EWG members were nominated by members of the Napa Sonoma Collaborative due to their work within the community, including those who directly engage vulnerable populations, provide housing for vulnerable populations, or are a member of a vulnerable population. Stipends/Honoria of $960 were offered to each EWG member for their time serving on the EWG. This report outlines key findings, constraints, and potential solutions to the constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Providing Equity for Underrepresented Groups Regionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Access to Housing and Fair Housing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barriers to Obtaining Affordable/Decent Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Obstacles to Securing/Maintaining Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Farmworker Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Housing Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concentration of Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landlord Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>Review Recommendations and Findings Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>Review &amp; Provide Input on Report from the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law – Preliminary Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the six sessions, the EWG discussed explicit and implicit barriers to obtaining and maintaining affordable housing and this document outlines key findings, repeated themes, and recommendations from the EWG to the NSC. Although this is a comprehensive report, it is strongly suggested that the EWG meeting minutes are reviewed for the full record of the EWG (attached). Key findings include:

- The current approach to housing policies throughout the region is ad hoc and piecemeal and what is really needed is a holistic approach to housing and homelessness issues.
 Affordable homeownership is missing from the conversation

 Transitional and supportive housing as a more integrated part of the whole conversation is missing

 The traditional paradigm of designing affordable housing should be changed at the educational level; design professionals should be educated to think holistically about designing communities and integrating affordable housing patterns into community design

• A lack of community trust leads to a lack of honest and transparent communication and engagement between local governments, partner agencies and the community members

• Additional housing costs are not factored into the affordable housing definition
  o The official definition of affordable housing does not include all related housing costs
    ▪ Those who live in deed-restricted affordable housing face food shortages, high insurance rates, and rising utility costs to name a few, which are not factored into the official definition of affordable housing. Yet these are costs that must be included in an already strained budget
  o Supercommuting leads to higher gas costs and more wear and tear on cars but is necessary to find and maintain affordable housing
  o The housing situation within the region leads to students working to support their families, creating an unintended consequence of students dropping out of their educational careers and/or leaving the community after they matriculate from High School since they cannot afford housing
  o Onerous regulation leads to displacement

• Affordable homeownership is missing from the conversation as renting is not a sustainable approach for all and it prevents people from accessing the “American Dream”

• The lack of affordable and safe housing due to high development costs, loss of units due to disasters, and/or gentrification (the EWG specifically called out investors renovating potentially naturally occurring affordable housing into higher end units) are some of the contributing factors to the housing crisis within the region.

• Discrimination is both subtle and overt
  o Tenants are susceptible to landlords taking advantage of them due to a very specific cocktail of issues including but not limited to
    ▪ Language barriers
    ▪ Cultural Barriers
    ▪ Stereotypes
    ▪ Disabilities
    ▪ Income
  o Discrimination is a multilayered situation:
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- Tenants in substandard/unhealthy housing live in precarious situations and are afraid to complain due to the fear of being evicted (which means that they live in substandard living conditions)
- There is a very real fear that rents will increase if tenants complain about substandard situations
  - Stereotypes associated with low-income tenants and voucher holders are a real barrier to obtaining housing
    - Criminal backgrounds and subsidies contribute to stereotypes which make landlords leery of renting.
    - SB 329 makes it illegal to reject housing vouchers, however, it still occurs
  - Discrimination is hard to determine since there aren’t enough vacancies to even apply for housing
- The lack of available land coupled with regulations and high impact fees are contributing factors to astronomical development costs

Conventional vs. Unconventional Approaches to Providing Housing

A reoccurring theme from the Equity Working Group is that conventional housing approaches are insufficient to address the severe housing crisis within the region and approaches tried to date have been ad hoc and piecemeal when a more regional, integrative, and creative approach to fully address the housing crisis is needed. Traditional housing approaches (single-family homes or apartments intended for the middle class) are no longer appropriate as housing needs increasingly include the unhoused, multi-generational families, those with criminal backgrounds and other “stories to tell,” and neo-traditional family patterns. Local governments should investigate the following approaches:

- Be creative and holistic. The EWG recommends some creative approaches such as engaging local university design centers, architecture schools, and urban planning departments to create a design studio to immediately address a community’s housing concerns in a holistic manner.
- Seriously consider tiny homes (and by extension tiny home villages) as a concept. Some examples that have gained local traction include efforts in the City of Petaluma, on the County-owned Los Gullicos property in East Sonoma County, and in villages for the unhoused in Los Angeles and in Eugene, Oregon. In addition to its relevance for the homeless, tiny homes may also address a segment of farmworker housing.
- Engage stakeholders that have been absent from the EWG including industry groups such as builders’ councils, farm bureaus, and construction trade unions. As the providers of infrastructure, land, and bricks, mortar, asphalt, and concrete, they have necessary expertise as well and need to be contacted by local planners.
**Inclusive Input**

The lack of community trust was identified as a significant barrier and constraint to fair housing within the region as those who most need to participate in the public process are leery of the process and local governments and as a result do not participate. The EWG explicitly shared that the lack of community trust is a barrier to full public participation and provided several sobering anecdotes and suggestions for how to remediate this lack of trust between the community, the local governments, and service providers within the region. In short, all partners must strive to engage the community where they are, on an ongoing nature, and much earlier in the process (the entitlement approval stage is too late for meaningful input). The EWG outlined the following recommendations for local governments to engage the community in an inclusive and meaningful manner:

- Start the community engagement process early and often. Encouraging input before the official process begins can prevent community members from feeling “blindsided.”
- Meet the community where they are by providing in-language meetings.
  - The outcomes of public meetings are drastically different when held in English vs Spanish (and other languages). There are drastically different outcomes and feedback gathered related to housing in general and affordable housing projects specifically. One anecdote provided described a proposed affordable housing development where English language attendees complained about the project and its proximity to them, whereas attendees at a Spanish only meeting for the same project were concerned about when the project would be developed and how they could apply for the housing.
  - A direct recommendation to overcome the language barrier (and gain community trust) is to host “in language” meetings (which run parallel to the public participation process, and do not eliminate the existing formal public participation process) and provide materials in said language. Note: simultaneous interpretation during public meetings is hard to achieve since simultaneous translation assumes a level of technical expertise which could exclude members.
- Engage with community organizations early and build relationships with partner agencies before public input is needed so that engagement does not feel transactional.
- Be transparent about their goals, how these goals will be measured, and then report back out to the community on a regular basis about progress (successful or not).
- Encourage developers to include amenities such as community benefit rooms; anecdotes were shared that highlighted how community members indicated that community rooms (those that included posters and materials about upcoming projects and a process to
collect feedback) increased community trust as community members felt as if they are informed throughout the process and not after a project has commenced.

- Engage community members well before the entitlement approval stage for feedback and input

**Lack of Housing Stock**

The EWG spoke at length about the lack of affordable and safe units throughout the region due to a variety of factors including but not limited to the cost of land, high development costs, units leaving the market due to disasters faster than their replacement rate, and landlords displacing tenants due to housing emergencies, and gentrification (the EWG specifically called out investors renovating potentially naturally occurring affordable housing into higher end units). Local governments with limited funding can help alleviate these constraints by:

- Ensuring that renters are truly being evicted with cause, and, ensuring that renovations which displace renters are completed instead of used as a ruse to displace residents.
  - There is suspicion that local landlords of income generating properties are displacing tenants when their main properties are destroyed due to local disasters. There is a case study underway to verify this hypothesis (by reviewing building permits to establish completion of renovations) and it was explicitly stated that landlords displacing tenants is a greater risk for the region as wildfires and natural disasters eliminate housing at a faster rate than it is rebuilt along with other housing capacity constraints.

- Support the creation of accessory dwelling units (ADUs/JADUs), duplexes, multiplexes, single-room occupancies (SROs).

- Develop programs for the registration of Short-Term Rentals, prevent concentrations of short-term rentals in one location, and prevent stays of longer than 120 days a year.
  - Additionally local governments should prohibit short term rentals in communities with severe housing constraints.
  - Disallow conversions of homes and potentially naturally occurring affordable housing to vacation rentals.

- Zone more land for housing which will directly decrease land costs and development costs.
  - One suggestion is to increase the density for underutilized farmland and allow for the safe habitation of underutilized farm buildings. This suggestion will be particularly impactful for farmworkers as the face of farmworkers has shifted from a single migratory man to families looking for long term housing and amenities. The EWG discussed how families settled along the HWY 12 and HWY 101 corridors.
to have access to farms and amenities which is a departure from traditional patterns of on-farm bunkhouses.

- Providing subsidies or “breaks” on impact fees for developers of affordable housing:
  - The EWG explicitly identified impact fees as a factor that increases the cost of developing affordable housing.
    - Discussion is needed about affordable vs. market rate impact fees.
    - Staffing constraints in local government offices are a direct contributor to higher development costs (since projects either have an extended timeline causing loan interest accruals or developers obtain outside plan check consultants to streamline plan checks to keep projects moving).

- Ensuring that density bonus units are integrated into a development (not placed in one corner of a development further stigmatizing affordable units), ensure that community members are aware that density bonus units are integral to a development and included in the project entitlements, and are not a “last minute add on” which can lead to NIMBYism.

- Establishing “one stop shops” for affordable housing permit processing thereby making it easier and faster for developers to build housing which helps decrease costs.

- Facilitate the creation of ADU/JADUs by individual homeowners by:
  - Connecting homeowners with the Napa/Sonoma ADU Center to facilitate the ADU/JADU development process
  - Considering unconventional alternative dwelling options such as tiny homes, individually or in the community for unhoused and/or farmworker residents

- Work with neighboring jurisdictions to create regional based programs to address issues.

**Housing Discrimination**

- Discrimination looks different based on the demographics of an area.
- Systemic racism is directly tied to discrimination; people of color tend to have lower credit scores and criminal histories due to systemic racism which then leads to barriers to obtaining housing.
- The lack of vacancies causes tenants to accept subpar housing and/or harassment.
- Landlords illegally discriminate against renters with subsidies by refusing to accept subsides. SB 329 makes it illegal for landlords to reject housing vouchers, yet discrimination against vouchers still occurs.
- Local governments should consider national origin and race as a distinct and perhaps overlapping characteristic to discrimination; local governments should not solely focus on race, as there needs to be a holistic approach to address discrimination.
- Local governments should consider the following to alleviate this barrier:
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- Address the root cause patterns of zoning that create disparities.
- Create programs to educate landlords to help prevent discrimination.
- Understand that there is a difference between ethnicity and race, and the federal government categorizes them differently.
  - The HUD definition of race-based discrimination does not account for national origin discrimination, and local governments should incorporate the eradication of national origin discrimination into its toolboxes
  - High Latino and Asian demographics create the possibility of instances of national origin discrimination instead of race-based discrimination. For example: a white landlord denying an Asian applicant the opportunity to apply because they are Asian is a race-based complaint but a Filipino applicant that is denied by a Korean homeowner because the applicant is Filipino is a national origin-based discrimination because two ethnicities within the same race are involved in allegation
- Provide educational materials and require a signature from landlords to acknowledge that they have taken some form of training:
  - Create a landlord database and pass ordinances that makes landlord registration with the jurisdiction mandatory. This could be enforced by Code Enforcement and the focus should be on education to gain compliance. The landlord registration should have a yearly compliance and education component on fair housing (e.g. successful completion of a course on fair housing in order to maintain a landlord permit).
  - Hosting landlord forums to educate landlords about subsidies/Section 8 vouchers.
    - Berkeley, Alameda, San Francisco have implemented source of income discrimination protections and the state has adopted them as broader protections.
- Look at local dynamics, demographics, patterns and how they play into the discussion and if there are any additional protections that can be implemented.

Farmworker Housing

The EWG discussed the strong agricultural focus within the region and how this focus creates barriers to increasing housing stock due to political pushback from rezoning/developing farmland into housing, disdainful attitudes towards RHNA, the high barriers for smaller and neotraditional farms to be successful which translates to missed opportunities to create livable wage jobs (high land lease costs due to regulatory barriers prevent smaller farms from passing those savings on to employees via higher wages). The EWG discussed these barriers as a significant missed
opportunity to provide housing to the community in general and for farmworkers specifically. Some highlights from the conversation include:

- The increasing commute times for all industries in the Bay Area and subregion predominantly due to the high cost of living and the cost of housing are likely affecting farmworkers the hardest, exemplified by the increasing length of commutes.
- The idea that farmworkers live in rural areas and on farms is no longer true as far more live along the HWY 101 and HWY 12 corridor to access amenities for their families.
- The nature of farm work has changed from seasonal to year-round.
- There’s a significant increase in the cost and time it takes for farmworkers to commute to work.
- Smaller farmers with non-traditional crops (cannabis) are becoming more prevalent within the region, and the traditional farm format along with traditional zoning precludes them from living on their farm which drives up costs (they must lease the farm and living quarters along with other operational costs) essentially pricing out these small businesses which has an unintended effect of precluding the creation of livable wage jobs.

Local governments can do the following to address these barriers:

- Increase bedroom counts, as limiting housing types in farm zoning designations to one bedroom/SRO/bunkhouses no longer reflects the needs of changing farmworker demographics (more families and more women).
- Increase the density for agriculturally zoned land which would allow smaller farm owners and/or neo traditional farm owners to live on the land (the costs of leasing land as well as leasing living quarters removes the potential for creating living wage jobs as any potential profits are eliminated due to high operating costs).
- Meaningfully engage with organizations that directly assist farmworkers:
  - California Human Development Corporation (CHDC)
  - La Luz Center
  - Corazon Healdsburg
  - California Coalition of Rural Housing (CCRH)
  - North Bay Jobs for Justice
  - United Farm Workers

Additional Suggestions to Consider Incorporating into Housing Elements

- Local governments need matching funds for state and federal funds to deploy additional programs.
- Convert surplus government lands into affordable housing via the Land Trust Model.
- Seriously consider the conversion of old hotels/motels into SROs via permitting and subsidies on a larger holistic level AKA transitional housing.
• Safe Parking Programs for Unhoused
• Supportive services need greater circulation to outreach to those in need

The Equity Working Group respectfully submits these findings report to the Napa Sonoma Collaborative, and members are individually available to provide additional commentary and support.
**Equity Working Group Session #1 Meeting Notes**
**January 26, 2022 1:30 PM -2:30 PM**

**Attendees:**
- Arthur George, Community Stakeholder
- Rue Furch, Community Stakeholder
- Colleen Halbohm, Wallace House
- Efren Carrillo, Burbank Housing
- Jésus Guzmán, Corazón Healdsburg
- Pablo Zatarain, Napa Fair Housing
- Caroline Banuelos, Sonoma State University
- Staff
  - Toccarra Nicole Thomas, *AICP, CQIA, Deputy Director Planning Services, 4Leaf, Inc.*

**Introductions:** Each member introduced themselves, their organizations and a brief synopsis of their key focus areas. After introductions the discussion then turned towards housekeeping items for the management of the Equity Working Group.

**Icebreaker recap:** Staff reviewed the brief poll to break the ice and open up conversation with the EWG members.

**Time commitment:** Staff reviewed the time commitment to serve on the EWG; six sessions beginning in January and ending in March. The EWG then provided feedback on the length of time for the meetings and agreed on the following format:

- 1.5 hours for the first two
- 1 hour meetings for two sessions,
- 1.5 hours For the Final sessions

Staff confirmed that the attendance is the only time commitment and that there will not be any pre or post meeting work/reading.

**Schedule**
Discussion then turned towards the purpose of the EWG, how the information in the sessions will be used, and why. Discussion highlights include:

- The EWG is an Initiative of Napa and Sonoma counties as they go through their Housing Elements
- The EWG is Providing an opportunity for those who don’t feel comfortable or don’t have access
- Feedback on certain topics and roll that into the HEU process
- EWG members were nominated to serve by people you work with, or nominated by city staff; you were nominated since you would provide good details about fair housing issues, and/or you might provide direct services in the community
Discussion then turned towards meeting date and times; staff introduced a poll in the chat and asked the EWG members to use the poll to provide their availability for when the EWG should meet.

**Report out to Napa Sonoma Collaborative:** Discussion then towards comfort of the EWG to record the sessions. The discussion centered around concerns with loss of sincerity, genuineness, and frankness when sessions are taped. Staff confirmed that the session recordings would only be shared with the Napa Sonoma Collaborative. Staff confirmed that there will be regular reporting out to the NSC and that the feedback gathered in the sessions will be used to update the Housing Elements within the region.

**Topics for the EWG:** The topics for the sessions were shared with the EWG virtually, with staff to send afterwards. The topics were also posted in the Outlook meeting planner. Staff reviewed the topics on a high level and gained feedback on the topics regarding whether items should be removed, added, or edited. The EWG generally accepted the topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan 14th</th>
<th>EWG Agenda and Materials Sent to EWG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1 January26</td>
<td>Introduction of EWG and Housing Element Update Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why it’s important, Expectations for participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing equity for underrepresented groups regionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the most prevalent housing needs you see or work with in and around your community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the best way to bring representation to underrepresented groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting 2nd TBD</th>
<th>Barriers to Obtaining Affordable Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are typical barriers to finding better housing conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obstacles to securing/maintaining housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you see as the biggest barriers to finding housing in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How common is it for those you work with to be living in overcrowded or substandard conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Among the communities you serve, how many are at risk of losing housing? (due to affordability, losing support, losing work, etc?) What do you see as the biggest barriers to them maintaining housing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Meeting 3rd TBD | EWG how they can be involved in outreaching to farmworkers about their needs, obstacles, etc? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting 4th</th>
<th>Discrimination when housing in obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergencies (context matters year by year) impacting vulnerable populations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
impacting Housing Stock and Opportunities to Obtain Housing is Expensive; not enough carrot/stick incentives to build more affordable units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Invite LC to Share Preliminary Findings, Goals and Recommendations Target For EWG Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Key takeaways and recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the housekeeping items were covered, discussion then turned towards the session topic and gaining feedback from the EWG.

