

“D”

Public Comments
Received After February 20, 2019

From: Tijero, Jesus
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 8:42 AM
To: Valdez, Jose (Louie) <Jose.Valdez@countyofnapa.org>
Cc: Whitney, Karita <Karita.Whitney@countyofnapa.org>; Morgan, Greg <Greg.Morgan@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: FW: Water Quality and Tree Protection ordinance information

Good morning,

See letter below addressed to the Board and Planning Commission regarding the watershed and tree protection ordinance.

Jesus Tijero
Staff Assistant BOS
Napa County
Office: 707-253-6170
Cell: 707-363-7467



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

From: Igor Sill <igor.sill@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 11:10 AM
To: Dillon, Diane <Diane.DILLON@countyofnapa.org>; Pedroza, Alfredo <Alfredo.Pedroza@countyofnapa.org>; Ramos, Belia <Belia.Ramos@countyofnapa.org>; Wagenknecht, Brad <BRAD.WAGENKNECHT@countyofnapa.org>; Tijero, Jesus <Jesus.Tijero@countyofnapa.org>; Cortez, Nelson <Nelson.Cortez@countyofnapa.org>; joellegPC@gmail.com; dave.witmer@countyofnapa.org; anne.cottrell@lucene.com; andrew.mazzotti@countyofnapa.org; jeriGillPC@outlook.com; Tom Davies <tom@vsattui.com>; Tom Dinkel <tom@doslagosvineyards.com>; Peter Stoneberg <pstoneberg@gmail.com>; Patrick Elliott-Smith <elanwine@aol.com>; Elana Hill <Elana@primesolum.com>; Celeste Cooper <Celeste.Cooper@blackstallionwinery.com>; Gregory, Ryan <Ryan.Gregory@countyofnapa.org>; Harvest Duhig <harvestvino@gmail.com>; Samuel Peters <sampeters_apaa@live.com>; Darioush Khaledi <darioush@darioush.com>; Cathy Corison <cathy@corison.com>; Susan Boswell <susan@chateauboswellwinery.com>; gene@casanuestra.com; Carmen Policy <cpolicy@casapiena.com>; Andre Crisp <andre@lunavineyards.com>
Subject: Water Quality and Tree Protection ordinance information

Dear Napa County Supervisors & Planning Commission:

I would like to bring to your attention important information regarding the issues raised at last Wednesday's Napa County Planning Commission's review of Water Quality and Tree Protection Ordinance as part of the Napa County Strategic Plan. First, please recall that a majority of Napa County voters defeated Measure C. As a small family farmer in Napa I would like you to realize that we, the small family farm are facing a very real, dire crisis with survival as our single biggest concern.

Anti-winery rhetoric geared towards increasing winery restrictions and further protectionism is overtaking control of Napa's greatest treasure, the finest wine-producing area in the world. The 1968 agricultural preserve was passed by Napa's then Board of Supervisors and later strengthened by a majority of voters to preserve, promote and protect agricultural land in Napa Valley for future generations. The ordinance established agriculture as the "best use" of these lands and kept Napa from being over-developed. With it, Napa's vineyards are now the most regulated agricultural industry in California.

Activist demands threaten Napa's vintners and winemakers contributions to our schools, housing, tax revenues, jobs that support our local community and our citizens. As a small Napa farmer, I concur completely with the following position and statement: ***"In my opinion, if his proposed ordinance is approved, it will not only nearly stop the planting of new vineyards, it will derail the economic engine of the Napa Valley"*** said Tom C. Davies of St. Helena, President of V. Sattui Winery.

As a further example, I would like you to reflect on the enormous contributions of many of Napa Winery owners to Napa's protective environment. An example is Mr. Davies' employer, Dario Sattui, himself a pioneer visionary of a clean, sustainable Napa agricultural community who faced activist environmentalist through similar intimidation, bullying, shunning and character assassination some 20 years ago.

This excerpted from a 17 year old article published in SFGate:

<https://www.sfgate.com/wine/article/The-empire-that-Sattui-built-A-tourist-s-dream-2792191.php>

"Looking down on Sterling Vineyards across the valley, the castle is going to be a tourists' dream, but it's seen as a travesty by many locals who decry the commercialization of their beautiful valley.

Even ardent environmentalists and preservationists concerned about erosion, watershed disturbance, deep disruption of the soil and the "viewshed" or look of the area cite Sattui's contributions to the Land Trust and don't want to jeopardize his stated goal of shielding most of his land from development. Sattui envisions the grounds will have olive trees and chickens running around, dogs lying in the path and signs in Italian. "I want people to enjoy themselves," he says. The new and still-unnamed winery won't have a deli but it will offer tours. He also says he's not doing it for the money, but just to have fun. "It's my fantasy," he admits, "a way to restore my family's wine tradition."

And here 17 years later, what a thoughtful, wonderful contribution he has and continues to make to Napa and its citizenry. Today, Castello di Amorosa is a world famous iconic Napa estate winery and has allowed Sattui to become one of Napa's biggest tax payers, generous contributor to Napa's welfare, Napa's land trust, environment, culture, and many other causes; truly one of Napa's greatest philanthropists.