**Introduction of the EWG, Housing Element Update Process and General Discussion**

Some of the overarching themes and key focus of EWG members discussed are:

General Discussion:

- “Price of land is ridiculous”
- RHNA requirement for the County is huge
- When housing is permitted throughout the County it tends to not be affordable
  - Too desirable so someone will turn it into a vacation rental
- More expensive to live there, setting aside rental/mortgages, higher transportation costs and utilities are higher, no public transit
- Jurisdiction question is a big conundrum
- Anecdote: Montage hotel opened up, affordable housing planned – community meeting, families shared with the city that they were tired of renting, we want to own our home – no way we can buy $600k with 20% down
  - Increasing homeownership – if the main wealth creation is homeownership in this country is that then we need it
- Housing Land Trust model, but there’s definitely a need
  - Stabilizes families for generations
  - Certainly homeownership is a key aspect in the intergenerational transfer of wealth, particularly back east where Black communities have been redlined
- General discussion push for ownership could get in the way of rental opportunities
- Housing discrimination is a key issue for some of the organizations
- Working with partners and collaborations is key
- Safe parking and sanitation
- Corazon started in Healdsburg but provides services for all of North County
  - Latin American immigrant groups primarily served
  - Housing is an important part of that
- Discrimination is being seen in Napa County; specifically, taking away the rights of tenants
Let’s Talk Housing

- Context changes year over year and changes the stock of housing and vulnerable populations
- Lack of incentives to increase housing stocks; there isn’t “a good carrot/stick system to build more affordable units”
- Discussion: How the County spends its money - $6 million to spend on hotel to take that off the tax rolls, $7 million in Healdsburg in a city that is otherwise gentrifying – serving about 30 residents in a county that is otherwise unhoused – never really any good answers

Diversity, Trust, Communication, and Partnerships
- There isn’t enough diversity of voices in the conversation; and organizations are leery to participate because they have been burned by transactional experiences
  - Only hearing one specific voice (White)
  - As result when projects are proposed, the project might not fit everybody’s needs
  - In Sebastopol, even as we get to West County as it gets agricultural – we were looking to see whether there were people of different races that were involved, most are White
- Antidote: organization reached out to the Hispanic and Lao Churches in their communities to include their voices in the conversation but didn’t really receive a good response
- Communication is key
- Substantially underrepresented in the media coverage
- In West County, the Latino community is either nonexistent or very much in the shadows
- Language is the most important part and that should be first
- Going beyond it being transactional
- Building and nurturing relationships
  - Institutional and local trust, a lot more work needs to be done to garner the kind of trust this group is tasked with getting
- Concerns about some organizations only reaching out to Black/Brown communities to “check the box”
  - Hesitation to participate in the process if they are only going to be used
  - Feels very transactional, not a lot of time building relationships
    - Must create relationships BEFORE need
  - Organizations have to be cautious about who they partner with as their reputations with the people they serve is on the line
- Local challenges we face in terms of garnering that trust
- Napa and Sonoma dealing with trust issue
- Resources for nonprofits to compete over
This could be an institutional problem
Beyond anything that is housing related it’s a general issue

Emergency Housing/Discrimination:
• Napa Fair Housing paired with Sonoma County for housing after disasters
• Anecdote: Organization was involved in obtaining emergency housing vouchers – needed to be chronically homeless – 280 vouchers uniquely available
  o More than a year or more than 4 times in a year and have a chronic condition
  o Some had a criminal history that precluded them from getting a HUD voucher, even if minor drug offense and they went through treatment
  o Could not find housing for “those who have a story to tell”
  o Vouchers are use it or lose it
• Emergencies impact housing stock
  o Emergencies caused a direct increase in housing prices; too expensive
  o EWG agreed to add the impact of emergencies on housing stock to one of the sessions
    ▪ Focus on Sonoma, Napa, and then regionally

Barriers to Housing:
• Clarifying question: barriers to housing, is this in regard to the HEU, services as well, feel like this could go in a bunch of directions
• Language Barriers are a big issue
  o “If we want to involve people and include them, we have to make the space, take down the barriers to language access, don’t want to seem like an interpretation service”

Farmworker Housing
• Sonoma County has tried some things such as cohousing
• One of the biggest NIMBY arguments is don’t put housing here, think of agriculture
• Point of Clarification re: RHNA – jurisdictions are only required to identify parcels where affordability could be built but it doesn’t mean they get built, and doesn’t mean they get built affordably
• Picture of farmworker has changed, less single people now more families
• Staff confirmed that there will be a session devoted only to farmworker housing
• Agriculture focus creates barriers to increasing housing stock
  o Hard to develop ag land as housing
  o We’re in counties where agriculture and land use impacts land use and our ability to build
  o It’s a generally disdained attitude toward RHNA – not a lot of motivation to meet numbers to reach affordable housing
    ▪ Attention to not expanding the footprint
• Some potential solutions raise question of substandard housing
  o For example: Fairgrounds barns and tent cities suggested as solutions
  o Back in the 60s there was a warranty of fitness of habitability – slums and civil
    rights lawsuits – a lot of the talk we see in the County pushes that to the side

Landlord Issues
• Landlord friendly BOS, precluding organizations from helping tenants
• Housing stock and availability become a problem
• Lack of trust toward anything we’re doing
• NIMBYism ruins prospects:
  o Can have a project or vouchers with Section 8 with areas being new for the
    county, areas that may not have been available to the community and then you
    see NIMBYism saying we don’t want them in our community

6Miscellaneous:
• Additional Resources were shared:
  o Napa Sonoma Collaborative – Let’s Talk Housing (www.NSC-Housing.org)
  o AFFH = Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing
  o RHNA = Regional Housing Needs Allocation: the number of housing units each
    jurisdiction is responsible for providing during specified planning periods
  o https://generationhousing.org/state-of-housing-2022/
Equity Working Group #2 2/18/22

WORKING GROUP ATTENDANCE:
- Efren Carrillo – Burbank Housing
- Jessica Chavez – Wallace House
- Arthur George – West County Homeless Advocates
- Cristian Gutierrez – Latino Service Providers
- Pablo Zatarain – Napa Fair Housing

STAFF ATTENDANCE:
- Toccarra Nicole Thomas – Napa Sonoma Collaborative
- Luke Lindenbusch – Napa Sonoma Collaborative

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

DISCUSSION:

How does the formal Definition of Affordable Housing Sit with You?

The general consensus is that the formal definition of affordable housing is outdated and does not include modern issues. Discussion then centered on the following points:

- Rent protections have expired
- COVID
- Construct that affordable housing is 100% subsidized and sometimes just not true, but these are really working-class families
- Federal and state income limits set at 80% and below, and that’s who affordable housing providers.
- Official definition does not account for all the ancillary costs associated with housing, increased electric rates, application costs; Subsidies/Vouchers don’t account for the costs of applying for housing and the sheer number of applications needed, e.g. the person might have the voucher but has to pay for 20 applications and doesn’t have that funding to absorb that costs. This effectively becomes a barrier.
- 80-120% is now described as missing middle, because they can’t afford market-rate
- Median rents are not going to create housing opportunity for residents, and the region doesn’t allow the presence of the poverty.

What are Barriers/Obstacles to obtaining and maintaining affordable housing?

- One of the most profound points in our last meeting – cultural mistrust and sense of betrayal.
- Additional costs that are not factored into the affordable housing definition
  - Amount of money it takes to get into a house – first, last, security present a barrier. May be a bigger barrier when we look at COVID-19 and inflationary pressures, landlords may be more reticent
- Low housing stock and additional expenses combine. Anecdote: Some clients who received housing vouchers will be able to use them as long as they’re considered low-income, but they still have to pay for every application. There are some new services that cover the costs but there’s a barrier to that. When there are 50 people who apply for a unit, you’re out all this money because you’ve gotten 20+ rejections and lose hope.
  - Even those in deed-restricted affordable housing face food shortages, high insurance rates, other costs – utility costs are factored into overall cost of housing but not the rest. The need is more severe now than it’s ever been for these residents and the margins of getting by are diminished to a breaking point.
  - Supercommuting leading to higher gas costs and more wear and tear on the cars
    - Super-commuting and leaving the region has been a pronounced issue since the 2017 wildfires. The region has gone through a succession of emergencies that have chipped away at the housing stock that is here. Many properties are at least uninhabitable and at least yellow-tagged. The stock is old, unrenovated, and residents are dealing with issues like mold so it’s a habitability.
  - Domino effect
  - PG&E costs are increasing. Some of that is due the fires; PG&E needing to pay off their liability. Record drought affects crops, and thus food crises. Ukraine crisis affecting oil prices. Study underway in Sebastopol to look at the effect of housing and there will be disproportionate effect on poor and seniors with fixed incomes. All these costs increase burden.
- Wildfires
  - Many of the houses that burned were inhabited by renters. Many also saw second homes that didn’t burn, but the landlord’s house did so residents were kicked out to provide homes for their landlords.
  - Wineries are bussing in workers due to a lack of workers in the area. We have workers who are being brought in by bus from Modesto due to a complete lack of workers.
  - In Sonoma, fires affected mostly urban areas. In Napa, 2017 fires were more characteristic of the trickle-down effect with landlords moving into second homes. Landlords were claiming just cause to evict renters and it doesn’t pan out. It’s been up and down – with the onset of COVID, there have been many more protections and that changed in September 2021 with the expiration of tenant protections. AB 1482 is the main protection now, which comes with rent cap but also protects tenants from being evicted without cause. Upon hearing of renovations, first step is going to the City or County and pulling the permits and seeing if it actually bears out.
  - Napa no longer has fire-related price-gouging protections and rents can be raised without limit as long as it doesn’t fall under AB 1482, we’ve seen prices rise at unsustainable rates
- Less housing stock in Napa (smaller county) leads to a strong likelihood of housing insecurity
- Housing situation in Sonoma County something that student population is having to work on. Children of farmworkers are having to pick up a job and divert focus from their studies. The effect of high costs trickles down to the wellbeing of children who are destabilized by having to ask, will I have a place to go?
- Trend in Sonoma of apartment units go off to investors, and we have significantly and effectively priced out residents, particularly in Santa Rosa, Healdsburg, and City of Napa. Acquisition and rehab of those units has helped people stay housed and restore the habitability of those units. Latino residents were displaced in one of the last bastions of affordability in Healdsburg and they’ve looked at attaching affordability covenants to keep them affordable in perpetuity.
- Overcrowding in dwellings at 2-3 families per dwelling and renovating garages in uninhabitable ways. Mostly single families, seeing this prominently in the West 9th community. Recognition of lack of supply and that’s what people are being forced to do.
- CRLA, Legal Aid will provide further information on real-life cases and data.

Obstacles to obtaining and maintaining housing

- Onerous regulation leading to displacement. For example, Sebastopol City Council will propose the enactment of a new parking ordinance that would sweep all RVs out of town during business hours – that would include all, family members visiting, and the unhoused. Where are these people going to go?
- Incremental solutions instead of a holistic approach. E.g. Homekey conversions are an incremental intervention with a downside of taking away from the tax revenue. Continuum of Care is a countywide effort that makes a plan, it fails, then they make another one, it fails, and they reboot. Incremental solutions are triaged, we do what we can and it’s important.
- Credit history, law enforcement record, many obstacles that are evident across the board. It’s a friction between property management and laws. Compassionate housing organizations strive to recognize that a renter who applies is not the same person as they were five years ago.
- Members of the African-American community feel they are being excluded from affordable housing, that does well at providing opportunity for Latinos but nevertheless. Whether that’s real or a perception, that’s a problem if an organization presents an obstacle to housing.
- As an organization: fees, costs, neighborhood opposition. $60,000 of impact fees per unit – should be paying them but shouldn’t be at that level. $500-600k per unit to fully built out a development is a major constraint. That’s why you see multimillion dollar investments for just a few units.
- Need layered approach to deal with this issue because one intervention won’t cut it.
- 10,000 people on waitlist for just one affordable housing provider, just for Burbank. While waiting, people are looking under every rock they can to find housing.
- Anecdote of two meetings for Healdsburg project that resulted in two different outcomes – English only meeting resulted in 35 people showed up who were only with height, parking, etc. 45 people showed up to Spanish-only meeting and the two questions were: how soon are you building it and how can we get on the waitlist? No opposition.
- Poverty. There’s a stigma at a societal level. Discrimination plays a huge level in it. There are protections at the state level for Section 8 vouchers. Housing Authority is great at identifying opportunity but there are landlords who simply won’t house a Section 8 tenant.
- NIMBY opposition to housing in public hearings, their concerns are that it’s a “calm neighborhood” and Latinos will bring a “rowdy element” with their quinceneras and etc. Gaslighting them by saying it’s not just one family, but it’s four families. Not even allowing opportunity for community to have housing because there’s always going to be an argument against it. It’s difficult to see a future here with the rising cost of housing, and many younger people are moving to Sacramento, Modesto, and other areas. Mystery of wondering what’s going to happen creates existential stress.
- Homelessness assistance no longer reflects reality; chronically homeless units are focused toward people with disabilities. The demographics have shifted to women and children living in substandard housing e.g. garages. People who are on these lists need to get into housing and there are substantial barriers. Anecdote shared of blind woman calling caseworker crying because the regulatory barriers are too high (she is being forced to commute to a location to physically apply for housing when she cannot).
- Housing Authority has moved from looking at seven-year criminal history to looking at one-year criminal history to lower the barriers.

Solutions

- Need to be creative and provide a holistic approach. Some potential examples include rehabilitating existing farmland, County fairgrounds, barns, space must be habitable.
- Towns have large amounts of land, but they are locked by political constraints to development.
- Supportive services need greater circulation to outreach to those in need.
- 16,000 units of housing are needed at BMR. An additional 30,000 units of market rate.
- Gen H State of Housing report features solutions and there’s a way to balance the need to meet the existing housing demand and protect the reasons we love living in Sonoma County including open space and community separators
- Jurisdictional partners need to “step up” Existing zoning and projected zoning in larger cities (SR, Petaluma, RP, Windsor) and they’re going to need to step it up.
- Unincorporated can’t bear the brunt of these. Fife Creek Commons – only major development west of Forestville – cost $900/sqft and $1mil per unit because it had to be built up to be out of the floodplain. Fit within the confines of a site, community, and location. Not everyone is going to suitable for these purposes.

Recap:

- The people who stand to lose the most in these decisions are not having their voices heard, not making part of the process, and are usually not in the room. It’s evident in the policies made.
- When we talk about affordable housing, we talk about solutions that ascribe to the American Dream like an apartment house or the white picket fence. Institutional approaches are an important function of the solution, but guerrilla housing is important as well. Tiny homes are not anyone’s idea of ideal unless you’re sleeping on the street. Local organization that builds them at $7k-12k and Petaluma is pursuing it.
Equity Working Group #3 - Farmworker Housing

02/22/22 – 10am-11am

ATTENDANCE:

- Caroline Banuelos – SSU Center for Community Engagement
- Efren Carrillo – Burbank Housing
- Jessica Chavez – Wallace House
- Rue Furch
- Stephanie Manieri – Latino Service Providers
- Pablo Zatarain – Napa Fair Housing

STAFF ATTENDANCE:

- Toccarra Nicole Thomas
- Luke Lindenbusch

In previous sessions, the issue of supercommuting has risen to the forefront, and we’ve heard that farmworkers are coming from as far as Modesto. Where are people coming from?

- In Napa, it’s very much a part of the reality of the ins and outs of the county. There’s simply not enough housing for the amount of jobs in the county. The people who are having the hardest time finding housing are low-income and often farmworker. City of St. Helena sees about 85% of its workforce come from out of town. Jobs up and down Napa Valley and there are a lot of other factors in terms of transit, in terms of traffic. Looking at families, looking at a subset of a demographic.

- Not sure it’s identical in Sonoma, but there are conundrums around housing in general, and it’s long been one of those problems to solve. The difference between housing for single people (whether it’s men or women), and the housing is quite different and the needs are quite different. Single men that are transitory can just walk to work, across the field, whereas families have different needs and different commutes patterns.

- When you look at the changes in the Bay Area and subregionally, there’s a pattern in the increase of time it takes for the workforce in all industries to drive to work – predominantly due to the cost of living and the cost of housing. It’s likely affecting farmworkers the hardest, exemplified by the length of commute. Construct that farmworkers live in rural areas – this is simply not true and far more live in the 101 corridor. The seasonality of farm work is not what it used to be and people are looking at it year round. There’s a significant increase in the cost and time it takes for a farmworker to get to work.

- Organizations to reach out to:
  - California Human Development Corporation (CHDC)
  - La Luz Center
  - Corazon Healdsburg
  - California Coalition of Rural Housing (CCRH)
  - North Bay Jobs for Justice
United Farm Workers – used to be really active in SR and haven’t had a full-time person in the office for a few years, and JWJ filling that void

- Language barriers and unfamiliarity with laws create problematic situations – uninhabitable housing, rent raised illegally, etc.
- Farmworker housing can be precarious because their housing is part of their employment, so they don’t enjoy the same tenant rights as they would with a traditional lease. We’ve seen this happen with people who are working at a winery for 5 years, then they have to leave within two weeks. It’s an opportunity to housing, but not always and equal or sustainable opportunity to housing.
- Nonprofits in Sonoma Valley have indicated that former migrant bunkhouse style housing is not the same need anymore, and they’re looking for housing that is year-round and family oriented.
- State prioritizes studios/1br units for farmworkers and often can’t find community members in those populations to fill those units. Oftentimes, those units go vacant for a while because really the need is for 2br/3br. The state has it a little backward because meeting people at their AMI is often difficult – we’ve seen incomes go up, but the state hasn’t caught up in terms of income limits.
- Seeing multiple families under one roof, so there’s a need for higher bedroom count and that’s contrary to what many may think a single-family residence may be able to provide. There’s a cultural difference in terms of multigenerational living arrangements, three generations in one home – there’s a necessity component to it that to pay the mortgage or rent there’s a need to rent the garage, etc. It does create a construct that there’s no demand – well no, there’s an existing demand but they’re not living in great conditions.
- Tiny homes could work, largely for individual housing to provide gender neutrality. Demographic change between bunkhouses (harkening back to the bracero program).
- There’s a large variety of people, and just like everyone else, there are many needs. It’s an issue of pay, so wages are low, lack of suitable breaks – all of that factors into quality of life.
- Farmworkers should be required to provide housing on-site or nearby. There have been efforts in the transportation arena to reduce VMT and get people to be closer to where they work.
- Farmworker housing is workforce housing – it’s meeting the needs of people working in a given region. Rental assistance, on-site housing, a wide number of multifaceted solutions to work on getting people.
- State has recently made significant adjustments to farmworker RHNA – specifically, in this last budget there was $100 million for the Joe Serna housing. Those funds were oversubscribed, and there are too many projects to fully fund them all. Though there’s a focus on rental, there are opportunities for homeownership for some farmworker families with low-interest loans and affordable homeownership. Huge amount of farmworker applications for affordable homeownership in recent developments.


How should EWG and jurisdictions be a part of this outreach?

- Farmworker housing being developed, so would like to look into those local opportunities and how to be further engaged with that.
Potential for conversion of existing residences – SROs, apartments, JADUs. Underutilized and existing stock that is well situated.

Other needs:

- There’s a significant need for electrification, and we’re doing a disservice to the farmworker community by not integrating those incentives. There are two doctoral researchers at Stanford doing research on the electrification of housing and transportation and the clear need for intentionality on bringing low-income people into the opportunities.

- Anecdotally, I know that many farmworkers and their families live in overcrowded homes or with multiple families under one roof because the cost of housing is too high for individuals or families to keep up with on their own. They experience a lot of instability and insecurity.

- Affordability to keep it affordable need to be considered in the overall price – your utility costs can’t be through the roof, and you can’t be so far from where you work that your cost of transportation is so high that even a low mortgage or rent makes it difficult.