Lastly, I would like you to consider the exhaustive research and analysis response by Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department and publicly released in response to erroneous, inaccurate activist information as cited below:

“I would like to respond to Ms. Chris Malan’s letter, published on Sept. 2, 2018, where she recommends that water be the focus of the county’s Strategic Plan (“Impose moratorium on new slope vineyards”). Ms. Malan’s comments are welcome, and water is likely to play a prominent role in the plan, but the letter contains incorrect information. My intent is not to be argumentative, but it is critical for the success of the Strategic Plan that community decisions be based on factual evidence.

The Strategic Plan will define county priorities through 2022, and the actions needed to achieve those goals. While debate often centers around land use, the county has nearly 20 departments and over 1,350 employees, who deal with issues including law enforcement, fire, healthcare, libraries, support services, parks, and roads. The Strategic Plan will encompass all of the county’s many responsibilities and public concerns.

I would like to respond to several specific issues raised by Ms. Malan.

Algae blooms are a health concern throughout California. They are caused by increased water temperature, high nutrient concentrations, and low water flows. In 2014, the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) approved a proposal to take the Napa River off the list of impaired water bodies for nutrients resulting in excessive algae growth. The State Water Quality Control Board (SWQCB) will consider the delisting in the summer of 2020.

County staff have worked with the RWQCB to ensure that the new vineyard Waste Discharge Requirements are compatible with our erosion control plan process. **As a result of these requirements, other jurisdictions in the Bay Area will be following the model that Napa County established more than 25 years ago to protect watersheds and the quality of our streams.**

Forests are not being eliminated within Napa County. Nearly 42 percent of the county (or 213,000 acres) consists of oak woodlands, riparian forest, or conifer forest. In comparison, only 13 percent of the county is used for farmland, and 6 percent is developed with urban uses. **Trees cover more than twice as much land in Napa as agriculture and cities combined.**

Since 1991, the county has approved an average of eight new wineries annually. There have never been 50 new wineries approved in one year. In fact, there haven’t been 50 new wineries approved over the past eight years combined. The highest number of new wineries approved in any one year was 17 in 2006.

Most vineyards are not planted on steep slopes. There are currently 53,451 acres of vineyards in Napa County. More than 57 percent of the vineyards are on lands that have slopes of less than 5 percent. More than 85 percent of vineyards are on slopes of less than 15 percent.

The Conservation Regulations already require stream buffers and tree retention. Setbacks of 35 to 150 feet are mandated for vineyards, depending on the surrounding slopes. Setbacks may also be applied to vineyard replanting and previously disturbed areas may be required to be revegetated. A minimum 60 percent of all tree canopy must be retained on any parcel where a vineyard is proposed. When biological studies are also applied, 90 percent of on-site trees are protected.

Extensive monitoring of wells around the Napa Valley shows that ground water levels remain steady. There is no evidence of subsidence, water quality impacts, salt water intrusion, or streams being affected by overdrafting. The county has prepared a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (Basin Analysis Report), as required under state law. The plan is currently under review by the California Department of Water Resources. In addition, the county has joined with the city of Napa to voluntarily study water quality in the watersheds of the municipal reservoirs.

The Napa River is proposed for listing as an impaired water body for chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, mercury, and PCBs. No action by the SWQCB has yet been taken. However, the pesticides referenced have been banned for over 30 years. Mercury is a mineral that naturally occurs throughout the region and has not been mined locally more than 50 years.

The county administers 29 permits that allow the use of hold and haul to process high strength wastewater. Six facilities are located within city limits and another five are within the airport industrial area (serviced by the Napa Sanitation District). Only 18 of over 500 wineries (less than 4 percent) have hold and haul permits. Note that on-site wastewater systems also need to have their tanks regularly pumped.

Public policy should be based on goals that we can all agree upon, relying on fact-based analysis. I appreciate and share Ms. Malan's interest in protecting our natural resources and welcome the ongoing dialogue. The best way that we can ensure a comprehensive and balanced approach to protecting our natural resources is for the public, business leaders, and local government to work together in developing a sustainable vision for all of Napa County."

David Morrison, Director

Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department

I also support the position that Napa County stop limiting the number of visitors and employees each winery is allowed to have, but instead base winery visitation on a winery's supported infrastructure, such as water, parking and handling of its wastewater.

In closing, we all recognize that our Napa agriculture has a unique heritage. This legacy of farming is present today and remains one of the most important agricultural places in the world. The 1968 agricultural preserve was passed by Napa's then Board of Supervisors and later strengthened by a majority of voters to preserve, promote and protect agricultural land in Napa Valley for future generations. The ordinance established agriculture as the "best use" of these lands and kept Napa from being over-developed. This was long before Napa County's future as a prosperous wine country was assured, when many felt Napa Valley might go the way of urbanized Silicon Valley. Napa County's Ag Preserve was a visionary land-zoning ordinance, the first of its kind in the USA and, our farming legacy thrives today because of it, having become one of the most productive counties in the entire nation. Since then, the rest of the Bay Area has seen a huge growth difference, mirroring Los Angeles and Silicon Valley's sprawling urbanization while Napa maintains its strategic growth plans. If governmental growth projections are correct, Napa Valley will remain a regional oasis of agriculture 50 years from now. With it, Napa's vineyards have become the most regulated agricultural industry in California. The cost of compliance results in significant additional expense and time for us farmers, property owners as well as the County.

All farmers that I know in Napa are tremendously diligent, responsible, eco-conscientious and concerned about always doing the right thing with their farms and surrounding lands.

It has become obvious that certifications of National Wildlife Federation, FishFriendlyFarming, CCOF and NapaGreen have become abundant and virtually posted everywhere, just note the number of vineyard signs attesting to prevention of water pollution, limited or total non-use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides to protect our surrounding waterbodies, wild life and air quality. This is a voluntary, conscientious movement by us farmers to continue to "do the right thing" for Napa's land and community, without the need for further excessive governmental bureaucratic involvement.

Napa is well known for its outsized share of activists that have alarmed the community with deceptive and erroneous reporting of false information surrounding Napa's long term strategic plan. Let's consider the science-based facts, and not alter, change or add restrictions to an already restrictive and functioning policy. Thank you, Igor Sill, one of Napa's small family farmers, Atlas Peak, Napa.

George Banks
270 Franz Valley School Road
Calistoga, CA 94515

Planning Commission Mtg.
MARCH 6 2019
Agenda Item # 7A

Belia Ramos
County of Napa
1195 Third Street
Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559

Ms. Ramos,

As a hillside land owner in Napa County, I would hope that you do not further destroy the value of my property. The county land use laws are already much to oppressive with regards to planting and farming my land. Any further attempts to "Put canopy or 30%" restrictions is unwanted and unnecessary.

Thank you for your consideration.



George Banks

From: [Morrison, David](#)
To: [Fuller, Lashun](#); [Bledsoe, Teresa](#); [Thepkaisone, Cesselea](#)
Cc: [Bordona, Brian](#); [Anderson, Laura](#); [Gallina, Charlene](#)
Subject: FW: Letter from Concerned Land Owner
Date: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 4:18:17 PM
Attachments: [scan19022614164.pdf](#)
Importance: High

From: Valdez, Jose (Louie) <Jose.Valdez@countyofnapa.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 3:47 PM
To: Gregory, Ryan <Ryan.Gregory@countyofnapa.org>; 'Diane Dillon' <diane@dianedillon.net>; Wagenknecht, Brad <BRAD.WAGENKNECHT@countyofnapa.org>; Ramos, Belia <Belia.Ramos@countyofnapa.org>; Pedroza, Alfredo <Alfredo.Pedroza@countyofnapa.org>
Cc: Morrison, David <David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org>; Brax, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Brax@countyofnapa.org>; Tran, Minh <Minh.Tran@countyofnapa.org>; Whitney, Karita <Karita.Whitney@countyofnapa.org>; Morgan, Greg <Greg.Morgan@countyofnapa.org>; Capriola, Thomas <Thomas.Capriola@countyofnapa.org>; Sharp, Leigh <Leigh.Sharp@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: FW: Letter from Concerned Land Owner
Importance: High

Members of the Board:

Good afternoon.

Please see the correspondence below regarding the Draft Water Quality & Tree Protection Ordinance.

Thank you.

Louie Valdez
Administrative Manager –
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of Napa, CA
1195 3rd St., 3rd Floor
Napa, CA 94559
(707)-253-4196 Office



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and all attachments are confidential and intended solely for the recipients as identified in the "To," "Cc" and "Bcc" lines of this email. If you are not an intended recipient, your receipt of this email and its

attachments is the result of an inadvertent disclosure or unauthorized transmittal. Sender reserves and asserts all rights to confidentiality, including all privileges that may apply. Immediately delete and destroy all copies of the email and its attachments, in whatever form, and notify the sender of your receipt of this email by sending a separate email or phone call. Do not review, copy, forward, re-transmit or rely on the email and its attachments in any way.

From: Ramos, Belia <Belia.Ramos@countyofnapa.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 3:37 PM
To: Valdez, Jose (Louie) <Jose.Valdez@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: FW: Letter from Concerned Land Owner
Importance: High

Sent with BlackBerry Work
(www.blackberry.com)

From: Sharon Beiner <sbeiner@prcpllc.com>
Date: Tuesday, Feb 26, 2019, 1:36 PM
To: Ramos, Belia <Belia.Ramos@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: Letter from Concerned Land Owner

Please see the attached

George Banks
(707) 942-4132

From: [Morrison, David](#)
To: [Joelle Gallagher](#); [Whitmer, David](#); [Anne Cottrell](#); "Jeri Gill"; [Andrew Mazotti](#)
Cc: [Bordona, Brian](#); [Anderson, Laura](#); [Gallina, Charlene](#)
Subject: FW: New proposed ordinance
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 11:49:04 PM
Attachments: [Prelim version 1.pdf](#)
[CA - Old Republic Title Company - 201804240122 - 1459138.pdf](#)
[Watershed protection ordinance.docx](#)

From: Oz Erickson <oz@emeraldfund.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 5:33:45 PM
To: Bordona, Brian
Cc: 'George Bachich (gbachich@accordionrevival.com)'; Brent Saldana@fbm.com
Subject: New proposed ordinance

Dear Brian,

George Bachich recently sent me information about the Draft Water Quality and Tree Protection act. There are certain provisions in that proposed ordinance that are exceedingly confiscatory to existing property owners.