- Public transportation is a huge issue, not having access to the train/buses, there’s poor connectivity between the systems. It’s not ideal if you need to use it as an alternative form of transportation. You need to have a need to get to work, even if you live close to where you’re trying to get to. Geographic isolation and gearing of transit to wine tourism preclude it as a meaningful option.

- Disasters, language and cultural barriers, immigration challenges – all factor into the challenges faced in finding and keeping housing. The immigration status doesn’t just determine what they’re eligible for, but there’s a hesitance to even ask for help. Other times it’s just a cultural shame associated with asking for assistance. Any policy that looks to help farmworkers specifically needs to be culturally competent and address all those needs.

- Construct of cleanliness, not having trash removal often enough, limited food storage if you’re living in a converted garage – may not have a working stove or a functioning refrigerator. Temperature, moisture, smoke, functioning bathroom facilities, etc – not always present.
EWG Session #4: Discrimination and its Effects on Obtaining Affordable Housing

3/1/22 10:00am -11:00am

Attendees:
Caroline Banuelos-SSU
Effren Carrillo-Burbank Housing
Rue Furch
Jessica Chavez-Wallace House

Staff:
Luke Lindenbusch
Toccarra Nicole Thomas

Housingkeeping
The meeting opened with some housekeeping:

- Members were reminded about the availability of stipends available to compensate time for time.
  - Discussion turned towards asking about the possibility of providing the stipend to someone else. The example was given to accepting the stipend as an honoraria and donating it to the organization or someone being assisted by an organization
- Suggestions on how local jurisdictions and other organizations involved in affordable housing development can regain community trust provided
  - Go to the community directly; don’t expect the community to come to the jurisdiction
  - Communicate more frequently and with more transparency
    - Share expectations, and, how they will be measured
      - If you miss the mark be honest and open about it
      - Ask community members for input on expectations
    - Talk about when you meet expectation as well!
  - Make sure to not over promise! If you do make a promise make sure that it’s achievable
  - Offer meetings in both languages but separately
    - Trying to offer simultaneously translation isn’t as effective as having the meetings separately
• There is a lot of technical ground that must be covered before getting to the actual purpose of the meeting. E.g. what is a site plan, what is in a landscaping plan
• Once there is an understanding then the next session can be devoted to the question at hand
• Follow-up meetings are key
• Local government must provide information in different languages regularly; this can’t be a one time occurrence
  ▪ Start early and often!
    • Especially if you are working with a community where the jurisdiction, NGO, or CBO might have already lost trust
  ▪ Have to share wins as well as challenges
    • Transparency builds trust
  ▪ Anecdote shared that for originations which use tax credit finance, translation services must be provided
  ▪ Community rooms within developments have a built in sense of trust; this trust is embedded through services
    • Lot easier to have people feel like they are a part of the solution
  ▪ If there is a misstep or missed expectation the organization has to actively show up and listen and learn and empower the residents as well as staff
  ▪ Have to fully integrate integrity into the process, especially if trust has been broken in a community.
  ▪ Publishing the decision matrix that is used to make decisions and asking for community input can help with regaining trust
    • This can help combat perception that decisions are “already made” and that organizations/jurisdictions are only asking for input to “check the box”
• Announced that the NSC would love for EWG members and their organizations to provide additional feedback to directly to the jurisdictions
• Have you heard of any anecdotes of people experience discrimination when attempting to obtain housing?
  o Discrimination is hard to determine since there is simply not enough housing stock to go around. Renters don’t even get to the discrimination stage because it’s hard to obtain housing period
Lack of affordable units, & lack of vacancies prevents people from even attempting to access units
- Due to a lack of units people commute which contributes to lack of affordability
  - Unit might be affordable, but gas prices and the commuting time takes away from the budget
- Discrimination generally occurs based on income
  - Stereotype associated with low income and vouchers
  - Anctedote shared of a tenant feeling as if their housing situation is precarious due to the landlords treatment. But, the tenant is “stuck” in the situation since there aren’t any other units to move to
    - If a person is lucky enough to find a place and it turns out to not be the best situation they are essentially stuck due to
      - Lease, notice timeframes, and other regulations that prevents them from moving, fear of eviction
      - Lack of vacant units
      - This in turns makes renters feel as if they are stuck in situations where landlords are watching their every move
  - Discrimination is more subtle
  - Black and brown people homes are being undervalued by the market; example given of homes being severely undervalued when they are associated with minorities; once the homeowner changes their name or something of that nature the value of the home increases again
    - Extra (perhaps undue) scrutiny is being paid to renters during the application and review process, e.g. extra background checks due to stereotypes
- How has segregation affected affordable housing?
  - “Made it worse!”
  - The effects of redlining is still around
  - Certain developments that are proposed today are still subject to the effects of segregation
  - See all of the developments concentrated along HW 101 and HW 12
  - Process of allowing developers to pay in lieu fees instead of developing affordable housing units
  - Have seen some instances where affordable housing units as part of a larger development are built last, and in “one corner” of the development when they are built; this has the consequence of segregating affordable housing users and subjecting them to stigma
Examples of “NIMBYs” finding out about the affordable units that are being built and protesting them as if they are a “new” addition, when they were always a part of the Use Permit

• Jurisdictions need to be forceful about ensuring that affordable housing units that are included in a development are built throughout the development and not last

• Are there any concentrations of poverty that you are aware of?
  o HWY 101 and HWY 12

• Tell us about any landlord issues that your constituents might have faced?
  o Extra scrutiny of tenants that are in affordable housing or have subsidies
  o Gentrification
    • Investors buying up market rate rentals that could potentially become affordable housing naturally, renovating them, and then putting them back on the market as market/high end
    • Healdsburg, Roseville
  o Displacement by investors
    • Opportunity for local governments to obtain these properties and maintain them as deed restricted affordable housing

General EWG Member Thoughts shared via email:

I sent a few thoughts and observations to the Sonoma County planning staff, and thought they might be of interest to you .... we’ve heard repeatedly that what is needed is a wide variety of housing types proportionate to need distributed where infrastructure exists.

Greenbelt Alliance’s slight change in focus: "We’ve learned that just focusing on new homes downtown and near transit is not enough to address the severe housing shortage and stem the extreme negative environmental impacts of increasing sprawl. So, we’ve adapted our advocacy efforts, making changes when we learn new information."

Policies should include requirements for infrastructure including long term consideration of affordability factors such as transportation, fire and/or flood hazard impacts, water and sewer system availability, etc. A residence is not really affordable if only the rent or mortgage is low. All other associated costs must be considered for a home to achieve meaningful lasting affordability.
Housing should be provided inside UGBs where infrastructure exists or can reasonably be extended so density is possible. Single residences do not tend toward affordability unless they are in a higher density area.

In the unincorporated areas ... see considerations listed such as infrastructure, transit, etc.

When JADUs and/or ADUs or second units are built - they should be tied to affordable standards that last. “Affordable by design” is not a reality in Sonoma County.

Workforce housing should be provided near employment whenever possible, and on transit routes to reduce traffic impacts. That would also apply to Farmworker housing ... with at least two types of housing made available: on-farm single person housing and farm family housing - which may need to be closer to services and schools.

Meaningful constraints should be applied to units that could be used (or converted) to Vacation Rentals or any transitory housing other than seasonal farm work.

Second units on Ag lands should be used for farm workers . farm families. In some instances, it may be possible for startup (new farmers without family ties to land) farmers to live in the 2nd unit and lease a portion of land for their enterprise. A Farm Start-Up. There are many young people with serious interest in being farmers (as opposed to the generation of older farmers and ranchers we see leaving the land without successors) who would benefit from an opportunity to work and live on farmland. They cannot both pay rent and land lease costs. Conditions can be placed on these units in order to enable the next generation of farmers to learn the “trade”.

Inclusionary housing is more likely to be built (vs in lieu fees) so should be required whenever possible and should be scattered throughout a project. We’ve seen clustered affordable housing that was supposed to be built, but was left to last - and then not built or a poor after thought by a developer. SFU could offer ADUs if fees were reduced and affordability insured over time. This could provide housing near work, as well as senior and student housing.
APPENDIX B: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF 5TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Timeframe in H.E</th>
<th>Status of Program Implementation</th>
<th>Status in 6th Cycle HE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program H-1a: Continue to inspect housing in response to complaints, and work with property owners to bring units up to current housing code standards.</td>
<td>Objective H-1a: Through code enforcement efforts and funding assistance, the County will seek to facilitate the rehabilitation of 19 housing units in fair or dilapidated condition in the County or in the Cities that are occupied by low- (7 units), very low- (8 units), or extremely low income (4 units) households during the planning period.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Partially Complete and Ongoing - Code Enforcement Division diligently respond to complaints and pursue abatement of all violations.</td>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-1b: To the extent permitted by law, implement a program to enable non-profit organizations to apply for the use of up to 10 percent of new funds annually to fund projects and programs designed to correct health and safety hazards in owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing that is reserved for low-, very low-, or extremely low-income households.</td>
<td>Objective H-1b: The County will seek to make available up to 10 percent of new Affordable Housing Fund money annually to leverage federal, state, and other public and private housing rehabilitation funds.</td>
<td>December 31, 2016</td>
<td>In 2014, the County released a NOFA for small grants ($20,000) for this purpose. All funds were used. The County is working on rehab program guidelines and will have the program ready to apply for grant funding.</td>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-1c: In addition to the priorities identified in Policy AG/LU-118, assign high priority to abatement of illegal vacation rentals, ensuring that existing dwelling units are used as residences, rather than tourist accommodations.</td>
<td>Objective H-1a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Code Enforcement Division diligently respond to complaints and pursue abatement of all violations.</td>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2a: Prioritize the use of funds for development of Affordable Housing Combination District (AHCD) sites and Napa Pipe, and continue to work with interested parties to encourage their development of the sites under the AHCD provisions. The County will seek to work with a developer to process a development application on at least one AHCD site during the planning period.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: The County will seek to facilitate the development of lower income units by prioritizing its Affordable Housing Fund monies to assist affordable housing development on Affordable Housing (‘AH’) Combination District sites and supporting affordable housing on the Napa Pipe site, with the objective of permitting and assisting development of at least 113 affordable units during the planning period (32 moderate, 30 low-, and 51 very low-income units, with a goal of half of the very low-income units serving the extremely low-income level).</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The Napa Pipe project site has been fully annexed into the City of Napa, who will oversee and permit future development, including 140 affordable units. Up to 80% of County Affordable Housing Funds will be used to assist development of the affordable units.</td>
<td>Continue: modify to focus on 6th Cycle housing sites inventory parcels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2b:</td>
<td>Continue to encourage greater provision of affordable housing units in conjunction with market rate projects by implementing the Affordable Housing Ordinance, which requires an inclusionary percentage of 17 to 20 percent in for-sale projects, allows the payment of housing impact fees in for-sale housing projects only for developments of four or fewer units, and requires new rental developments to pay a housing impact fee. The County will conduct a nexus study during the Housing Element planning period to verify the residential fee amounts and inclusionary percentages.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - The Residential Impact fees were updated in 2010 and the Commercial Fees were updated in 2014. Both sets of fees used a phase-in approach over three years to get to the maximum fee level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2c:</td>
<td>Conduct a nexus study to verify the commercial housing impact fee during the Housing Element planning period.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing, each Housing Element Update Cycle</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - The Commercial Impact Fees were updated in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2d: Through a Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA) process, notify the public of available special assistance programs in coordination with the cities and other public and private agencies, using brochures and news releases.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - A NOFA was issued in 2010 and left open for other projects to apply. Since the initial 2010 NOFA, the County has funded 190 additional units both rental and for sale.</td>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2e:</td>
<td>Continue program of exempting all secondary residential units from the Growth Management System (GMS).</td>
<td>Objective H-2b: The County will seek to facilitate the development of second units with the objective of permitting development of at least 25 second units in zoning districts where they are allowed during the planning period.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed - 5 to 15 second unit permits are issued per year by right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2f:</td>
<td>Continue to require new affordable housing development projects receiving Affordable Housing Fund monies or any other type of County assistance, as well as those units built as part of the County’s inclusionary housing requirement, to apply deed restrictions that will require affordability of assisted low- and very low-income units for a minimum of 40 years.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Application of deed restrictions is a prerequisite for Board of Supervisors funding authorization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2g:</td>
<td>Continue to use the Affordable Housing (AH) Combination District as a tool to provide specific and reasonable development standards and stimulate affordable housing production in designated locations, as described in Appendix H-1.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - 12 Affordable Housing sites are designated with a combined potential realistic unit count of 427 units (Table H-F: Summary of Housing Sites Inventory).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2h:</td>
<td>Continue to implement the County’s worker proximity housing program that encourages low- and moderate-income homebuyers, to purchase a home within 15 miles of their place of employment, by providing local down payment assistance.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Demand for the program is strong with the Board committing $950,000 in new funds in FY 18-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2i:</td>
<td>Continue to offer financial assistance to property owners who are interested in building second units that would be deed restricted for use by very low- or low-income residents.</td>
<td>Objective H-2b: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing - The County created a funding process for the JADU program and is looking at a similar process for stand-alone ADUs to meet public interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2j:</td>
<td>Maintain the affordable housing provided in existing mobile home parks to the extent permitted by State law. Existing mobile home parks may be redeveloped, including adding up to 25 percent more units than the number of units allowed by their Planned Development (PD) zoning, provided that the adverse impact of such redevelopment on existing residents, including impact to housing affordability and displacement, is fully analyzed and mitigated. Consider adopting a comprehensive mobile home park conversion ordinance to require the assessment of impacts, public hearings and relocation assistance before a mobile home park can be redeveloped or converted to another use.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Conversion density bonus - Ongoing; Consideration of comprehensive mobile home park conversion ordinance</td>
<td>Density bonuses are allowed under existing mobile home park zoning provisions. Consideration of potential updates to mobile home park conversion regulations is under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2k:</td>
<td>Continue to allow infrastructure improvements as an eligible cost under the Affordable Housing Ordinance, and work with affected agencies to pursue grant money to improve water and sewer infrastructure on the Angwin, Moskowite Corner, and Spanish Flat sites to facilitate affordable housing development.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing Infrastructure improvements are an eligible cost and grant applications can be pursued at the time the projects move forward in AH districts. Funds to be made available for water and sewer agencies to apply for upgrades in Angwin, Moskowite Corner and Spanish Flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2l:</td>
<td>Analyze the County’s inventory of vacant and/or underutilized County-owned properties and identify those that would be suitable to support affordable housing development. If at least one appropriate site is identified, select one site and issue an RFP to solicit proposals from affordable housing developers to develop the site in partnership with the County.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The County has completed its inventory of surplus land. All available sites suitable for affordable housing are located within the cities, who have authority over future land use of the properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2m:</td>
<td>If the City of Napa does not commit by June 30, 2015 to provide water service to the Napa Ppe site, Napa County will pursue other water sources for the project. The County will consider all possible water sources and purveyors in order to secure a water supply for the project.</td>
<td>Objective H-2a: (see above)</td>
<td>Initiate by July 1, 2015, if necessary, and seek to secure an alternate water source by June 30, 2016</td>
<td>Completed - Development Agreement with City of Napa that included water entitlement was executed January 26, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-2n:</td>
<td>Continue the County’s program of inspecting migrant farm labor housing to ensure compliance with state standards. Efforts will be made to seek compliance to avoid closure of such facilities.</td>
<td>Objective H-3a:</td>
<td>Work to maintain occupancy of publicly-run farm worker centers to a year-round average of 75% or more.</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Public farm labor housing is routinely inspected under the ongoing County work program. Private facilities are inspected by Environmental Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H-3b: Continue to contract with Fair Housing Napa Valley or another capable organization that will review housing discrimination complaints, attempt to facilitate equitable resolution of complaints and, where necessary, refer complainants to the appropriate County, State, or Federal authorities for further investigation and action. The County’s contract with Fair Housing Napa Valley (FHNV) will call for increased public outreach about housing discrimination, including dissemination of informational brochures about available assistance, targeted to vulnerable populations, such as farm workers. Napa County will amend the agreement with FHNV to call for regular and ongoing distribution of fair housing information, including increasing general public awareness of fair housing laws as well as publicizing availability of assistance for people who believe they are victims of unfair housing practices. The agreement will call for actions such as, but not limited to: public service announcements on radio, TV, and in newspapers; presentations and distribution of literature to real estate organizations such as Realtors and residential property manager groups; presentations and distribution of literature to community groups associated with populations vulnerable to housing discrimination; and posting of notices publicizing fair housing resources in public locations likely to be visible to vulnerable populations. At a minimum, materials and announcements will be provided in English and Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective H-3b: Provide Affordable Housing Fund resources for the development and operation of emergency shelter and transitional housing facilities for eight homeless families in a partnership between the County Department of Health and Human Services and a non-profit. (December 31, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise agreement with FHNV by July 1, 2015; outreach activities Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - The contract with Fair Housing Napa Valley was revised in 2014, and the non-profit organization continues to provide the services mandated by this program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue; modify objectives to include more specific outreach and education commitments to be included in FHNV contract at renewal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-3c: Continue to contribute towards the annual operating costs of local emergency shelters and transitional housing where such funds are available and their use legally permissible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective H-3b: Provide Affordable Housing Fund resources for the development and operation of emergency shelter and transitional housing facilities for eight homeless families in a partnership between the County Department of Health and Human Services and a non-profit. (December 31, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Permanent affordable housing projects receiving county funds include occupancy by farm workers and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H-3d: To the extent permitted by law, continue to require a preference for local workers, including farm worker households, in affordable housing developments assisted with Affordable Housing Fund monies, with a goal of including farm worker households in at least 10 percent of the units assisted with Affordable Housing Fund money. The County will monitor the percentage of farm worker households occupying housing units assisted with Affordable Housing Fund money in conjunction with income eligibility monitoring for affordable housing units.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective H-3c: Encourage and facilitate development of six new farm labor dwellings on agriculturally-zoned properties and encourage and facilitate development of one new multifamily housing complex targeted to families within the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Permanent affordable housing projects receiving county funds include occupancy by farm workers and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue: modify to also include target for 10 percent of units to serve senior households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Program H-3l: Continue to monitor the need for farm worker housing throughout the harvest season. | Objective H-3c: (see above) | Ongoing | Completed and Ongoing – In 2021 Napa County obtained competitive REAP grant funds through ABAG to explore further opportunities for the establishment of Farm Worker housing projects. |
| Program H-3g: Work to identify a site and funding for a new farm worker family housing development and prioritize use of resources available to support new farm worker housing accordingly. | Objective H-3c: (see above) | December 31, 2018 | Staff has actively been searching for a suitable site for family farm worker housing leveraging recent State Housing bonds. |
| Program H-3h: Conduct an analysis to identify sites within the unincorporated area where up to 12 units of onsite farm worker housing could be developed, which are near cities and in locations where schools, transit, services, and shopping are relatively easily accessible. The County will provide owners of identified properties with information about opportunities to build farm worker housing on their sites, including potential County assistance. | Objective H-3c: (see above) | Conduct study and outreach to owners by January 31, 2016 | Site analysis occurred prior to January 31, 2016. Several potential housing sites meeting program criteria have been identified. Staff is looking for additional sites and funding options with the State Department of Housing and Community Development. |
| Program H-3i: In soliciting developer requests for Affordable Housing Fund monies, encourage developers to propose projects that can address unmet needs for housing with supportive services for the disabled (including the developmentally disabled). | Objective H-3b: (see above) | Ongoing | Completed and Ongoing - An MOU Agreement has been executed for one project currently under construction with another three projects willing to include permanent supportive units in their developments. |
| Program H-3j: Review the Zoning Ordinance and amend as necessary to ensure compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6 regarding provisions for farm worker and employee housing in zones that currently include agriculture and/or housing as allowable uses. | Objective H-3c: (see above) | Review and amend ordinance by January 31, 2017 | Ordinance amended with the last Housing Element update. Additional updates to be considered with Sixth Cycle Housing Element Update. |