As you perhaps know, I own a lot above my house at 3211 St. Helena Highway North. This is a 30-acre site, APN 022-070-023, which I bought in May of 2017. The lot had an easement by prescription across the properties of seven different owners, but no recorded access easement. Through diligent, expensive work, I have now obtained the recorded easement agreements of 4 parties and am very close to agreements on the remaining 3 properties, one of which I own.

Before I bought the lot I engaged an experienced civil engineer, Joel Dickerson, and a highly respected surveyor, Chris Cole, to review the lot and its access road. They concluded that the only site on the lot suitable for a residence was at the "top" of the lot where there was a large flat area that would meet all county codes. They also concluded that the existing access road, while steep, could be modified by judicious grading to meet acceptable county standards. I bought the lot and to date I have been successfully negotiating with my neighbors to secure the necessary recorded easements that will enable me to build a house for my children. It is highly likely that all the remaining easements will be recorded in the next two months.

The proposed grading restrictions contained in the Draft Water Quality and Tree Protection ordinance would stop any possibility of the construction of any structure on my lot given that the only location for a residence is up the existing, too steep access road. It would also forbid a lot line adjustment on my 10-acre neighboring lot that would forbid construction of a residence on that lot as well. The values of both lots would go down to zero (what are steep lots worth in Napa Valley that are unsuitable either for vine cultivation or residential construction?)

I know for a fact that directly across the little valley from 3211 St. Helena Highway North, accessed

by the same entrance off Highway 29, there are 3 owners of lots with easements by prescription who are currently working with “downstream” owners to secure recorded access easements. The development of their existing lots with steep access roads would also be prohibited by the proposed grading restrictions.

In short, in just one tiny area of Napa County there are at least 5 lots that will be greatly harmed by the proposed ordinance. Lost values just on these lots will amount to millions of dollars and very needed residences would not be built, hurting both potential renters and homeowners as well as local contractors and local professionals. There are undoubtedly hundreds, maybe thousands, of lots that would be negatively affected by this ordinance.

It is of great concern to me that notice of this ordinance was not directly provided to owners, like me, that would be radically affected by its passage. Absent the kindness of Mr. Bachich, I would have known nothing about this ordinance. I enclose his formal comments on this ordinance that strike me as highly intelligent and trenchant.

I would very much like to meet with you and Mr. Morrison as soon as possible to review possible emendations to this ordinance that would possible mitigate its draconian effects.

My best,

Oz

PS: My telephone number is 415-377-0082 and I would very much like to talk to you in the near future.

S. Osborn Erickson
Emerald Fund, Inc.

The Russ Building

[235 Montgomery Street, 27th Floor](#)
[San Francisco, CA 94104](#)

T [\(415\) 489-1316](#) F [\(415\) 777-1317](#)

<http://www.emeraldfund.com>



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Efforts to protect the environment always seem desirable on the surface, but regardless of how well intended these efforts may be, they can have serious unintended consequences, as would this proposed ordinance, if enacted.

Unintended consequence #1 – Severe financial damage to property owners)

The inclusion of setbacks along Class III streams (ephemeral and intermittent streams) will result in tens of thousands of acres being essentially confiscated for de facto conservation easements, without fair compensation. Class III streams are those little gullies that begin very near the ridge tops and often extend to the valley floor where they flow into a larger stream. They usually run only when it rains, or maybe for a week or two afterward. They do not support riparian vegetation and certainly not fish. High in the hills where I live, they can be less than 100 feet apart at their sources, then combine into one stream a bit farther down the slope, then combine with still another even farther down, before finally flowing into Dry Creek about a mile from the ridge top. This dendritic stream pattern results in a significant portion of the land near the top of the ridge being within the 35 foot setback. In some areas, the setback may include the majority or even all of the land near the ridge top. Serious limitations on what can be done within these setbacks essentially deprives property owners of beneficial use of a huge portion of their property near the ridge tops, and significant portions of their property farther down the slope, not only within the setbacks, but also between them, because of the restrictions on crossing the setbacks to get to the land in between. This imposes real costs on property owners, including permit fees, professional investigation and reports, permit preparation and processing time, permit compliance costs, loss of use, and loss of property value.

When a similar ordinance was proposed, passed, and eventually overturned by ballot referendum in 2004, County staff estimated that the proposed setbacks, including the then-proposed 25 foot setbacks along Class III streams, would include approximately 53,000 acres along 3,200 miles of (mostly Class III) streams in Napa County, which itself is only about 45 miles long. The huge aggregate stream length and the large amount of included acreage in such a small county gives some sense of the serious consequences of such an ordinance for hillside property owners. This ordinance proposes an even larger 35 foot setback along ephemeral streams, which seems likely to include more than 70,000 acres. Regardless of the precise number of acres, this is a huge land grab which cannot be justified by undemonstrated and immeasurably small incremental gains in water quality.

Unintended consequence #2 –More severe wildland fires with more property damage in the future

The general prohibition on tree and brush removal without a use permit, with exemptions for fire hazard reduction only to the extent required by and under the direction of Cal-Fire, discourages property owners from reducing fuel loads and fire hazards beyond the 100 foot minimum required by Cal-Fire. This is counter-productive, and will result in future fires more destructive than they otherwise would be. We should be finding ways to encourage property owners to reduce fire hazard, not discouraging them by imposing limits and setbacks, requiring permits and County review, and thereby exposing them to frivolous lawsuits (see Unintended consequence #4).

On my property I have cleared all the underbrush from my 12 acres, plus another 3 acres or so along the mile long driveway through neighbors' properties, making a shaded fuel break from Dry Creek Road to the top of the ridge. I would not have done that if it had required a permit, and I will not

maintain it if maintaining it requires a permit. I think other property owners feel the same way. At the point where the County wants to micromanage us and our properties, we may rationally decide that it is therefore the County's responsibility to reduce the fire hazard. If we want property owners to take responsibility for fire hazard reduction beyond the required minimum, we should be encouraging them, not continuing to put more obstacles in their way. This ordinance will result in fewer property owners taking the initiative I have taken, which will result in less fire hazard reduction work taking place, an undesirable outcome.

This ordinance will also result in fewer new vineyards in the hills, and those few that will be developed will be smaller. This may be one of the intended consequences of the ordinance, but that is a misguided goal. The more important unintended consequence will be wildfires of increased size and intensity, harder to stop, and resulting in more property damage and environmental damage. The Nunns fire, which eventually approached to within 400 yards of my property, was stopped at a vineyard. CAL-FIRE made a firebreak from the southwest corner of the Brandlin Ranch Cuvaison vineyard to Mount Veeder Road, and another firebreak from the northeast corner of that same vineyard to Dry Creek Road.

The mile long vineyard was an essential component of the fire-fighting effort, not only for self-extinguishing the fire along the edge of the vineyard, but also as a base for operations including overnight camp for fire fighters, fire truck access, hose laying crew and supply access, water tender access, observation posts for managing fire suppression efforts, and helicopter water source. Hillside and ridge-top vineyards are our fire breaks. If the Cuvaison vineyard had not been there, and if the north wind had picked up, the Nunns fire might have swept into Brown's Valley with results similar to those in Santa Rosa. Any ordinance that increases the risk of wildfire is ill-advised. In light of the expected increase in frequency and intensity of wildfires, we need more vineyards, not fewer. This ordinance should be modified to encourage, not discourage the development of more hillside vineyards.

Unintended consequence #3 – Unaccountability for land management mistakes

The person who lives and works on the land is best positioned and has the best incentive to properly care for it, and is therefore more likely to make the best decisions on how to manage it. Someone at a Planning desk in Napa can never be as familiar with it as the owner, and is therefore not as well positioned to make the best decisions about how to manage it.

In addition, the permitting official is never accountable for his mistakes. If a poor decision is made to prohibit shrub removal and this later causes property loss in a fire, it is the owner's loss, not the bureaucrat's, and the bureaucrat responsible for the loss would never be held to account. The property owner who bears the consequences, costs, and rewards of his management decisions is going to make better decisions than some bureaucrat who has no skin in the game.

This is particularly problematic when the permitting officials are under political and legal pressure by vocal and persistent tree-huggers who also have no skin in the game. Under such pressure the permitting officials are more likely to err on the side of restraining property owners, which could put the property owner, his property, and his family in jeopardy. Authority to make these decisions should remain with the only people accountable for any errors, i.e., the property owners.

Unintended consequence #4 – putting property owners at the mercy of radical environmentalists

This ordinance may not come right out and say that it requires a permit for any tree or shrub removal for fire hazard reduction, but the exclusion for *required* fire hazard reduction measures begs the question, “who decides what is required fire protection”? I believe that implicit in the ordinance is the notion that a permit will be required for any vegetation removal, be it a single tree, poison oak, scrub oak, or underbrush, in order to allow someone at the County or at Cal-Fire to review it and decide whether it conforms to the requirements of the ordinance. Requiring a permit for this work would be a major disservice to property owners, not only for the hassle and expense involved, but also for exposing them to frivolous lawsuits by radical environmentalists.

Requirement of a permit for common property management activities puts the property owner at the mercy of the most radical environmentalist. Napa County has a long history of being sued by radical environmentalists for its permitting decisions, and this is the reason why every permittee now must indemnify the County and agree to defend it at his own expense in the event of a lawsuit. What this means in practice is that any property owner who cannot afford tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees to defend his permit application in court is at the mercy of any radical environmentalist or irate neighbor who wants to file a suit to challenge his permit.

This is not mere speculation. I remember a time when the County was sued by the Sierra Club and lost, resulting in the local president of the Sierra Club being physically in the Planning Department, reviewing applications and telling staff which ones they could approve and what modifications must be made in order for the County not to be sued again. It is the permit itself, along with the required indemnity that creates this legal jeopardy. Napa County has a responsibility not to put its property owners in this kind of jeopardy, and should revise this ordinance to eliminate any need for permits for common land management activities, or else reject this ordinance in order to avoid this disastrous consequence.

Unintended Consequence #5 - Unfairly imposing all the costs of obtaining public benefits on a few people

This regulation is being proposed with the intent to secure certain environmental benefits for the many, but as it is currently written, all of its costs will be imposed on just a few thousand rural property owners. These new restrictions deprive land owners of legitimate use of their properties and impose severe costs on those who choose to try. Whatever amount of marginally cleaner water that may accrue to everyone as a result of this ordinance, it will come at great cost to the property owners whose land lies within the proposed stream setbacks, which land will essentially be confiscated for public conservation easements. If these benefits are truly worth the cost of obtaining them (which I doubt), then those costs should be borne by those who benefit, i.e., the County as a whole, not those few who are victimized by this ordinance.