| Continue; modify to include assistance for mobile home park preservation as well as farm worker housing. | Continue | Continue; modify to focus on outreach to owners of qualified properties. | Continue; modify to include emphasis on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing via funding criteria. | Continue; modify to reflect new Zoning Ordinance updates that are needed. |
| Program H-4a: Consistent with Conservation Element Policy CON-66 continue the program of providing local worker or “proximity” preferences to new affordable housing projects and continue providing assistance to local workers who buy homes in market rate projects. | Objective H-4a: Make available permits for construction of up to 105 new dwelling units each year, exclusive of permits for secondary residential units, and exclusive of permits for “carryover” affordable housing units. Permits for non-affordable housing units not issued in one year may be issued in any of the following three years, thereby allowing the number of permits issued to exceed 105 in a given year when unused permits are available from prior years. The County will set aside a minimum of 16 permits each year for affordable housing units, as defined in the County’s Growth Management System, in addition to 630 such permits that the County projects will be available in 2014 for issuance for units affordable to lower and medium income households. | Ongoing | Completed and Ongoing - Workforce proximity housing program is an ongoing program available to purchasers of deed restricted affordable property where the housing unit is within 20 miles of the worker’s employment site. | Continue |
| Program H-4b: Continue to allocate Affordable Housing Fund monies to affordable housing developments in the cities when funds are available and such allocation is consistent with the Affordable Housing Ordinance and criteria. The County will continue to work with the cities to establish and update a list of criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals for use of Affordable Housing Fund monies, with priority for projects that serve extremely low income households. The County will use a NOFA process to solicit applications on an annual basis. | Objective H-4a: (see above) | Annually | Completed and Ongoing. In 2017/2018 the County helped to fund 190 new units and secure 105 RHNA transfer credits for the sixth cycle. | Continue: modify to include emphasis on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing via funding criteria. |
| Program H-4c: Consistent with Agriculture and Land Use Policy AG/LU-15.5, staff of the County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services will review and recommend to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors appropriate changes to planning and zoning standards that minimize any conflicts between housing and agriculture. | Objective H-4a: (see above) | Ongoing | Completed and Ongoing - Zoning text and map amendments are evaluated for conflicts between housing and agriculture as part of review process. | Continue |
| Program H-4d: Continue to allow accessory residential units in commercial zones where compatible with neighboring land uses, and where infrastructure is available to support the residential units. | Objective H-4a: (see above) | Ongoing | Completed and Ongoing - Zoning regulations allow accessory dwelling units in commercial zoning districts. | Delete program to streamline; County will continue. |
Program H-4e: When requested by Mid-Peninsula Housing, the designated developer for affordable housing at Napa Pipe, Napa County will assist in identifying and securing funding for the 140 low- and very low-income housing units that are contemplated as part of the Napa Pipe Development Agreement. This will include providing information and other assistance in the preparation of applications to third parties for funding assistance. The County also anticipates that the development agreement for the Napa Pipe property will specify that a significant portion of affordable housing impact fees paid by development at Napa Pipe will be dedicated to assisting affordable housing onsite. Finally, consistent with Program H-2a, the County’s Affordable Housing Ordinance gives funding priority for all available housing trust fund monies to projects located in the unincorporated area.

Program H-4f: Continue to allow development of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Units in all zones that allow multifamily housing.

Program H-5a: Continue to provide fee waivers for nonprofit affordable housing developers.

Program H-5b: Expedite permit processing for housing projects that will serve very low-, low-, and moderate income households when such projects provide adequate assurances of long-term affordability.

Program H-5c: Exempt affordable housing projects from the 30-acre minimum parcel size requirement for PD zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-4e</td>
<td>Objective H-4a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The first of two affordable housing developments at Napa Pipe is in the pre-development phase for a total of 140 new units. SB235 (2019) implemented to address RHNA credit between County and Napa City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-4f</td>
<td>Objective H-4a: (see above)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Zoning regulations permit SRO units in all districts where multifamily housing is permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5a</td>
<td>Removal of Government Constraints</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Fee waivers are available for qualifying projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5b</td>
<td>Removal of Government Constraints</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Expedited processing is available for qualifying projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5c</td>
<td>Removal of Government Constraints</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing - Zoning regulations permit affordable housing on all PD properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delete; one-time action completed. Delete program to streamline; County will continue. Continue.
| Program H-5d: Continue to implement the Growth Management System by (i) continuing the practice of accumulating unused Category 4 (affordable) permits indefinitely; (ii) continuing the practice of accumulating unused permits in other categories for three years; (iii) consolidating implementation of Category 1-3 permits except when a lottery is required; and (iv) simplifying periodic updates to the permit limit. Updates to the permit limit may occur on an annual basis, but in no case less frequently than this Housing Element is updated, and shall be calculated based on the population in unincorporated Napa County times one percent (0.01), divided by the estimated household size and adjusted to reflect the average annual growth rate of the nine Bay Area counties over the last 5-7 years (if less than 1%). In no instance shall the new permit limit be lower than the previous permit limit if the units are required to meet the County’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation, except as needed to adjust for annexations within the planning period. (Also see Policy Ag/LU-119 in the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element.) | Removal of Government Constraints | Annually | Completed and Ongoing - Residential permit activity is evaluated annually for compliance with the Growth Management System including carryover provisions for affordable housing units. | Continue |
| Program H-5e: Staff will report to the Board of Supervisors on the status of housing entitlement processing, including Napa Pipe and other priority sites and, if necessary, recommend changes in policies and regulations as appropriate to promote their development. | Removal of Government Constraints | Annually | Completed and Ongoing - General Plan and Housing Annual Report is prepared in the first quarter of every fiscal year and provided to Board of Supervisors for review, comment and direction. | Continue |
| Program H-6a: As part of the development review process for major projects, encourage mixed-use development, such as Napa Pipe, where appropriate. | Objective | Ongoing | Completed and Ongoing - Development proposals are evaluated for mixed-use potential where appropriate. | Continue |
| Program H-6c: Continue to enforce current state mandated standards governing the use of energy efficient construction, and continue to implement green building standards in building code. | Objective H-6a: (see above) | Ongoing | Completed and Ongoing - Building Division evaluates permits applications for compliance with energy and green building standards. | Continue |
| Program H-6d: Establish a Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program to assist homeowners with financing to make sustainable energy improvements to their homes. | Objective H-6a: (see above) | April, 2014 | Completed and Ongoing - Public Works Department implemented 4 separate PACE programs all prior to April 2014, which are ongoing. | Delete; one-time action completed |
APPENDIX C: RHNA TRANSFER MATERIALS
Meeting Agenda - Final

ABAG Executive Board

Thursday, March 17, 2022
5:30 PM
REMOTE (In person option available)

Association of Bay Area Governments
Executive Board Meeting No. 469

The ABAG Executive Board is scheduled to meet on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 5:30 p.m., or immediately following the preceding ACFA meeting, in the Bay Area Metro Center (Remotely).

In light of Governor Newsom’s State of Emergency declaration regarding COVID-19 and in accordance with Assembly Bill 361’s (Rivas) provisions allowing remote meetings, this meeting will be accessible via webcast, teleconference, and Zoom for all participants.

A Zoom panelist link for meeting participants will be sent separately to committee, commission, or board members.

The meeting webcast will be available at: https://abag.ca.gov/meetings-events/live-webcasts

Meeting attendees may opt to attend in person for public comment and observation at 375 Beale Street, Board Room (1st Floor).

In-person attendees must pass required health screenings and adhere to posted public health protocols while in the building.

Members of the public are encouraged to participate remotely via Zoom at the following link or phone number:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
https://bayareametro.zoom.us/j/81009290493

Or One tap mobile:
US: +13462487799,,81009290493# or +12532158782,,81009290493#

Or Telephone:
Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 408 638 0968 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 876 9923 or 888 788 0099 (Toll Free) or 833 548 0276 (Toll Free) or 833 548 0282 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5247 (Toll Free)

Webinar ID: 810 0929 0493

Detailed instructions on participating via Zoom are available at:
https://abag.ca.gov/zoom-information

Committee members and members of the public participating by Zoom wishing to speak should use the “raise hand” feature or dial “*9”.

In order to get the full Zoom experience, please make sure your application is up to date.

Members of the public may participate by phone or Zoom or may submit comments by email at info@bayareametro.gov by 5:00 p.m. the day before the scheduled meeting date. Please include the committee or board meeting name in the subject line. Due to the current circumstances there may be limited opportunity to address comments during the meeting. All comments received will be submitted into the record.
The ABAG Executive Board may act on any item on the agenda.
The meeting is scheduled to begin at 5:30 p.m., or immediately following the preceding ACFA meeting.
Agenda, roster and webcast available at https://abag.ca.gov
For information, contact Clerk of the Board at (415) 820-7913.

Roster

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Confirm Quorum
   Quorum is a majority of ABAG Executive Board members present.

2. Public Comment
   Information

3. Executive Board Announcements
   Information

4. President's Report

4.a. 22-0456 ABAG President's Report for March 17, 2022
   Action: Information
   Presenter: Jesse Arreguin

5. Executive Director's Report

5.a. 22-0457 Executive Director's Report for March 17, 2022
   Action: Information
   Presenter: Therese McMillan

6. Executive Board Consent Calendar
6.a. 22-0458 Approval of ABAG Executive Board Minutes of January 14, 2022; January 20, 2022; February 11, 2022

**Action:** Approval

**Presenter:** Clerk of the Board

**Attachments:**
- 06a 1 EB Minutes 20220114 465 Draft.pdf
- 06a 2 EB Minutes 20220120 466 Draft.pdf
- 06a 3 EB Minutes 20220211 467 Draft.pdf

6.b. 22-0459 Napa County Request for Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Transfers

Consistent with Government Code Section 65584.07(a), approval of a request from Napa County to transfer RHNA units to City of Napa, City of American Canyon, and City of St. Helena.

**Action:** Approval

**Presenter:** Gillian Adams

**Attachments:**
- 06b 1 Summary_Sheet_Napa_County_RHNA_Transfers.pdf
- 06b 2 Attachment A - Napa_County_RHNA_Transfer_Request.pdf

6.c. 22-0460 Adoption of Resolution No. 04-2022 Regarding Remote Meetings Pursuant to AB 361

**Action:** Approval

**Presenter:** Kathleen Kane

**Attachments:**
- 06c 1 Summary Sheet Findings Pursuant to AB 361 v1.pdf
- 06c 2 ABAG Resolution No 04 2022 Findings Pursuant to AB 361 to Continue V

6.d. 22-0470 Contract Amendment - Agency Website Support Services: Peak Digital, LLC ($50,000)

**Action:** Approval

**Presenter:** Alysha Nachtigall

**Attachments:**
- 06d 1 Summary Sheet Peak Digital LLC v2.pdf
- 06d 2 Summary Approval Peak Digital LLC.pdf
6.e. **22-0485** Adoption of Resolution No. 05-2022 authorizing application for 2021 Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Program Grant funding, and authorization to amend an existing funding agreement with the California Department of Water Resources and to contract with Daily Acts for up to $4,600,000 to implement the Petaluma River Watershed: Land Resilience Partnership Project

**Action:** Approval

**Presenter:** Caitlin Sweeney

**Attachments:**
- [06e 1 SFEP Summary Sheet 2021 State Urban Multibenefit Drought Grant.pdf](#)
- [06e 2 EB Summary Approval Sheet 2021 State Urban Multibenefit Drought Grant.pdf](#)
- [06e 3 ABAG Resolution No 05 2022 Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Proc](#)

7. **ABAG Administrative Committee**

7.a. **22-0461** Report on ABAG Administrative Committee Meetings of February 11, 2022 and March 11, 2022

**Action:** Information

**Presenter:** Jesse Arreguin

8. **Joint MTC ABAG Legislation Committee**

8.a. **22-0462** Report on Joint MTC ABAG Legislation Committee Meetings of February 11, 2022 and March 11, 2022

**Action:** Information

**Presenter:** Jesse Arreguin

8.b. **22-0514** Assembly Bill 1944 (Lee): Brown Act Reform

Modifies current law related to teleconferencing by board members and remote participation for local public meetings.

**Action:** Support and Seek Amendments

**Presenter:** Rebecca Long

**Attachments:**
- [08b 1 Summary Sheet AB 1944 Lee Brown Act Reform.pdf](#)
- [08b 2 Attachment Joint Legislation 2c_AB_1944_Lee.pdf](#)
8.c. **22-0515**  Assembly Bill 2336 (Friedman): Pilot Program to Test and Deploy Speed Safety Cameras

Revised version of legislation MTC supported in 2021 (Assembly Bill 550 (Chiu)) to create a five-year pilot program for cities to use speed cameras, under specific circumstances. Modifications include equity-driven restrictions related to fines and requirements that cities work with advocacy groups representing disadvantaged communities on the placement of cameras.

**Action:** Support

**Presenter:** Rebecca Long

**Attachments:**
- 08c 1 Summary Sheet AB 2336 Friedman Pilot Program Spped Safety Camera
- 08c 2 Attachment Joint Legislation 2d_AB_2336_Friedman.pdf

9. **ABAG Finance Committee**

9.a. **22-0465**  Report on ABAG Finance Committee Meeting of March 17, 2022

**Action:** Information

**Presenter:** Karen Mitchoff

10. **ABAG Housing Committee**

10.a. **22-0466**  Report on ABAG Housing Committee Meeting of January 24, 2022

**Action:** Information

**Presenter:** Lori Wilson

11. **MTC’s Draft Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy**

11.a. **22-0467**  Presentation on MTC’s draft Transit Oriented Communities Policy

**Action:** Information

**Presenter:** Kara Vuicich

**Attachments:**
- 11a 1 Summary_Sheet_TOC_Policy v2.pdf
- 11a 2 Presentation Regional TOC Policy v2.pdf

12. **Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)**
12.a. **22-0468** Reflecting on the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Process

Discussion of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Cycle 6 process conducted between 2019 and 2021, as well as next steps for ABAG and local jurisdictions.

**Action:** Information

**Presenter:** Gillian Adams

**Attachments:**

- 12a 1 Summary_Sheet_RHNA_Discussion.pdf
- 12a 2 Attachment A Discussion Topics from RHNA Appeal Hearing.pdf
- 12a 3 Attachment B Reflections on RHNA.pdf
- 12a 4 Attachment C Presentation Reflections on RHNA v2.pdf

13. **Adjournment / Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the ABAG Executive Board is on May 19, 2022.
Public Comment: The public is encouraged to comment on agenda items at Committee meetings by completing a request-to-speak card (available from staff) and passing it to the Committee secretary. Public comment may be limited by any of the procedures set forth in Section 3.09 of MTC's Procedures Manual (Resolution No. 1058, Revised) if, in the chair's judgment, it is necessary to maintain the orderly flow of business.

Meeting Conduct: If this meeting is willfully interrupted or disrupted by one or more persons rendering orderly conduct of the meeting unfeasible, the Chair may order the removal of individuals who are willfully disrupting the meeting. Such individuals may be arrested. If order cannot be restored by such removal, the members of the Committee may direct that the meeting room be cleared (except for representatives of the press or other news media not participating in the disturbance), and the session may continue.

Record of Meeting: Committee meetings are recorded. Copies of recordings are available at a nominal charge, or recordings may be listened to at MTC offices by appointment. Audiocasts are maintained on MTC's Web site (mtc.ca.gov) for public review for at least one year.

Accessibility and Title VI: MTC provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited-English proficient who wish to address Commission matters. For accommodations or translations assistance, please call 415.778.6757 or 415.778.6769 for TDD/TTY. We require three working days' notice to accommodate your request.

可及性和法令第六章: MTC 根据要求向希望来委员会讨论有关事宜的残疾人士及英语有限者提供服务/方便。需要便利设施或翻译协助者，请致电 415.778.6757 或 415.778.6769 TDD / TTY。我们要求您在三个工作日前告知，以满足您的要求。

Acceso y el Titulo VI: La MTC puede proveer asistencia/facilitar la comunicación a las personas discapacitadas y los individuos con conocimiento limitado del inglés quienes quieran dirigirse a la Comisión. Para solicitar asistencia, por favor llame al número 415.778.6757 o al 415.778.6769 para TDD / TTY. Requerimos que solicite asistencia con tres días hábiles de anticipación para poderle proveer asistencia.

Attachments are sent to Committee members, key staff and others as appropriate. Copies will be available at the meeting.

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.
Subject:

Request from Napa County to transfer a portion of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) to the City of Napa, City of American Canyon, and City of St. Helena.

Background:

Government Code Section 65584.07(a) allows an unincorporated county and one or more jurisdictions in that county to voluntarily agree on a transfer of units from the county to the city or town. Voluntary transfers can be completed during the period between adoption of the Final RHNA (December 16, 2021) and the Housing Element due date (January 31, 2023). The statute stipulates that the county’s share of low-income and very low-income housing shall be reduced only in proportion to the amount by which the county’s share of moderate- and above moderate-income housing is reduced. The jurisdictions proposing the transfer must submit an analysis of the factors and circumstances, with all supporting data, justifying the revision to ABAG. By statute, ABAG shall approve the proposed transfer if the conditions identified above have been satisfied.

Issues:

On February 4, 2022, the County of Napa submitted a letter to ABAG (Attachment A) requesting the transfer of RHNA units to several cities within the county. Table 1 shows the number of units to be transferred to each city by income category.

Table 1: Requested Transfers from Napa County to the Cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Napa</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Canyon</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>324</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
<td><strong>908</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABAG-MTC staff has reviewed Napa County’s submittal and determined that the County has provided the necessary documentation to meet the statutory requirements. Napa County demonstrated the transfers were voluntary agreements with jurisdictions within the county by providing copies of executed agreements for RHNA transfers to Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena. For all three cities, the number of units the County is requesting to transfer is lower than or equal to the number authorized in the agreements. These agreements are summarized below:
City of Napa

- December 17, 2019: agreement provides for annexation and phased development of Napa Pipe site in the City of Napa. The City of Napa agrees to accept up to 80% of Napa County's 6th Cycle RHNA, or up to **811 units**.