Unintended Consequence #6 – misallocation of resources by over-paying for nebulous benefits

It is likely that Napa County already has enough environmental protections and associated land use restrictions, and that further restrictions will not be cost-effective. The natural environment here is not deteriorating and does not seem to be in danger, other than from natural events like fires and floods. Other than hysterical ravings by the ever-present, very vocal, and tiny tree-hugging minority, there is nothing to suggest that additional restrictions might be necessary or even beneficial, let alone

cost-effective. With our watershed already in such good shape, any further gains in water quality will likely be immeasurably small. The proposed additional restrictions seem arbitrary and may just be items on the wish list of some folks who feel all warm and fuzzy whenever any new environmental restrictions are enacted, regardless of real benefit, and regardless of cost.

To avoid misallocation of scarce resources, Napa County should quantify the costs to land owners as well as the benefits to the public and perform a full cost/benefit analysis of the impacts of the ordinance so an informed decision can be made about whether the benefits justify the costs. Imposing severe costs on already overburdened land owners to achieve nebulous or immeasurably small improvements in water quality would not be cost-effective and should not be done.

Have the promoters of this ordinance identified any specific problems that need to be solved, and if so, have they demonstrated that these proposed restrictions are the best and most cost-effective way to solve those problems? If not, then the planning Commission should not approve this ordinance.

Unintended Consequence #7 – Public backlash

This is not new. In 2003 and 2004 we went through the same process. The Board of Supervisors instructed staff and the Planning Commission to come up with a Stream Setback Ordinance. Community response was overwhelmingly negative. Hundreds of people showed up at Planning Commission meetings, then later at Board of Supervisors meetings, voicing strong objections. Despite the public outcry against it, the Board of Supervisors passed the ordinance unanimously. Opponents organized as the Napa Valley Land Stewards Alliance and immediately circulated a ballot referendum petition, which qualified for the ballot, putting the ordinance temporarily in abeyance. At the next election, the Stream Setback Ordinance was overturned by voters by 65% to 35%, nearly two to one, and the ordinance never went into effect.

The backlash did not stop there. Infuriated by such a brazen attempt to steal their land, and desiring to prevent such unfair attacks in the future, the Napa Valley Land Stewards Alliance proposed and qualified a ballot initiative called the Fair Payment for Public Benefit Act, which would require just compensation to land owners for future regulatory takings. Initial polling indicated that it, too, would pass by two to one. Through the most costly election campaign in Napa County history, opponents turned that around and defeated the Fair Payment for Public Benefit Act at the next election. Will it be so lucky next time?

This ordinance is similarly brazen, saying exceptions will be made only to the extent necessary to avoid a “taking” under the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Courts have declared that a Fifth Amendment taking does not occur as long as any value remains in the property. This means the County can legally take or destroy 90% or maybe even more of our property value without having to pay us anything. It is the clearly stated intention of this ordinance to take the maximum allowable amount that would not trigger mandatory compensation under the Fifth Amendment. That is clearly not fair, is a brazen attack on property rights, and is the reason why people naturally favor a solution like the Fair Payment for Public Benefit Act. To prevent such an outcome, this ordinance should include fair compensation for any significant damage it causes to property value, or the ordinance should be abandoned.

Aside from the predictable unintended consequences I have listed, there may be others. In addition, some of the *intended* consequences of this ordinance are extreme and unnecessary, and contrary to the General Plan.

The Napa County General Plan says property rights must be considered and weighed against other factors when making land use decisions. That means property rights cannot be arbitrarily infringed. An ordinance that restricts property rights without demonstrating a clear need to do so would be inconsistent with the General Plan and should be rejected on that grounds alone. Despite the boiler plate findings at the beginning of this ordinance, no real need for this ordinance has been demonstrated, which puts it in conflict with the property rights clause of the General Plan.

The requirement to maintain a minimum of 70% of the original tree canopy is arbitrary and extreme. Napa County is not losing its forests, and there is no demonstrated need to impose this requirement.

The requirement to maintain a minimum of 40% of the original shrub canopy is arbitrary and extreme. Although this might or might not be important in domestic water reservoir drainages, it has no place in the rest of the county, and serves only to restrict property owners from the beneficial use of large swaths of their property, with no discernible benefit. Also, being forced to retain our poison oak, deer brush, manzanita, and chaparral in addition to our tree canopy and all our various stream setbacks might preclude use of any of our property, as well as making it more vulnerable to fire.

The three for one tree replacement requirement is arbitrary, extreme, and punitive. What is the policy justification for this requirement? Is it the County's desire to re-forest the entire County and eliminate agriculture completely? Tree replacement, if any, should be one for one, which would maintain the current number of trees, a reasonable policy objective.

This ordinance will make nearly every hillside parcel un-developable, except by use permit, thereby imposing unnecessary costs and delays and exposing all hillside property owners to legal harassment and intimidation by radical environmentalists.

This ordinance also newly prohibits any development on slopes greater than 30%, including houses and driveways. Currently, such development is allowed only by use permit, which allows for adequate review and mitigation of any adverse impacts in these more sensitive areas. What is the justification for cutting off this avenue to development? If there is no such justification, this provision should be eliminated from the ordinance.