City of American Canyon

- May 25, 2010: agreement provides for annexation of the Town Center/Lower Watson Area. American Canyon agrees to accept up to **168 units** in the 6th RHNA Cycle.
- May 2, 2017: agreement provides County affordable housing funds to support Valley View Senior Homes. American Canyon agrees to accept up to **30 units** in the 6th RHNA Cycle.

City of St. Helena

- June 26, 2017: agreement provides County affordable housing funds to support Turley Flats affordable housing. St. Helena agrees to accept up to **2 units** in the 6th RHNA.

The County’s transfer request also shows that the transfers of very low- and low-income units are proportional to the transfers of moderate- and above moderate-income units (see Table 2, Attachment A). The submittal includes an analysis of the factors justifying the transfer, which include preservation of agricultural land, city control within Spheres of Influence, and county financial support for affordable developments within city limits. In addition to meeting these statutory requirements, Napa County also included the analysis of how the transfers are consistent with furthering the RHNA objectives identified in Government Code Section 65584(d), as requested by ABAG.

**Recommended Action:**

The Executive Board is requested to approve Napa County’s request for the transfer of RHNA units to the Cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena, as described in Table 1 (above).

**Attachments:**

A. Napa County Request for RHNA Transfers

**Reviewed:**

Therese W. McMillan
Gillian Adams, Senior Planner  
Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Executive Board  
Bay Area Metro Center  
375 Beale Street, Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2066  

RE: Request for RHNA Transfers per California Government Code Section 65584.07  

Dear Gillian,  

Napa County congratulates ABAG on its December 16, 2021, adoption of the Final Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Plan: San Francisco Bay Area, 2023-2013, and is writing to request ABAG’s approval of RHNA Transfers between the County and the cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07.  

As ABAG staff and board members are aware, Section 65584.07 states that council of governments shall reduce the RHNA of unincorporated counties if one or more cities within the county agree to increase their shares by an equivalent amount. These RHNA “transfers” are to occur between adoption of the final RHNA (in this case December 2021) and the due date of the housing element (in this case January 2023) and were called out specifically in ABAG’s staff reports on appeals submitted by unincorporated counties (Contra Costa, Sonoma, Marin, and Santa Clara) as a way to address concerns about accommodating RHNA in a way that fosters efficient infill and protection of agricultural and environmental resources.  

Napa County and cities within the county have long shared a commitment to urban centered growth and agricultural preservation, and with this letter and attachments, the County is providing specifics of three requested transfers, which are based on signed agreements between the County and the three cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena. We also explain the factors and circumstances justifying the transfers and provide supporting documentation. Although not required by the statute, we have also included a discussion of the RHNA objectives in Government Code Section 65584(d).  

Importantly, with approval of the transfer requests, the County would retain a RHNA allocation and continue to fulfill its obligation to provide affordable housing in the unincorporated area.  

We would welcome an opportunity to discuss any questions you have regarding our request, the transfers, or the information and analysis provided with this letter, and invite you to contact me at david.morrison@countyofnapa.org. As noted in Section 65584.07(b)(1), the County and the cities involved in the transfers will need to use the RHNA as revised by the transfers to complete our respective housing element updates, and we therefore feel some urgency to conclude this step in the process.  

Respectfully,  
David Morrison, Director
I. Request for Transfer

In accordance with Government Code Section 65584.07(a), Napa County requests ABAG approval of revised RHNAs for the County, the City of Napa, the City of American Canyon, and the City of St. Helena. In each instance, the County and the city have executed one or more agreements wherein the city has agreed to increase its RHNA in an amount equivalent to a reduction that would be experienced by the County.

These “transfer agreements” are included as an attachment and support the request for transfers summarized in Table 1, below. In all instances other than the agreement with the City of St. Helena (which provides for a transfer of two units), the requested transfers are somewhat less than the maximums allowed by the executed agreements. This ensures that the County’s RHNA is reduced but not eliminated, as shown in Table 2, so that the County will continue to fulfill its obligation to plan for development of affordable housing in the unincorporated area and meet other requirements of the law.

| Table 1. Requested Transfers from the County to the Cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
|                                 | Very Low Income Units | Low Income Units | Moderate Income Units | Above Mod Income Units | Total Units transferred to the City(s) |
| Transfer Request #1 (City of Napa) | 266        | 153        | 86            | 225            | 730             |
| Transfer Request #2 (City of American Canyon) | 57         | 44         | 20            | 55             | 176             |
| Transfer Request #3 (City of St. Helena) | 1          | 0          | 0             | 1              | 2               |
| Total of Transfers 1+2+3         | 324        | 197        | 106           | 281            | 908             |

Notes:
1 The proposed transfers to the City of Napa and City of American Canyon are somewhat less than the maximum permitted under the terms of agreements executed by the County and the cities. In each case, the distribution of units by income category has been crafted to ensure the County’s compliance with Government Code Section 65584.07(a)(3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Napa County RHNA Before and After the Requested Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Low Income Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County's RHNA as of Dec. 2021</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of VLI+LI and Mod+Above Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Transfers 1+2+3 from Table 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of VLI+LI and Mod+Above Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County's Revised RHNA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of VLI+LI and Mod+Above Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Reduction btw RHNA as of Dec. 2021 and Revised RHNA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The transfers of lower income units are proportional to the transfers of moderate + above moderate units as required by Government Code Section 65584.07(a)(3). As shown in the last row, the combination of very low and low income units would be reduced by 90% (521 out of 582 very low and low income units), and the combination of moderate and above moderate units would also be reduced by 90% (387 out of 432 moderate and above - moderate units).

II. Compliance with Requirements of Section 65584.07(a)

Government Code Section 65584.07(a) provides a process whereby unincorporated counties may reduce their share of regional housing needs by transferring units to one or more of the cities within the county. This section of the law has remained essentially unchanged since its...
adoption in 2004 despite the recent flurry of housing legislation and serves to recognize the challenges faced by unincorporated jurisdictions, which often steward agricultural and environmental resources and are not broadly served by municipal utilities.

As stated in Section 65584.07(a)(4), the council of governments “shall approve the proposed reduction if it determines that conditions set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) have been satisfied.”

a. The condition in Section 65584.07(a)(1) states: “One or more cities within the county agree to increase its share or their shares in an amount equivalent to the reduction.” As explained above, and as demonstrated by the agreements attached to this report, the Cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena have each agreed to an increase in their RHNA that is equivalent to the County’s decrease.

b. The condition in Section 65584.07(a)(2) states: “The transfer of shares shall only occur between a county and cities within that county.” As explained above, and as demonstrated by the agreements attached to this report, the requested transfers would only be between the County and three cities within the County: Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena.

c. The condition in Section 65584.07(a)(3) states: “The county’s share of low-income and very low income housing shall be reduced only in proportion to the amount by which the county’s share of moderate- and above-moderate income housing is reduced.” The requested transfers would reduce the County’s lower income units (i.e., very low + low income units) in proportion to the reduction in moderate + above market units. Specifically:

- The transfer to the City of Napa would reduce the County’s RHNA for lower income units (very low + low income units) by 72% and would reduce the County’s RHNA for moderate plus above moderate units by 72%.
- The transfer to the City of American Canyon would reduce County’s RHNA for lower income units (very low + low income units) by 17% and would reduce the County’s RHNA for moderate plus above moderate units by 17%.
- The transfer to the City of St. Helena would reduce the County’s RHNA for lower income units (very low + low income units) by one unit and would reduce the County’s RHNA for moderate plus above moderate units by one unit.
- As shown in Table 2, all three transfers combined would reduce the County’s RHNA for lower income units (very low + low income units) by 90% and would reduce the County’s RHNA for moderate plus above moderate units by 90%.

III. Factors and Circumstances Justifying this Request

Section 65584.07(a)(4) further requires that “the county and city or cities proposing the transfer shall submit an analysis of the factors and circumstances, with all supporting data, justifying the revision.” Each of the city-county agreements attached to this request describes the factors and circumstances justifying the revision, summarized here as follows:
Preservation of Agricultural Land. Napa County and its incorporated jurisdictions have long shared a common interest in agricultural preservation and in maintaining the vibrant agricultural economy that is Napa County’s economic base. This has resulted in strong policies to protect agricultural lands from conversion to non-agricultural uses, and in policies to support urban centered growth. Examples include the County’s Measure P, adopted by the voters in November 2008 to preserve agricultural lands, and the urban growth boundaries (called Rural Urban Limit or Urban Limit Lines) established by the cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena.

These shared commitments seek to ensure that non-agricultural uses are located within incorporated jurisdictions where they will not conflict with agricultural uses, and also serve to encourage non-agricultural uses in areas (i.e., within city limits) where there are urban services, including water and wastewater utilities, frequent transit service, schools, groceries, health care, and all other needed services. The vast majority of unincorporated Napa County does not have access to water and wastewater utilities or convenient access to other urban services.

City Control within Spheres of Influence. Cities also wish to control development at their boundaries, so developable land that is available in the unincorporated area has often been annexed to the cities. A recent example involved the 154-acre Napa Pipe site, a former industrial site south of the City of Napa where the County approved a mixed-use development with 945 housing units that was identified in the County’s housing element for 2014-2022. The City of Napa wished to annex the site to control its phased development, and in exchange, agreed to accommodate 80 percent of the County’s RHNA via use of Section 65584.07. In turn, the County agreed to provide 80 percent of its affordable housing funds to projects within the City of Napa. A similar agreement facilitated annexation of the 320-acre Town Center/Lower Watson area to the City of American Canyon. While these annexations are consistent with the principles shared by the County and the cities, they also had the effect of reducing developable lands in the County that could be planned for multifamily housing.

County Financial Support for Affordable Developments within City Limits. The County provides significant financial support for affordable housing development without regard to jurisdictional boundaries. In the fifth housing element planning cycle, it has supported projects in American Canyon, Napa, St. Helena, providing in part: $2.25 million to the 70-unit Valley View project in American Canyon; $650,000 to the 8-unit Turley Flat project in St. Helena; and a total of at least $7.3 million to four projects in the City of Napa providing 154 affordable units. All of these projects were far more feasible within city limits than in the unincorporated area. The County has committed to providing the City of Napa with 80 percent of its affordable housing funds in the sixth housing element cycle. In recognition of the enhanced feasibility of affordable housing within city limits, the cities involved agreed to accommodate a portion of the County’s RHNA.

The four agreements between the County and the cities that form the basis of this request under Section 65584.07(a) are summarized in Table 3 below. A copy of each agreement is also provided as an attachment to this request.

---

1 Annexation occurred in December 2019. Legislation passed in 2020 allows the County to claim credit on its Annual Performance Reports for lower income housing at this site after annexation. See Government Code Section 65584.08.
Table 3. Summary of Executed Transfer Agreements between the County and Cities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction and Date of Agreement</th>
<th>Units by Income Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Napa (December 17, 2019)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agreement provides for annexation and phased development of the 154-acre Napa Pipe site in the City of Napa in exchange for the City’s agreement to accept 80% of the County’s RHNA in the 6th and subsequent housing cycles. The County had previously approved 945 housing units on the site.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of American Canyon (May 25, 2010)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agreement provides for annexation of the approximately 320 acres comprising the Town Center/Lower Watson Area which will accommodate 1,200 homes in exchange for the City’s agreement to accept a specified quantity of the County’s RHNA in the 5th and 6th housing cycles.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of American Canyon (May 2, 2017)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agreement provides for $2.25 M in County affordable housing funds to support development of the 70-unit Valley View Senior Homes project in exchange for the City’s agreement to accept a specified quantity of the County’s RHNA in the 6th housing cycle.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Helena (June 26, 2017)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agreement provides for $650K in County affordable housing funds to support development of the Turley Flats affordable housing project in exchange for the City’s agreement to accept a specified quantity of the County’s RHNA in the 6th housing cycle.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *The County’s January 2022 request for ABAG approval seeks transfers that are less than the maximum allowed under the agreements with the City of Napa and American Canyon.

bUnit distribution by income group is only specified in the May 25, 2010, City of American Canyon agreement. For all other agreements, the distribution by income group shown here is based on the distribution within County’s December 16, 2021, RHNA.

cUnits distributed by income group in the May 25, 2010 agreement add up to 186, but the agreement specifically references 168 units.
The requested transfers would advance the principles of agricultural preservation and urban centered growth by ensuring that additional housing is planned and developed within the cities. In addition, the transfers will result in more housing being developed because water and waste water utilities and access to other urban services are available in the cities rather than in the unincorporated County.

Importantly, despite the requested reduction in its RHNA, the County will retain a share of the regional housing need and will plan for affordable housing – especially farmworker housing – within the unincorporated area. The County will also meet all other housing element requirements related to affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH), emergency shelters, multifamily development, single room occupancies, transitional and supportive housing, and reducing constraints.

IV. Conformance with RHNA Objectives in Section 65584(d)

ABAG has asked that the transfer request demonstrate conformance with the RHNA objectives in Section 65584(d), although this is not a requirement for a transfer. Nonetheless, the requested transfers would conform to the RHNA Objectives in Government Code Section 65584(d), as outlined below.

- **65584(d)(1):** Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low income households.

The RHNA transfers will not change the total amount or type of housing that must be accommodated in Napa County but rather will place that housing on sites with available public utilities and access to urban services. The unincorporated properties with the greatest housing development potential have been annexed to the cities. The requested transfers will likely result in greater increases in housing supply generally and affordable housing in particular than would occur in the County because of the services available in the incorporated areas; access to services is required to obtain tax credits and other affordable housing funds. The transfers will also ensure that the County retains its agricultural economic base, which provides the basis for a majority of the jobs and other economic activity in the County.

The County will be required to meet all other housing element requirements, including providing a mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability. Although the approved agreements provide for the transfer of the County’s total RHNA, under this request the County would retain an allocation of 61 units for low- and very low income households following approval of the requested transfer.

The County will also continue to offer financial support for affordable housing developments in the cities as well as in the unincorporated area, with 80 percent of the County’s affordable housing funds provided to the City of Napa. (As noted in the previous section, the County has provided over $10M of affordable housing funding to the Cities of American Canyon, Napa, and St. Helena during the fifth cycle planning period.) The County also provides a broad array of services to city residents, especially lower income residents, including child welfare services, public health services, mental
health services, self-sufficiency services, and services for older adults. See information available on the County’s website here: https://www.countyofnapa.org/159/Programs-Services.

- **65584(d)(2): Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, the encouragement of efficient development patterns, and the achievement of the region’s greenhouse gas reductions targets provided by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Section 65080.**

ABAG encouraged counties that appealed their Draft RHNA (Contra Costa, Sonoma, Marin, Santa Clara) to pursue transfer agreements with their cities to “foster efficient infill and protection of agricultural and environmental resources.”

The requested transfers would promote infill development and other listed objectives by encouraging development within urbanized areas, rather than in agricultural zones, where parcel sizes are considerably larger, development is more dispersed, and fewer urban services (including utilities) are available. While residents of the cities who work in the unincorporated area will have to travel to their jobs, most jobs in the county are located within the cities, and the cities are where employees go for most urban services like groceries, hospitals, schools, etc. The cities also have more frequent transit service. All this means that development of infill housing in the cities would result in fewer and shorter auto trips and fewer emissions than housing in the unincorporated area.

- **65584(d)(3): Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing, including an improved balance between the number of low-wage jobs and the number of housing units affordable to low-wage workers in each jurisdiction.**

The County and the cities within Napa County have long agreed that urban services and non-agricultural development belong in urbanized areas and have viewed preserving Napa County’s agricultural economy (and supporting related employment) as a joint responsibility. ABAG’s Projections 2040 data for the County as a whole currently indicates 71,905 jobs and 50,365 households in the year 2020, or 1.43 jobs per household. The requested transfers would not change this, although by encouraging additional units in the cities where development of housing is more likely, they could incrementally improve the balance between jobs and housing.

The County also recognizes that there are – primarily agricultural – uses within the unincorporated area that involve employment. Farmworkers, winery employees, and similar workers must travel from the cities to their job sites unless they can find housing closer to their employment. As a result, the County supports operation of three farmworker centers (i.e., group housing) in the unincorporated area and permits development of up to 12 units of farmworker housing or 36 beds on any agriculturally zoned parcel. County staff is exploring ways that the housing element update can expand use of this code provision and otherwise promote development of farmworker housing and is actively participating in ABAG’s Farmworker Collaborative.

---

2 See ABAG staff reports regarding Contra Costa County Appeal, Sonoma County Appeal, Marin County Appeal, and Santa Clara County Appeal at this location: https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/housing/rhna-regional-housing-needs-allocation/2023-2031-rhna-appeals-process.
• 65584(d)(4): Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent American Community Survey.

The requested transfers comply with State law, which requires lower income (very low income + low income) units to be transferred proportionately to moderate + above moderate units. In other words, the County is not seeking to transfer away only its lower-income units and cannot adjust the proportion of lower income units versus moderate + above moderate units based on current household characteristics in the County or the cities.

Approximately 35% of the households in the County as a whole (unincorporated and incorporated jurisdictions) have incomes less than 80% of area median income (AMI). This compares to 36% of the households in the City of Napa, 34% of the households in the City of American Canyon, and 38% of the households in the City of St. Helena.³ This data suggest that most jurisdictions have comparable proportions of lower income households compared to the County as a whole and that the proposed transfers would not materially affect a jurisdiction with a disproportionate share of lower income households.

• 65584(d)(5): Affirmatively furthering fair housing. (Based on Section 65584(e), “affirmatively furthering fair housing” means taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws.)

Again, the requested transfers comply with State law, which requires lower income (very low income + low income) units to be transferred proportionately to moderate + above moderate units. In other words, the County is not seeking to transfer away only its lower-income units, and cannot adjust the proportion of lower income units versus moderate + above moderate units based on current household characteristics in the County or the cities. The cities participating in the transfer would be receiving a balance of lower income (very low income + low income) units and moderate + above moderate income units. See above for a discussion of each jurisdiction’s existing share of households by income category. Also, consistent with State law and HCD guidance, the County and each of the cities will have to conduct detailed AFFH assessments as part of their housing element updates.

³ 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) data. The County as a whole includes 17,185 households <80% of AMI out of a total of 49,030. The City of American Canyon includes 1,870 households <80% AMI out of 5440 total. The City of Napa includes 10,310 households <80% AMI out of a total of 28,455. The City of St. Helena includes 995 households <80% of AMI out of a total of 2,600. Survey data for the unincorporated area is not available.
V. Supporting Information

The four executed transfer agreements with the cities of Napa, American Canyon, and St. Helena that form the foundation for the County’s transfer request are included here as an attachment and provide evidence of the commitment to the RHNA transfers by all jurisdictions involved.
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN THE CITY OF NAPA AND NAPA COUNTY  
REGARDING REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATIONS FOR FUTURE HOUSING ELEMENT PLANNING PERIODS  

This Memorandum of Agreement ("Agreement") between the City of Napa ("City") and Napa County ("County") is dated August 25, 2015, to reflect the first date upon which it is executed by both the City and the County, as shown by the signatures of their authorized representatives below, and, subject to the terms set forth herein, shall be binding upon the City and County from the date of its complete execution. The City and County each may be referred to herein as a “Party” and together may be referred to herein as the “Parties.”  

RECITALS  

A. The City and County have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") regarding the future development of two parcels of land in unincorporated Napa County comprising approximately 154 acres and commonly referred to as the Napa Pipe site (APNs 046-400-030 and 046-412-005, as and hereafter, the "Property"). The Property is depicted in greater particularity on Exhibit A hereto.  

B. The County Board of Supervisors has adopted various land use approvals for the development of the Property (the "Project"), which approvals include Resolution No. 2014-139, approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 25, 2014, approving a Tentative Map for the Project; Ordinance No. 1393, approved by the Board on December 16, 2014, approving a Development Plan for the Napa Pipe Zoning District portion of the Property; Ordinance No. 1394, approved by the Board on December 16, 2014, approving a Development Agreement for the Napa Pipe Zoning District portion of the Property; and Ordinance No. 1397, approved by the Board on February 10, 2015, approving the Design Guidelines for the Napa Pipe Zoning District portion of the Property.  

C. The County desires to rely on housing proposed as part of the Project to meet certain affordable housing obligations imposed on the County by state law. Pursuant to Article 10.6 (the "Housing Element Law") (Government Code sections 65580 - 65589.8) of Chapter 3 of the Planning And Zoning Law, the Association of Bay Area Governments ("ABAG") periodically adopts a Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA") for each county and city in the greater San Francisco Bay Area, including Napa County and the City of Napa. Under the Housing Element Law, each city and county must periodically revise the housing element of its general plan utilizing the latest RHNA adopted by ABAG. The current revision to the housing elements of the City and County is designated as the fifth required revision by Government Code Section 65588, and is identified by ABAG as the 2014-2022 planning period.  

D. The MOU between the City and County provides in Section 2.3(e) that the City and County may enter into a RHNA agreement as allowed under Government Code Section 65584.07 or any successor statute ("Section 65584.07") providing for the transfer to the City of eighty percent (80%) of the County's RHNA obligation for each housing element planning period commencing with the sixth and subsequent revisions (as defined in Government
Code 65588), during such time as the County's Measure P (as approved by the voters in November 2008, and as may be extended by subsequent voter approval) remains in effect, provided that certain requirements of the MOU are satisfied. This Agreement is intended by the County and the City to serve as the RHNA agreement contemplated by Section 2.3(e) of the MOU.

E. Approval of the Project and successful implementation of the MOU will allow the County to meet its RHNA for the 2014-2022 housing element planning period (fifth revision) and obtain a certified housing element. This Agreement provides for RHNA transfers from the County to the City in the sixth and subsequent housing element planning periods, so long as the County’s Measure P remains in effect, for the benefit of both the City and the County and in furtherance of City and County policies to preserve agricultural lands in Napa County so as to maintain a viable agriculture-based economy, prevent urban sprawl, direct growth and development into existing cities, and promote infill and smart growth.

F. In addition to this Agreement, the City and County have entered into that certain Memorandum of Agreement Between the City of Napa and Napa County Regarding the City of Napa’s Sphere of Influence and the Napa Pipe Property (the “SOI Agreement”), as provided by California Government Code Section 56428. As described in the SOI Agreement, the City Council has, by resolution dated July 21, 2015, authorized the City Manager to approve, subject to the satisfaction of certain conditions set forth in such resolution, the submittal of an application (the “LAFCO Application”) to the Napa County Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) to (i) update the City’s Sphere of Influence (“SOI”) boundary to bring the Property within the City’s SOI, (ii) extend City services, including water and other required municipal services in accordance with that certain Memorandum of Agreement Between the City of Napa and Napa County Regarding the Provision of Municipal Services for the Napa Pipe Development Project (the “Municipal Services Agreement”) and that certain Annexation Consent, Protest Waiver and Water Service Agreement By and Between the City of Napa and Napa Redevelopment Partners (the “Water Agreement”), and (iii) annex the Property to the City in two steps in accordance with the SOI Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises and agreements contained herein, the Parties hereto mutually agree as follows:

TERMS

1. The County has identified the specific portion of the Property zoned NP-MUR-W:AC (the “Housing Site”), as an available housing site in its fifth Housing Element revision, and intends to issue, upon application, residential building permits for construction of housing on the Housing Site during the 2014-2022 housing element cycle, while the Housing Site remains in the County’s jurisdiction, in order to satisfy the County’s RHNA obligation for the fifth revision.

2. Starting with the sixth revision of the housing element (currently 2023-2030, or as that planning period may be adjusted by ABAG, the Department of Housing and Community Development, or statute) and for all subsequent revisions for the life of the County's Measure P (as approved by the voters in November 2008, and as may be extended by subsequent voter
approval), upon ABAG’s adoption of a final RHNA, the County and City shall jointly apply to ABAG to reduce the County's RHNA allocation by 80% and to increase the City's RHNA allocation by 80% of the County's original allocation, as provided for and in conformance with the requirements of Government Code section 65584.07. Accordingly, upon ABAG's approval, the City's share of the RHNA will increase by 80% of the County's original allocation and the County's RHNA shall decrease by 80% of the County's original allocation, as allowed under Government Code section 65584.07.

3. ABAG may determine the City and County's RHNA for the sixth and subsequent revisions of the housing element in one of two ways. ABAG may make the determination based on its methodology adopted under Government Code Section 65584.04. Alternatively, the parties and other cities or counties may form a subregional entity under Government Code Section 65584.03 or any successor statute for purposes of allocating the RHNA among members of the subregional entity. If the parties are members of such a subregional entity, the RHNA prepared by the subregional entity and submitted to ABAG shall be made without reference to the contemplated 80% transfer. Upon ABAG's adoption of a final RHNA, the County and City shall jointly apply to ABAG to reduce the County's RHNA allocation by 80% and to increase the City's RHNA allocation by 80% of the County's original allocation as described in Paragraph 2 above.

4. At all times following the transfers of the County’s RHNA allocations described in Sections 2 and 3 above, the County shall prioritize eighty (80%) of the County’s Non-Residential Affordable Housing Impact Fees and other funds in the County’s affordable housing fund generated County-wide to finance affordable housing projects within the City of Napa in recognition of the City’s agreement to assume the County’s ongoing RHNA obligation. Notwithstanding the foregoing, County’s use of Non-Residential Affordable Housing Impact Fees and other funds in the County’s affordable housing fund generated from the Project shall be used in accordance with Section 5.3 of the Affordable Housing Plan attached as Exhibit C to that certain Development Agreement entered into between the County and Napa Redevelopment Partners, LLC, dated as of January 13, 2015.

5. At all times while the modifications to the City’’s and the County’’s RHNA obligations described herein remain in effect, the County shall limit land uses to governmental uses or uses consistent with applicable zoning in effect on October 8, 2013, as provided in the MOU (unless changes to the zoning and Specific Plan are mutually agreed to by the City and the County) for all properties generally located south of the City of Napa and north of the City of American Canyon, as depicted in the South County Industrial Areas map attached as Exhibit B to the MOU (also attached hereto as Exhibit B), including (a) the Napa County Airport Industrial Area (b) all unincorporated land to the south of the City limits, including but not limited to the Syar Properties, and (c) unincorporated land north of the City of American Canyon generally on the east side of Highway 29 between South Kelly Road and Napa Junction.
6. All other provisions of this Agreement to the contrary notwithstanding, this Agreement shall have no force or effect unless and until all of the following conditions have been satisfied:

a. the City and the NRP shall have executed the Water Agreement described in Recital F above;

b. the County and NRP shall have executed an amendment to the Development Agreement consistent with the terms of the Water Agreement, as described in Recital F above;

c. the Napa County LAFCO shall have approved the City’s requests to (i) expand its SOI to include the Property, and (ii) extend municipal services to the Property, as set forth in the City’s LAFCO Application described in Recital F above; and

d. at all times since October 8, 2013, the County shall have fully and without exception enforced the limitation on land uses described in Section 5 above.

Provided that the preceding conditions have been satisfied, then upon the effective date of LAFCO’s approval of the City’s requests to expand its SOI and extend municipal services to the Property, as provided by Government Code section 56428(e), the City and County shall become unconditionally obligated to comply with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

7. The City and County shall take all steps reasonably necessary to comply with the Government Code section 65584.07 and such other transfer statutes, as applicable, to implement this Agreement, including but not limited to, providing the appropriate documentation to ABAG or any other agency, as required. The parties agree to work together to obtain ABAG and any other approval where required to effectuate this Agreement. City further agrees that it will utilize the revised RHNA that includes the transfer of RHNA contemplated by this Agreement in preparing the City’s sixth and subsequent housing element revisions, as applicable.

8. The County shall indemnify, defend, and hold the City and its respective elected and appointed councils, boards, commissions, officers, agents, employees, volunteers, and representatives, harmless from all loss, fines, penalties, forfeitures, costs, damages and other liabilities of any type (whether in contract, tort or strict liability), including but not limited to personal injury, death or property damage (including inverse condemnation) (collectively, “Liabilities”), and from any and all claims, demands and actions in law or equity (including attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses) directly or indirectly arising out of or alleged to have arisen out of or in any way related to this Agreement (collectively, “Claims”), asserted against or incurred by the City to the extent arising from any action of the County or of any employees of the County in their performance of any of the terms, covenants or conditions of this Agreement during the term hereof. The City shall indemnify, defend, and hold the County and its respective elected and appointed councils, boards, commissions, officers, agents, employees, volunteers, and representatives, harmless from any and all Liabilities and Claims (as those terms are defined above) asserted against or incurred by the County to the extent arising from any action of the City or of any employees of the City in their performance of any of the terms, covenants or
conditions of this Agreement during the term hereof. The Parties shall cooperate in the defense of any third party legal action challenging this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been entered into by, and shall be binding upon, the County and the City as of the date it has been executed by both Parties as shown by the signatures below.

COUNTY:
COUNTY OF NAPA
By: DIANE DILLON, CHAIR of the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
By: MINH TRAN, COUNTY COUNSEL

CITY:
CITY OF NAPA
By: CITY MANAGER
On: 8-11-15

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
By: CITY ATTORNEY

ATTEST:
By: Deputy CITY CLERK

MOU re RHNA for Napa Pipe property
EXHIBIT A
(Property Description)
EXHIBIT B
(South County Industrial Areas Map)

EXHIBIT - B

Industrial Areas
AIASP Boundary
City Boundaries

South County Industrial Areas

Made with ArcGIS

County of Napa
P.B.E.S.
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF NAPA AND NAPA COUNTY
REGARDING REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATIONS FOR FUTURE
HOUSING ELEMENT PLANNING PERIODS

This Amended and Restated Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Napa ("City") and Napa County ("County") regarding Regional Housing Needs Allocations for Future Housing Element Planning Periods ("Agreement") is dated, for reference purposes, December 17, 2019, to reflect the first date upon which it is executed by both the City and the County, as shown by the signatures of their authorized representatives below. This Agreement amends and restates the Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Napa and Napa County regarding Regional Housing Needs Allocations for Future Housing Element Planning Periods entered into by the City and County on August 25, 2015 (the "RHNA Agreement") to reflect the intended annexation of the entire Property to the City. The City and County each may be referred to herein as a "Party" and together may be referred to herein as "the Parties."

RECITALS

A. On October 8, 2013, City and County entered into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") regarding the future development of four parcels of land in unincorporated Napa County comprising approximately 154 acres and commonly referred to as the Napa Pipe site (APNs 046-412-006, 046-412-007, 046-400-054 and 046-400-055, hereafter, "the Property"). The Property is depicted in greater particularity on Exhibit A hereto.

B. The County Board of Supervisors has adopted various land use approvals for the development of the Property (the "Project"), which approvals include Resolution No. 2014-139, approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 25, 2014, approving a Tentative Map for the Project; Ordinance No. 1393, approved by the Board on December 16, 2014, approving a Development Plan for the Napa Pipe Zoning District portion of the Property; Ordinance No. 1394, approved by the Board on December 16, 2014, approving a Development Agreement for the Napa Pipe Zoning District portion of the Property; and Ordinance No. 1397, approved by the Board on February 10, 2015, approving the Design Guidelines for the Napa Pipe Zoning District portion of the Property. The County and Napa Redevelopment Partners, LLC ("Landowner"), and the City, following annexation to the City of a portion of the Property, are each a party to that certain Development Agreement By and Between Napa County and Napa Redevelopment Partners, LLC, which carries Napa County Agreement Number 8264 and was recorded in the official records of the County of Napa on January 26, 2015, as Document Number 2015-0002281, as amended by that certain First Amendment to Development Agreement (County Agreement No. 8264) By and Between Napa County and Napa Redevelopment Partners, LLC, which was recorded in the official records of the County of Napa on September 23, 2015, as Document Number 2015-0024296 (as amended, the "DA").

C. The County’s Housing Element of the General Plan relies on housing proposed as part of the Project to meet certain affordable housing obligations imposed on the County by state law. Pursuant to Article 10.6 (the “Housing Element Law”) (Government Code Sections 65580 - 65589.8) of Chapter 3 of the Planning and Zoning Law, the Association of Bay Area Governments ("ABAG") or a subregional entity that includes the Parties and is formed under...
Government Code Section 65584.03 or any successor statute ("Subregion") periodically adopts a Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA") for Napa County and the City of Napa. Under the Housing Element Law, each city and county must periodically revise the housing element of its general plan utilizing the latest adopted RHNA. The current revision to the housing elements of the City and County is designated as the fifth required revision by Government Code Section 65588 for the 2015-2022 planning period.

D. The MOU between the City and County provides in Section 2.3(e) that the City and County may enter into a RHNA agreement as allowed under Government Code Section 65584.07 or any successor statute ("Section 65584.07") providing for the transfer to the City of eighty percent (80%) of the County’s RHNA obligation for each housing element planning period commencing with the sixth and subsequent revisions (as defined in Government Code Section 65588), during such time as the County’s Measure P (as approved by the voters in November 2008, and as may be extended by subsequent voter approval) remains in effect, provided that certain requirements of the MOU are satisfied. The RHNA Agreement entered into by the Parties was intended by the County and the City to serve as the RHNA agreement contemplated by Section 2.3(e) of the MOU and became binding upon the City and County from the date of its complete execution on August 25, 2015.

E. Approval of the Project and successful implementation of the MOU was intended to allow the County to meet its RHNA for the 2014-2022 housing element planning period (fifth revision) and obtain a certified housing element. Under the terms of the DA, the parties thereto anticipated that the residential portions of the Project would be developed in phases, and as building permits were issued for each phase, the portions of the Property that had been developed would be annexed to the City.

F. However, in January 2018, Landowner notified the City and the County that Landowner desired to redesign the Project and accelerate construction of housing on the Property, including the required Affordable Homes (as defined in the Napa Pipe Affordable Housing Plan attached to the DA). Landowner’s proposed redesign of the Project requires several amendments to its existing entitlements, including amendments to the DA. The City and Landowner initiated the annexation of the remainder of the Project site to the City, including the proposed residential portions of the Project, thereby allowing Landowner to process all required amendments to its entitlements in the City. On November 18, 2019 the Local Agency Formation Commission of Napa County ("LAFCO") approved the annexation of the entire Property to the City, conditioned in part on the execution of a mutually acceptable amendment to the RHNA Agreement. Execution of this Agreement by the Parties will satisfy that condition to the annexation of the Property.

G. This Agreement provides for RHNA transfers from the County to the City in the sixth and subsequent housing element planning periods, so long as the County’s Measure P remains in effect, for the benefit of both the City and the County and in furtherance of City and County policies to preserve agricultural lands in Napa County so as to maintain a viable agriculture-based economy, prevent urban sprawl, direct growth and development into existing cities, and promote infill and smart growth.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises and agreements contained herein, the Parties hereto mutually agree as follows:
TERMS

1. The Preamble, Recitals, Exhibits, and all defined terms set forth therein are hereby incorporated into this Agreement as if set forth herein in full.

2. Starting with the sixth revision of the housing element (currently 2022-2030, or as that planning period may be adjusted by ABAG, the Department of Housing and Community Development, or statute) and for all subsequent revisions for the life of the County’s Measure P (as approved by the voters in November 2008, and as may be extended by subsequent voter approval), upon ABAG’s or the Subregion’s adoption of a final RHNA, the County and City shall jointly apply to ABAG or the Subregion, as appropriate, to reduce the County’s RHNA allocation by 80% and to increase the City’s RHNA allocation by 80% of the County’s original allocation, as provided for and in conformance with the requirements of Government Code Section 65584.07. Accordingly, upon ABAG’s or the Subregion’s approval, the City’s share of the RHNA will increase by 80% of the County’s original allocation and the County’s RHNA shall decrease by 80% of the County’s original allocation, as allowed under Government Code section 65584.07 or successor statute.

3. At all times following the transfers of the County’s RHNA allocations described in Section 2 above, the County shall prioritize eighty (80%) of the County’s Non-Residential Affordable Housing Impact Fees and other funds in the County’s affordable housing fund generated County-wide to finance affordable housing projects within the City of Napa in recognition of the City’s agreement to assume the County’s ongoing RHNA obligation.

4. At all times while the modifications to the City’s and the County’s RHNA obligations described herein remain in effect, the County shall limit land uses to governmental uses or uses consistent with applicable zoning in effect on October 8, 2013, as provided in the MOU (unless changes to the zoning and Specific Plan are mutually agreed to by the City and the County) for all properties generally located south of the City of Napa and north of the City of American Canyon, as depicted in the South County Industrial Areas map attached as Exhibit B to the MOU (also attached hereto as Exhibit B), including (a) the Napa County Airport Industrial Area (b) all unincorporated land to the south of the City limits, including but not limited to the Syar Properties, and (c) unincorporated land north of the City of American Canyon generally on the east side of Highway 29 between South Kelly Road and Napa Junction.

5. All conditions contained in Section 6 of the RHNA Agreement have been satisfied, and on September 22, 2015, which was the effective date of LAFCO’s approval of the City’s requests to expand its Sphere of Influence and extend municipal services to the Property, as provided by Government Code Section 56428(e) and LAFCO Resolution No. 2015-11, the City and County became unconditionally obligated to comply with the terms and conditions of the RHNA Agreement, and that unconditional obligation is incorporated into this Agreement.