Hysterical fear that some big corporation is going to rape the land is not justification for tying the hands of individual property owners who are the best stewards of their own land. Perhaps any new restrictions should be levied only on owners who do not live or work on their land, or on owners of very large parcels, rather than on every good citizen in the county.

Requiring permits, enforcing new restrictions, all make it harder for responsible property owners to properly manage their land, thereby discouraging good stewardship, which in turn will help degrade the environment, increase fire hazard and the likelihood of environmental damage due to fire and post-fire erosion. Any provision that discourages voluntary stewardship is counter-productive and should be rejected.

EXHIBIT A

The land referred to is situated in the County of Napa, City of Saint Helena, State of California, and is described as follows:

The West half of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter and the Southeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter, in Section 27, Township 8 North, Range 6 West, M.D.B. & M.

APN: 022-070-023-000



OLD REPUBLIC
TITLE COMPANY

2140 Jefferson St., Ste. A
Napa, CA 94559
(707) 265-9838 Fax: (707) 265-9846

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Our Order Number 0530016990-ML

COLDWELL BANKER - BROKERS OF THE VALLEY
1289 Main Street
Saint Helena, CA 94574

Attention: TOM DIXON

When Replying Please Contact:

Mark Lyons
MLyons@ortc.com
(707) 265-9838

Property Address:

022-070-023, Saint Helena, CA 94574

In response to the above referenced application for a policy of title insurance, OLD REPUBLIC TITLE COMPANY, as issuing Agent of Old Republic National Title Insurance Company, hereby reports that it is prepared to issue, or cause to be issued, as of the date hereof, a Policy or Policies of Title Insurance describing the land and the estate or interest therein hereinafter set forth, insuring against loss which may be sustained by reason of any defect, lien or encumbrance not shown or referred to as an Exception below or not excluded from coverage pursuant to the printed Schedules, Conditions and Stipulations of said policy forms.

The printed Exceptions and Exclusions from the coverage and Limitations on Covered Risks of said Policy or Policies are set forth in Exhibit I attached. The policy to be issued may contain an arbitration clause. When the Amount of Insurance is less than that set forth in the arbitration clause, all arbitrable matters shall be arbitrated at the option of either the Company or the Insured as the exclusive remedy of the parties. Limitations on Covered Risks applicable to the Homeowner's Policy of Title Insurance which establish a Deductible Amount and a Maximum Dollar Limit of Liability for certain coverages are also set forth in Exhibit I. Copies of the Policy forms should be read. They are available from the office which issued this report.

Please read the exceptions shown or referred to below and the exceptions and exclusions set forth in Exhibit I of this report carefully. The exceptions and exclusions are meant to provide you with notice of matters which are not covered under the terms of the title insurance policy and should be carefully considered.

It is important to note that this preliminary report is not a written representation as to the condition of title and may not list all liens, defects, and encumbrances affecting title to the land.

This report (and any supplements or amendments hereto) is issued solely for the purpose of facilitating the issuance of a policy of title insurance and no liability is assumed hereby. If it is desired that liability be assumed prior to the issuance of a policy of title insurance, a Binder or Commitment should be requested.

Dated as of September 22, 2016, at 7:30 AM

OLD REPUBLIC TITLE COMPANY
For Exceptions Shown or Referred to, See Attached

OLD REPUBLIC TITLE COMPANY
ORDER NO. 0530016990-ML

The form of policy of title insurance contemplated by this report is:

CLTA Standard Coverage Policy -1990; AND ALTA Loan Policy - 2006. A specific request should be made if another form or additional coverage is desired.

The estate or interest in the land hereinafter described or referred or covered by this Report is:

Fee

Title to said estate or interest at the date hereof is vested in:

Frederick Michael Turner and Carolyn Jean Turner Nathan, Successor Co-Trustees u/d/t dated September 25, 1997, amended July 13, 2006

The land referred to in this Report is situated in the County of Napa, City of Saint Helena, State of California, and is described as follows:

The West half of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter and the Southeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter, in Section 27, Township 8 North, Range 6 West, M.D.B. & M.

APN: 022-070-023-000

At the date hereof exceptions to coverage in addition to the Exceptions and Exclusions in said policy form would be as follows:

1. Taxes and assessments, general and special, for the fiscal year 2016 - 2017, as follows:

Assessor's Parcel No	:	022-070-023-000	
Code No.	:	085-001	
1st Installment	:	\$291.84	NOT Marked Paid
2nd Installment	:	\$291.84	NOT Marked Paid
Land Value	:	\$52,679.00	

2. The lien of supplemental taxes, if any, assessed pursuant to the provisions of Section 75, et seq., of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California.

3. Water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not shown by the public records.

4. An easement affecting that portion of said land and for the purposes stated herein and incidental purposes as provided in the following

Instrument : Easement
Reserved By : United States of America
For : Right of way for ditches and canals
Recorded : [January 30, 1925 in Book 10 of Official Records, Page 148](#)
Affects : Route not defined of record

5. Matters as contained or referred to in an instrument,

Entitled : Agreement
Executed By : Walter J. Lens, et ux, and Nell C. Soehren and Lloyd W. Schmidt, et ux
Dated : March 8, 1954
Recorded : [May 4, 1954 in Volume 439 of Official Records, Page 509 under Recorder's Serial Number R7279](#)

Note: Reference is made to said instrument for full particulars.