6. The City and County shall take all steps reasonably necessary to comply with Government Code Section 65584.07 and such other transfer statutes, as applicable, to implement this Agreement, including but not limited to, providing the appropriate documentation to ABAG, the Subregion, or any other agency, as required. The Parties agree to work together to obtain ABAG, Subregion, or any other approval where required to effectuate this Agreement. City further
agrees that it will utilize the revised RHNA that includes the transfer of RHNA contemplated by this Agreement in preparing the City's sixth and subsequent housing element revisions, as applicable.

7. The County shall indemnify, defend, and hold the City and its respective elected and appointed councils, boards, commissions, officers, agents, employees, volunteers, and representatives, harmless from all loss, fines, penalties, forfeitures, costs, damages and other liabilities of any type (whether in contract, tort or strict liability), including but not limited to personal injury, death or property damage (including inverse condemnation) (collectively, "Liabilities"), and from any and all claims, demands and actions in law or equity (including attorneys' fees and litigation expenses) directly or indirectly arising out of or alleged to have arisen out of or in any way related to this Agreement (collectively, "Claims"), asserted against or incurred by the City to the extent arising from any action of the County or of any employees of the County in their performance of any of the terms, covenants or conditions of this Agreement during the term hereof. The City shall indemnify, defend, and hold the County and its respective elected and appointed councils, boards, commissions, officers, agents, employees, volunteers, and representatives, harmless from any and all Liabilities and Claims (as those terms are defined above) asserted against or incurred by the County to the extent arising from any action of the City or of any employees of the County in their performance of any of the terms, covenants or conditions of this Agreement during the term hereof. The Parties shall cooperate in the defense of any third party legal action challenging this Agreement.

8. The sole and exclusive judicial remedy for any Party in the event of a dispute between the Parties arising from or relating to this Agreement shall be an action in mandamus, specific performance, or other injunctive or declaratory relief. The Parties hereby expressly agree that neither Party, nor any of its elected and appointed councils, boards, commissions, officers, agents, employees, volunteers and representatives, shall be liable for any monetary damage for any breach of or default under, arising out of, or relating to this Agreement, and each Party hereby expressly waives any such monetary damages against the other Party.

9. If any term of this Agreement (including any phrase, provision, covenant, or condition) is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unenforceable, the Agreement will be construed as not containing that term, and the remainder of this Agreement will remain in full force and effect; provided, however, this section will not be applied to the extent that it would result in a frustration of the Parties' mutual intent under this Agreement.

10. This Agreement may not be amended or modified orally. No amendment or modification of this Agreement is binding unless it is in a writing signed by both Parties.

11. No waiver of a breach, default, or duty under this Agreement will be effective unless it is in writing and signed by the Party waiving the breach, default, or duty. Waiver of a breach, default, or duty under this Agreement will not constitute a continuing waiver or a waiver of any subsequent breach, default, or duty under this Agreement.

12. This Agreement, including all documents incorporated herein by reference, comprises the entire integrated understanding between the Parties concerning the subject matter hereof. This Agreement supersedes all prior negotiations, agreements, and understandings.
regarding this matter, whether written or oral. The documents incorporated by reference into this Agreement are complementary; what is called for in one is binding as if called for in all.

13. Each Party to this Agreement has had an opportunity to review the Agreement, and to consult with its respective legal counsel regarding the meaning of the Agreement. Accordingly, Civil Code Section 1654 will not apply to interpret any uncertainty in the meaning of the Agreement.

14. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each one of which is deemed an original, but all of which together constitute a single instrument.

15. The individuals executing this Agreement represent and warrant that they have the right, power, legal capacity, and authority to enter into and to execute this Agreement on behalf of the respective legal entities of the County and the City.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been entered into by, and shall be binding upon, the County and the City as of the date it has been executed by both Parties as shown by the signatures below.

**COUNTY:**
COUNTY OF NAPA

By:  
RYAN GREGORY, CHAIR
NAPA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On:  
12/17/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED AS TO FORM</th>
<th>APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>ATTEST: JOSE LUIS VALDEZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of County Counsel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By: S. Darbinian  
Deputy County Counsel  
Date: 12/13/19 |  
Date: 12/17/2019  
Processed by:  
Deputy Clerk of the Board |  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors |

**CITY:**
CITY OF NAPA

By:  
CITY MANAGER

On:  
12/18/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED AS TO FORM</th>
<th>ATTEST:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina S. Wolfson, Deputy City Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERSIGNED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY CLERK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY AUDITOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California
County of Napa

On December 18, 2019 before me, Caitlin Marie Saldanha, notary public

personally appeared Steve Potter

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Optional

Place Notary Seal and/or Stamp Above

Description of Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: ____________________________________________

Document Date: ______________________________ Number of Pages: __________

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: ______________________________________

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer's Name: ____________________________

☐ Corporate Officer – Title(s): ____________________________

☐ Partner – ☐ Limited ☐ General

☐ Individual ☐ Attorney in Fact

☐ Trustee ☐ Guardian of Conservator

☐ Other: ____________________________________________

Signer is Representing: ____________________________________________

Signer’s Name: ____________________________

☐ Corporate Officer – Title(s): ____________________________

☐ Partner – ☐ Limited ☐ General

☐ Individual ☐ Attorney in Fact

☐ Trustee ☐ Guardian of Conservator

☐ Other: ____________________________________________

Signer is Representing: ____________________________________________

©2017 National Notary Association
A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document, to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California

County of Napa ss.

On December 17, 2019 before me, Greg S. Morgan, Notary Public, personally appeared Ryan Gregory, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he executed the same in his authorized capacity, and that by his signature on the instrument the person, or the entity upon behalf of which the person acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature:

GREG S. MORGAN
Commission #2309553
Notary Public – California
Napa County
My Commission Expires October 20, 2023
Work Phone: 707-299-1515
EXHIBIT A
(Property Description)
RHNA TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND PROPERTY TAX REVENUE SHARING AGREEMENT REGARDING ADJUSTMENTS IN THE ALLOCATION OF PROPERTY AND SALES TAXES AS A RESULT OF THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN PARCELS (COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE TOWN CENTER/LOWER WATSON PARCELS) CURRENTLY IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF NAPA COUNTY TO THE CITY OF AMERICAN CANYON AND THE AMERICAN CANYON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

This Agreement is made and entered into as of June 28, 2010 by and between the County of Napa, a political subdivision of the state of California ("County"), the City of American Canyon, a municipal corporation ("City"), and the American Canyon Fire Protection District ("District").

WHEREAS, the District is a special district which was reorganized as a subsidiary district of the City as a part of the incorporation of the City of American Canyon effective July 1, 1992; and

WHEREAS, on July 3, 2008, City and County entered into County Agreement No. 7070/City Agreement No. 2008-93 relating to City’s urban growth boundary and other matters of mutual interest in the South County area; and

WHEREAS, the City’s urban growth boundary includes the property commonly known as the Town Center/Lower Watson Area as more particularly described in Exhibit B attached hereto and incorporated here by reference; and

WHEREAS, the City would like to annex the Town Center/Lower Watson Area and would like the County’s support of such annexation; and

WHEREAS, the City of American Canyon agrees to accept a significant allocation of the County’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA") in return for the County’s support of the annexation of the Town Center/Lower Watson Area; and

WHEREAS, section 99 of the Revenue and Taxation Code provides that negotiations be entered into between the County, the City and the District regarding adjustments in the allocation of property taxes whenever a "jurisdictional change" involving annexations are proposed; and

WHEREAS, Revenue and Taxation Code section 99(b)(6) provides that the LAFCO Executive Officer shall not issue a Certificate of Filing pursuant to section 56828 of the Government Code until the City and County included in the property tax revenue exchange negotiation present resolutions adopted by each entity whereby each entity agrees to accept the exchange of property tax revenues; and
WHEREAS, the parties will comply with the technical requirements of Revenue and Taxation Code section 99 and adopt the required resolutions whenever that section becomes applicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PARTIES AGREE ASдерivated:

PART I. AGREEMENT DEFINITIONS

When used in this Agreement, the following words or phrases shall have the following meanings unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Property Tax Share" shall mean the City receives forty-seven and a half percent (47.5%) of the County share of the one percent (1%) property tax rate increment applicable to the annexed lands; and five percent (5%) of the County share shall be reallocated to the District. The remaining forty-seven and a half percent (47.5%) of the preexisting County share shall be retained by County. One hundred percent (100%) of the County's Structural Fire tax base and increment shall be transferred to the District upon annexation of the lands to the District.

"City" shall mean the City of American Canyon.

"County" shall mean the County of Napa.

"District" shall mean the American Canyon Fire Protection District, a subsidiary district of the City of American Canyon.

"LAFCO" shall mean the Napa County Local Agency Formation Commission.

"County RHNA Transfer" shall mean a transfer of a portion of the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation to the City of American Canyon pursuant to Government Code section 65584.07 and its successor statute and in accordance with Exhibit A in return for the County's written support of the annexation of the Town Center/Lower Watson Area.

"Project Dwelling Units" shall mean the total number of dwelling units approved for the Town Center Specific Plan.

"Sphere of Influence" shall mean the LAFCO-approved plan for the probable physical boundary and service area of the City of American Canyon, as defined in Government Code section 56076.

"Town Center Property/Lower Watson Area" shall mean that real property described by Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) 59-020-008, 59-020-009, 59-020-010, 59-020-011, 59-020-026, 59-020-029 (portion), 59-020-030, 59-020-032 (portion), 59-030-003 (portion), 59-120-017 (portion), consisting of approximately 320 acres as is more fully described in Exhibit B, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.
PART II.  PRE-REQUISITE ACTIONS

A. Prior to the revenue tax sharing aspect of the Agreement taking effect, City and County agree to take certain actions as described in this Part II as follows:

B. City, District and County shall take all necessary actions required under this Agreement such that LAFCO may act on the annexation of Town Center/Lower Watson Area as soon as practicable. County will support City's and District's request that LAFCO expedite processing of the application for the Town Center/Lower Watson Area sphere of influence amendment and annexation.

C. County shall provide written support to LAFCO for the inclusion of Town Center/Lower Watson Area into City's and District's Sphere of Influence and for their annexation. The letter shall include a statement that inclusion of the Town Center Property/Lower Watson Area into City's and District's Sphere of Influence and annexation to the City and District is consistent with County's updated General Plan approved in 2008. Such written support shall be provided within 15 days of the approval of Agreement by City, County and District.

D. County will support City's and District's request that LAFCO use its "Southeast Napa: Municipal Service Review, June 2009" as the basis for its consideration of the Sphere of Influence and annexation and that LAFCO not require supplemental studies regarding infrastructure, services and finances except as such studies are required by California law.

PART III.  REVENUE TAX SHARING AGREEMENT

A. Property Taxes. In accordance with Revenue and Taxation Code section 99, the property tax sharing agreement is hereby adopted to be effective upon the recordation of the LAFCO Executive Officer's Certificate of Completion of annexations of the Town Center Property/Lower Watson Area.

The City, County, and Fire District shall be allocated property tax in accordance with the Property Tax Share in return for the City accepting the County RHNA Transfer that is, the City receives forty-seven and a half percent (47.5%) of the County share of the one percent (1%) property tax rate increment applicable to the annexed lands; and five percent (5%) of the County share shall be reallocated to the District. The remaining forty-seven and a half percent (47.5%) of the preexisting County share shall be retained by County. The City may request a proper accounting of any property tax distribution provided herein and the County shall make such a report in a timely manner.

B. County RHNA Transfer. The City agrees to and hereby accepts the County RHNA Transfer for the next two housing cycles/RHNA planning periods as depicted on Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. City's obligation to accept the County RHNA Transfer shall become effective upon the County's submission to LAFCO of the letter(s) described in Part II.C. The County RHNA Transfer is made pursuant to Government Code section 65584.07 and any successor statute relating to transfer of a jurisdiction's regional housing needs allocation. The parties hereby agree to take any and all actions required under Government Code section 65584.07 (and its successor statute) to implement the County RHNA Transfer.

C. Sales Tax. The City shall receive one hundred percent (100%) of the sales tax generated within any annexed area.
D. Effective Date of Agreement: This Agreement shall become effective upon execution by the parties. The Property Tax Share provisions shall become effective if and when the properties described herein are annexed to the City and District, upon recordation of the LAFCO Executive Officer’s Certificate of Completion of annexations of those properties. If one of properties is annexed to the City and District prior to annexation of the remaining properties, the Property Tax Share shall become effective with respect to the annexed property.

E. Compliance with Revenue and Taxation Code section 99. Whenever applicable, the parties will take the necessary steps required by section 99 of the Revenue and Taxation Code to implement this Agreement, including adoption of the requisite resolutions.

F. Warranty of Legal Authority. Each party warrants and covenants that it has the present legal authority to enter into this Agreement and to perform the acts required of it hereunder. If any party is found to lack the authority to perform the acts required of it hereunder or is prevented from performing the acts by a court of competent jurisdiction, this Agreement shall be null and void.

G. Assignment/Delegation. Neither party hereto shall assign, or transfer any benefit or obligations of this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other, and no assignment shall be of any force or effect whatsoever unless and until the other party shall have so consented.

H. Severability. In the event any provision of this Agreement is held to be invalid or unenforceable, the valid or enforceable portion thereof and the remaining provisions of this Agreement will remain in full force and effect.

I. Waiver. Any waiver (express or implied) by either party of any breach of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other or subsequent breach.

J. Notices. Whenever notice is to be given, it shall be in writing and delivered by personal, overnight express or courier service, with a written receipt, or sent by registered or certified mail in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid, return receipt requested and addressed as follows:

City of American Canyon:
City Manager
4381 Broadway, Suite 201
American Canyon, California 94503

With copy to:
City Attorney
Law Offices of William Ross
400 Lambert Street
Palo Alto, California 94306

County of Napa:
Napa County Executive Officer
1195 Third Street, Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559

With copy to:
Community and Intergovernmental Affairs Manager
County of Napa
Changes may be made in addresses to where notices are to be delivered by giving notice pursuant to this provision.

K. Entire Agreement. This document is intended both as the final expression of the agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the included terms and as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Agreement. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall constitute an original.

L. Amendment. This Agreement may only be amended in writing by an amendment authorized by the City Council, or the City Council acting as the governing body of the District, and the County Board of Supervisors.

M. Recitals Adopted. The parties hereby agree to, and adopt, the Agreement recitals as portions of the Agreement.

N. Copy to Interested Persons. The Clerk of the Board shall immediately forward a copy of this Agreement to the Auditor-Controller for the County, the Clerks of the District and the City, and the Executive Officer of LAFCO.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement was executed by the parties hereto as of the date first above written.

ATTEST: GLADYS I. COIL
Napa Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

COUNTY OF NAPA
By: [Signature]
DIANE DILLON,
Chair of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
ROBERT WESTMEYER, County Counsel

By: [Signature]
| ATTEST: Rebekah Barr, CMC  
American Canyon City Clerk | CITY OF AMERICAN CANYON  
By: [Signature]  
Mayor |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
WILLIAM D. ROSS, City Attorney | AMERICAN CANYON FIRE PROTECTION  
DISTRICT  
By: [Signature]  
Chairperson |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
William D. Ross, Attorney for District | ATTEST:  
District Clerk  
By: [Signature] |
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Exhibit A

A. **Purpose of Agreement and Exhibit A:** The purpose of this Agreement and this Exhibit A is to cover the next two housing cycles/RHNA planning periods, as those cycles are described in Government Code sections 65588 and 65584.02 (and any successor statutes). The transfers of housing units are made pursuant to Government Code section 65584.07 (and any successor statutes).

B. **Transferred Amounts:**

1. **The 2014-2022 RHNA Planning Period:** For the RHNA planning period 2014-2022, the City and County agree that the County’s RHNA shall be reduced by 200 housing units, and the City’s RHNA shall be increased by 200 housing units.

2. **The RHNA Planning Period Following the Next:** For the RHNA planning period following the 2014-2022 RHNA period, the City and County agree that the County’s RHNA shall be reduced by 168 units, and the City’s RHNA shall be increased by 168 units.

3. **Method of Distribution:** This reduction in the County’s RHNA is made pursuant to Government Code section 65584.07 and the transferred housing units shall be allocated in the manner required by that statute (and any successor statutes).

The allocation of the 200 units for the first RHNA planning period (2014-2022) covered by this agreement is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred Units</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The intent of this Agreement and this Exhibit A is to cover the next two housing cycle/RHNA planning periods. Currently, the next housing cycle/RHNA planning period is from 2014-2022. Sometimes the Legislature or the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) extends or modifies the cycle. The intent of this Agreement and Exhibit is to cover the next 2 housing/RHNA cycles, as they may be extended or modified by statute, HCD, ABAG, or by any court or state order or directive.

2 If the cities and the County form a subregion per Government Code section 65584.04 to determine their RHNA, then the allocations shall initially be made without reference to the proposed transfer, and the units shall be transferred after the initial allocations are approved by the subregion.
The allocation of the 168 units for the second RHNA planning period covered by this Agreement (following the 2014-2022 planning period) will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred Units</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The numbers set forth in the above graphs are the actual numbers to be allocated to each income category during the next two housing cycles to the extent that they meet the parameters of Government Code section 65584.07. The parties agree to meet and confer in good faith in the event the transferred housing units need to be reallocated among the income categories in order to comply with the mandates of state law.

C. **Housing Credits**: As each certificate of occupancy is issued for housing units in the City during the RHNA planning periods referenced above, the City will report to HCD the total number of housing units in each income category, and the City will credit the County with a percentage of the housing units in each category. The percentage credited to the County will be based on the ratio between transferred units, and the City's RHNA allocation following the transfer.
Exhibit B (To Be Attached)
(Legal Description of Town Center/Lower Watson Area)
EXHIBIT B

PROPERTY TAX REVENUE SHARING AGREEMENT
FOR LOWER WATSON/TOWN CENTER PROPERTIES
AMERICAN CANYON, CALIFORNIA

All that certain real property, situate in the incorporated territory of the City of American Canyon and in the unincorporated territory of the County of Napa, State of California, and being a portion of Sections 18 and 19, Township 4 North, Range 3 West, Mount Diablo Meridian, and a portion of Sections 13 and 24, Township 4 North, Range 4 West, Mount Diablo Meridian, described as follows:

Commencing at the centerline intersection of Rolling Hills Drive and Terrazzo Lane;

Thence, (1) North 02°05'13" West 134.92 feet to the true point of beginning,
Thence, (2) from said point of beginning, South 84°34'57" West 1,226.23 feet;
Thence, (3) North 03°20'23" East 600.03 feet;
Thence, (4) North 80°50'23" East 1,415.27 feet;
Thence, (5) North 06°09'00" East 749.40 feet;
Thence, (6) North 87°11'48" West 1,418.53 feet;
Thence, (7) North 03°20'23" East 2,649.15 feet;
Thence, (8) North 06°05'23" East 264.00 feet;
Thence, (9) North 08°20'23" East 132.00 feet;
Thence, (10) North 09°35'23" East 132.00 feet;
Thence, (11) North 12°35'23" East 612.48 feet;
Thence, (12) South 89°09'37" East 23.61 feet;

Thence, (13) along a non-tangent curve to the right with
Radius 5,629.58 feet
Delta 08°55'45"
Arc Length 877.33 feet
Chord Length 876.43 feet
Chord Bearing North 20°34'12" East
Radial Bearing South 73°53'40" East

Thence, (14) North 25°29'57" East 546.04 feet;
Thence, (15) along a non-tangent curve to the right with
Radius 1,560.00 feet
Delta 02°04'59"
Arc Length 56.72 feet
Chord Length 56.71 feet
Chord Bearing South 46°38'25" East
Radial Bearing South 42°19'06" West

Thence, (16) South 45°35'55" East  1,343.94 feet;

Thence, (17) along a tangent curve to the right with
Radius 1,560.00 feet
Delta 36°33'14"
Arc Length 995.26 feet
Chord Length 978.47 feet
Chord Bearing South 27°19'18" East

Thence, (18) South 09°02'41" East  597.78 feet;

Thence, (19) along a tangent curve to the right with
Radius 3,062.00 feet
Delta 03°53'47"
Arc Length 208.23 feet
Chord Length 208.19 feet
Chord Bearing South 07°05'48" East

Thence, (20) South 05°08'54" East  2,231.30 feet;

Thence, (21) along a tangent curve to the left with
Radius 1,438.00 feet
Delta 07°35'00"
Arc Length 190.33 feet
Chord Length 190.18 feet
Chord Bearing South 08°56'24" East

Thence, (22) South 12°43'54" East  220.24 feet;

Thence, (23) along a tangent curve to the right with
Radius 1,186.00 feet
Delta 46°55'59"
Arc Length 971.50 feet
Chord Length 944.56 feet
Chord Bearing South 10°44'06" West
Thence, (24) along a reverse curve to the left with
Radius 1,438.00 feet
Delta 18°12'18"
Arc Length 456.91 feet
Chord Length 454.99 feet
Chord Bearing South 25°05'56" West
Radial Bearing South 55°47'55" East

Thence, (25) South 15°59'47" West 9.80 feet;
Thence, (26) North 05°59'35" West 441.83 feet;
Thence, (27) North 87°30'27" West 1,276.17 feet;
Thence, (28) South 05°28'48" East 478.85 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 320 acres of land more or less.

END OF DESCRIPTION

For assessment purposes only. This description of land is not a legal property description as defined in the subdivision Map Act and may not be used as the basis for an offer of sale of the land described.
RHNA TRANSFER AGREEMENT FOR THE VALLEY VIEW PROJECT

This RHNA Transfer Agreement ("Agreement") is made and entered into as of May 2, 2017 by and between the County of Napa, a political subdivision of the state of California ("County") and the City of American Canyon, a municipal corporation ("City").

WHEREAS, the City and the County share a mutual commitment to encourage land use policies that preserve agricultural uses and that focus new development in urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, the City and the County also share a mutual commitment to cooperate toward pooling available resources in order to meet the housing needs of the County, including those regional housing needs identified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") and the Association of Bay Area Governments ("ABAG"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to housing element law (Government Code Sections 65580 et seq.), ABAG periodically prepares a Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA"), which specifies the existing and projected need for housing in each city and county in the San Francisco Bay Area, including Napa County and all cities in Napa County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 65888, the housing element of each city and county must be periodically revised, and prior to each required housing element revision, ABAG must adopt a revised RHNA, which is utilized by the County and the City in revising their housing elements; and

WHEREAS, the next required revision to the housing elements of the City and the County is designated as the "sixth" required revision by Government Code Section 65888, and will be due in approximately 2023; and

WHEREAS, City and County each award City affordable housing funds and County housing fund monies, respectively, for the development of affordable housing in Napa County as a whole; and

WHEREAS, the City owns certain real property located at 1 Theresa Avenue in the City of American Canyon, and City and Satellite Affordable Housing Associates, a California non-profit public benefit corporation and its affiliate Valley View Senior Homes LP, a California limited partnership (collectively "Developer"), have entered into an agreement whereby the City will convey the property to Developer for the construction of a senior citizen housing development containing 70 dwelling units, of which 34 units will be affordable to very low income households ("Project"); and
WHEREAS, the Developer of the Project has submitted an application to the County for a loan from the County's Affordable Housing Fund ("Housing Fund") to assist in the development of affordable housing; and

WHEREAS, the County by Resolution No. 2017-14 and Resolution No. 2017-68 has awarded up to Two Million Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($2,250,000) to the Project, with Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000) coming from the County's Housing Fund and Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000) coming from the Health and Human Services Agency general funds; and

WHEREAS, the Project and will provide housing for those who are age 55 and older and will have a set-aside for veterans who are either homeless or would otherwise soon be homeless; and

WHEREAS, of the 70 units, 17 will be set aside as permanent supportive housing for homeless veterans and an additional 5 will be set aside for veterans, for a total of 22 veterans units; three of the 70 units would house homeless or soon to be homeless individuals and families through the County's Coordinated Entry program, and thus the Project would be partially funded by County Health and Human Services Agency general fund; and

WHEREAS, to promote the City's and County's mutual commitment to focusing new development in urbanized areas, the County requires that, as a condition of funding those projects located in the incorporated municipalities within the County of Napa, the City must agree to increase its share of the regional housing needs pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07 (or successor provision) in the next RHNA cycle to be adopted by ABAG, so that the County's share of the RHNA shall be reduced.

NOW, THEREFORE, IN CONSIDERATION OF THE MUTUAL CONSIDERATION SET FORTH HEREIN, THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Transfer of a Portion of the County's RHNA. The City hereby agrees to increase its share of the RHNA adopted for the sixth required revision of the housing element by thirty (30) units so that the RHNA of the County shall be reduced by thirty (30) dwelling units. If the County and the City form a subregion pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.03 or any successor statute to determine the RHNA of the County and the City, then the RHNA prepared by the subregion shall initially be made without reference to this Agreement, and following initial adoption of the RHNA by the subregion, the City's share of the RHNA shall be increased by thirty (30) dwelling units, and the County's share of the RHNA shall be reduced by thirty (30) dwelling units. The thirty (30) dwelling units to be allocated in accordance with this Agreement shall be apportioned among very low income, low income, moderate income, and above moderate income housing, pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07(a).

2. Award of Housing Fund Monies. The County has agreed to award up to Two Million Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($2,250,000) from its Housing Fund to the Project (the "Loan") and has accordingly adopted Resolution No. 2017-14 and Resolution No. 2017-68 awarding the Loan to the Developer on the condition that the City and the County enter into this
Agreement. The City's obligation to increase its share of the RHNA as set forth in this Agreement is subject to the conditions precedent of: (a) the County's funding of the Loan to the Developer, and (b) upon the Developer obtaining building permits for the construction of the Affordable Units for the Project. If, for any reason, the Developer defaults on the Loan, or the County is forced for other reasons to recall the Loan, the City's obligation to increase its share of RHNA units and to comply with the provisions of this Agreement shall continue.

3. **Compliance with Government Code Section 65584.07.** The increase in the City's share of the RHNA and the reduction in the County's share of the RHNA as provided herein is made pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07 and any successor statute relating to transfer of a jurisdiction's RHNA, and the parties agree that the County's RHNA shall be reduced, and the City's RHNA shall be increased, in the manner required by these statutes. Accordingly, the City and the County shall take all steps necessary to comply with Government Code Section 65584.07 to implement this Agreement, including but not limited to, providing the appropriate documentation to ABAG and to HCD or any other agency if required. The parties agree to work together to obtain ABAG approval of the RHNA transfer included in this Agreement. The City further agrees that it will utilize the revised RHNA that includes the transfer of the dwelling units covered under this Agreement from the County to the City in preparing the sixth revision to its housing element as required by Government Code Section 65888. As soon as ABAG approves the reduction in the County's share of the RHNA and the increase in the City's share of the RHNA, the parties shall use the revised RHNA in preparing the sixth revision to their housing elements and shall adopt the sixth revisions in compliance with all laws.

4. **Annual Report.** In preparing the annual report required by Government Code Section 65400, the City shall report the assistance provided by the Housing Fund when reporting on the Project.

5. **Warranty of Legal Authority.** Each party warrants and covenants that it has the present legal authority to enter into this Agreement and to perform the acts required of it hereunder. If any party is found to lack the authority to perform the acts required of it hereunder or is prevented from performing the acts by a court of competent jurisdiction, this Agreement shall be null and void.

6. **Assignment/Delegation.** Neither party hereto shall assign, or transfer any benefit or obligations of this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other, and no assignment shall be of any force or effect whatsoever unless and until the other party shall have so consented.

7. **Severability.** In the event any provision of this Agreement is held to be invalid or unenforceable, the valid or enforceable portion thereof and the remaining provisions of this Agreement will remain in full force and effect.

8. **Waiver.** Any waiver (express or implied) by either party of any breach of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other or subsequent breach.
9. Notices. Whenever notice is to be given, it shall be in writing and delivered by personal, overnight express or courier service, with a written receipt, or sent by registered or certified mail in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid, return receipt requested and addressed as follows:

City of American Canyon

City Manager
4381 Broadway, Suite 201
American Canyon, California 94503

With copy to:

City Attorney

Law Offices of William Ross
400 Lambert Street
Palo Alto, California 94306

County of Napa:

Napa County Executive Officer
1195 Third Street, Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559

With copy to:

Housing and Intergovernmental Affairs Director
County of Napa
1195 Third Street, Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559

Napa County Counsel
1195 Third Street, Suite 301
Napa, CA 94559

Changes may be made in addresses to where notices are to be delivered by giving notice pursuant to this provision.

10. Entire Agreement. This document is intended both as the final expression of the agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the included terms and as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Agreement. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall constitute an original.

11. Amendment. This Agreement may only be amended in writing by an amendment authorized by the City Council and the County Board of Supervisors.
12. Recitals Adopted. The parties hereby agree to, and adopt, the Agreement recitals as portions of the Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement was executed by the parties hereto as of the date first above written.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTEST:</th>
<th>COUNTY OF NAPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By: Gladys I. Cole</td>
<td>By: Belia Ramos, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Napa County Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED AS TO FORM:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By: Silva Darbinian, Deputy County Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTEST:</th>
<th>CITY OF AMERICAN CANYON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By: Suellen Johnston, City Clerk</td>
<td>By: Dana Shigley, City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED AS TO FORM:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By: William D. Ross, City Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RHNA TRANSFER AGREEMENT FOR THE
TURLEY FLATS PROJECT

This RHNA Transfer Agreement (the "Agreement") is made and entered into as of May 31, 2017 by and between the County of Napa, a political subdivision of the state of California (the "County") and the City of St. Helena, a municipal corporation (the "City").

WHEREAS, the City and the County share a mutual commitment to encourage land use policies that preserve agricultural uses and that focus new development in urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, the City and the County also share a mutual commitment to cooperate toward pooling available resources in order to meet the housing needs of the County, including those regional housing needs identified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") and the Association of Bay Area Governments ("ABAG"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to housing element law (Government Code Sections 65580 et seq.), ABAG periodically prepares a Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA"), which specifies the existing and projected need for housing in each city and county in the San Francisco Bay Area, including Napa County and all cities in Napa County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 65588, the housing element of each city and county must be periodically revised, and prior to each required housing element revision, ABAG must adopt a revised RHNA, which is utilized by the County and the City in revising their housing elements; and

WHEREAS, the next required revision to the housing elements of the City and the County is designated as the "sixth" required revision by Government Code Section 65588 and will be due in approximately 2023; and

WHEREAS, City and County each award City affordable housing funds and County housing fund monies, respectively, for the development of affordable housing in Napa County as a whole; and

WHEREAS, a proposed affordable housing project located in the City of St. Helena and known as the "Turley Flats" project (the "Project"), as described in Exhibit "A" attached to this Agreement, is to be developed by Calistoga Affordable Housing, Inc., a California non-profit corporation (the "Developer"); and

WHEREAS, the Developer of the Project has submitted an application to the County for a loan from the County's Affordable Housing Fund (the "Housing Fund") to assist in the development of such housing; and

WHEREAS, subject to the terms of this Agreement, the City supports the Project's application for an award of monies from the Housing Fund, and is also awarding City affordable housing funds toward the development of the Project; and
WHEREAS, the County by Resolution No. 2017-60 adopted April 4, 2017 has awarded Six Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($650,000) to the Project from the County’s Housing Fund, and the City on January 31, 2017 awarded Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars ($700,000) to the Project from its affordable housing fund, which results in a proportionate award of Forty-Eight Percent (48%) of public funding from the County and Fifty-Two Percent (52%) of public funding from the City; and

WHEREAS, the Project proposes a total of eight (8) affordable housing units (the "Affordable Units"), all of which will benefit from funds contributed by the City and the County; and

WHEREAS, to promote the City's and County's mutual commitment to focusing new development in urbanized areas, the County requires that, as a condition of funding those projects located in the incorporated municipalities within the County of Napa, the City must agree to increase its share of the regional housing needs pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07 (or successor provision) in the next RHNA cycle to be adopted by ABAG, so that the County's share of the RHNA shall be reduced.

NOW, THEREFORE, IN CONSIDERATION OF THE MUTUAL CONSIDERATION SET FORTH HEREIN, THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Transfer of a Portion of the County's RHNA.** The City hereby agrees to increase its share of the RHNA adopted for the sixth required revision of the housing element by Two (2) dwelling units so that the RHNA of the County shall be reduced by Two (2) dwelling units. If the County and the City form a subregion pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.03 or any successor statute to determine the RHNA of the County and the City, then the RHNA prepared by the subregion shall initially be made without reference to this Agreement, and following initial adoption of the RHNA by the subregion, the City's share of the RHNA shall be increased by Two (2) dwelling units, and the County's share of the RHNA shall be reduced by Two (2) dwelling units. The Two (2) dwelling units to be allocated in accordance with this Agreement shall be apportioned among very low income, low income, moderate income, and above moderate income housing, pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07(a).

2. **Award of Housing Fund Monies.** The County has agreed to award Six Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($650,000) from its housing trust fund to the Project (the "Loan") and has accordingly adopted Resolution No. 2017-60 awarding the Loan to the Developer on the condition that the City and the County enter into this Agreement. The City's obligation to increase its share of the RHNA as set forth in this Agreement is subject to the conditions precedent of: (a) the County's funding of the Loan to the Developer, and (b) upon the Developer obtaining building permits for the construction of the Affordable Units for the Project. If, for any reason, the Developer defaults on the Loan, or the County is forced for other reasons to recall the Loan, the City's obligation to increase its share of RHNA units and to comply with the provisions of this Agreement shall continue.
3. Compliance with Government Code Section 65584.07. The increase in the City's share of the RHNA and the reduction in the County's share of the RHNA as provided herein is made pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.07 and any successor statute relating to transfer of a jurisdiction's RHNA, and the parties agree that the County's RHNA shall be reduced, and the City's RHNA shall be increased, in the manner required by these statutes. Accordingly, the City and the County shall take all steps necessary to comply with Government Code Section 65584.07 to implement this Agreement, including but not limited to, providing the appropriate documentation to ABAG and to HCD or any other agency if required. The parties agree to work together to obtain ABAG approval of the RHNA transfer included in this Agreement. The City further agrees that it will utilize the revised RHNA that includes the transfer of the dwelling units covered under this Agreement from the County to the City in preparing the sixth revision to its housing element as required by Government Code Section 65888. As soon as ABAG approves the reduction in the County's share of the RHNA and the increase in the City's share of the RHNA, the parties shall use the revised RHNA in preparing the sixth revision to their housing elements and shall adopt the sixth revisions in compliance with all laws.

4. Annual Report. In preparing the annual report required by Government Code Section 65400, the City shall report the assistance provided by the Housing Fund when reporting on the Project.

5. Warranty of Legal Authority. Each party warrants and covenants that it has the present legal authority to enter into this Agreement and to perform the acts required of it hereunder. If any party is found to lack the authority to perform the acts required of it hereunder or is prevented from performing the acts by a court of competent jurisdiction, this Agreement shall be null and void.

6. Assignment/Delegation. Neither party hereto shall assign, or transfer any benefit or obligations of this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other, and no assignment shall be of any force or effect whatsoever unless and until the other party shall have so consented.

7. Severability. In the event any provision of this Agreement is held to be invalid or unenforceable, the valid or enforceable portion thereof and the remaining provisions of this Agreement will remain in full force and effect.

8. Waiver. Any waiver (express or implied) by either party of any breach of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other or subsequent breach.

9. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts which together shall constitute the contract of the parties.

10. Notices. Whenever notice is to be given, it shall be in writing and delivered by personal, overnight express or courier service, with a written receipt, or sent by registered or certified mail in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid, return receipt requested and addressed as follows:
City of St. Helena

City Manager
City of St. Helena
1480 Main Street
St. Helena, CA 94574

With copy to:

City Attorney
City of St. Helena
1480 Main Street
St. Helena, CA 94574

County of Napa:

Napa County Executive Officer
County of Napa
1195 Third Street, Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559

With copy to:

Deputy County Executive Officer
County of Napa
1195 Third Street, Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559

Napa County Counsel
County of Napa
1195 Third Street, Suite 301
Napa, CA 94559

Changes may be made in addresses to where notices are to be delivered by giving notice pursuant to this provision.

11. Entire Agreement. This document is intended both as the final expression of the agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the included terms and as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Agreement. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall constitute an original.

12. Amendment. This Agreement may only be amended in writing by an amendment authorized by the City Council and the County Board of Supervisors.

13. Recitals Adopted. The parties hereby agree to, and adopt, the Agreement recitals as portions of the Agreement.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement was executed by the parties hereto as of the date first above written.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTEST:</th>
<th>COUNTY OF NAPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By:</td>
<td>By: Berta Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys J. Cole, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Chair, Napa County Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 10/4/18</td>
<td>Date: 5/14/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED AS TO FORM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By: Silva Darbinian, Deputy County Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 5/14/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTEST:</th>
<th>CITY OF ST. HELENA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By: Cindy Black, City Clerk</td>
<td>By: Erica Ahmann Smithies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: June 29, 2017</td>
<td>Title: Interim City Manager/Public Works Director and City Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED AS TO FORM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By: Thomas B. Brown, City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: June 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Turley Flats Project will consist of 8 units in the City of St. Helena. The project will target individuals and families earning 80% of the area median income for Napa County.

Below is a description of the property:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>1105 Pope Street, St. Helena</th>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>009-090-003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Status</td>
<td>Calistoga Affordable Housing, Inc.</td>
<td>Census tract(^1)</td>
<td>2016.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size</td>
<td>9,525 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Zoning/GP</td>
<td>1) Zoning: MR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D: SITES INVENTORY WORKBOOK

See separate Sites Inventory workbook in HCD’s Microsoft Excel format.