6. Matters as contained or referred to in an instrument,

Entitled : Easement Deed
Executed By : Nell C. Soehren, a married woman
Dated : March 8, 1954
Recorded : [May 4, 1954 in Volume 439 of Official Records, Page 511 under Recorder's Serial Number R7280](#)
Which Among Other Things Provides : Reference is hereby made to said instrument for full particulars

7. Terms and conditions contained in the Barbara Baumgarten Turner Trust u/d/t dated September 25, 1997 as disclosed by Grant Deed

Dated : September 25, 1997
Recorded : [October 14, 1997 in Official Records under Recorder's Serial Number 1997 024291](#)

NOTE: The requirement that:

A Certification of Trust be furnished in accordance with Probate Code Section 18100.5
The Company reserves the right to make additional exceptions and/or requirements.

8. Any lien for Federal Estate Tax payable by reason of the death of Barbara Baumgarten Turner on April 4, 2016.
9. Any lien for California Estate Tax payable by reason of the death of Barbara Baumgarten Turner on April 4, 2016.
10. Any facts, rights, interests, or claims that are not shown by the Public Records but that could be ascertained by an inspection of the Land or that may be asserted by persons in possession of the Land.
11. The requirement that this Company be provided with a suitable Owner's Declaration (form ORT 174). The Company reserves the right to make additional exceptions and/or requirements upon review of the Owner's Declaration.

----- **Informational Notes** -----

- A. The applicable rate(s) for the policy(s) being offered by this report or commitment appears to be section(s) 1.1 and 2.1.
- B. The above numbered report (including any supplements or amendments thereto) is hereby modified and/or supplemented to reflect the following additional items relating to the issuance of an American Land Title Association loan form policy:

NONE

NOTE: Our investigation has been completed and said land is unimproved. Said vacant land is known as: No address available

The ALTA loan policy, when issued, will contain the CLTA Modified 100 (TIM-52) and Modified 116 (TIM-58) endorsements. The referenced modifications to both endorsements delete only non-applicable coverage relating to improvements located upon said land.

Unless shown elsewhere in the body of this report, there appears of record no transfers or agreements to transfer the land described herein within the last three years prior to the date hereof, except as follows:

- C. All transactions that close on or after March 1, 2015 will include a \$20.00 minimum recording service fee, plus actual charges required by the County Recorder.

ON/JW

**CALIFORNIA LAND TITLE ASSOCIATION
STANDARD COVERAGE POLICY - 1990
EXCLUSIONS FROM COVERAGE**

The following matters are expressly excluded from the coverage of this policy and the Company will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees or expenses which arise by reason of:

1. (a) Any law, ordinance or governmental regulation (including but not limited to building or zoning laws, ordinances, or regulations) restricting, regulating, prohibiting or relating (i) the occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the land; (ii) the character, dimensions or location of any improvement now or hereafter erected on the land; (iii) a separation in ownership or a change in the dimensions or area of the land or any parcel of which the land is or was a part; or (iv) environmental protection, or the effect of any violation of these laws, ordinances or governmental regulations, except to the extent that a notice of the enforcement thereof or a notice of a defect, lien, or encumbrance resulting from a violation or alleged violation affecting the land has been recorded in the public records at Date of Policy.-

(b) Any governmental police power not excluded by (a) above, except to the extent that a notice of the exercise thereof or notice of a defect, lien or encumbrance resulting from a violation or alleged violation affecting the land has been recorded in the public records at Date of Policy.
2. Rights of eminent domain unless notice of the exercise thereof has been recorded in the public records at Date of Policy, but not excluding from coverage any taking which has occurred prior to Date of Policy which would be binding on the rights of a purchaser for value without knowledge.
3. Defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims or other matters:
 - (a) whether or not recorded in the public records at Date of Policy, but created, suffered, assumed or agreed to by the insured claimant;
 - (b) not known to the Company, not recorded in the public records at Date of Policy, but known to the insured claimant and not disclosed in writing to the Company by the insured claimant prior to the date the insured claimant became an insured under this policy;.
 - (c) resulting in no loss or damage to the insured claimant;
 - (d) attaching or created subsequent to Date of Policy; or
 - (e) resulting in loss or damage which would not have been sustained if the insured claimant had paid value for the insured mortgage or for the estate or interest insured by this policy.
4. Unenforceability of the lien of the insured mortgage because of the inability or failure of the insured at Date of Policy, or the inability or failure of any subsequent owner of the indebtedness, to comply with the applicable doing business laws of the state in which the land is situated.
5. Invalidity or unenforceability of the lien of the insured mortgage, or claim thereof, which arises out of the transaction evidenced by the insured mortgage and is based upon usury or any consumer credit protection or truth in lending law.
6. Any claim, which arises out of the transaction vesting in the insured the estate of interest insured by this policy or the transaction creating the interest of the insured lender, by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency or similar creditors' rights laws.

EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE - SCHEDULE B, PART I

This policy does not insure against loss or damage (and the Company will not pay costs, attorneys' fees or expenses) which arise by reason of:

1. Taxes or assessments Which are not shown as existing liens by the records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or assessments on real property or by the public records.

Proceedings by a public agency which may result in taxes or assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of such agency or by the public records.
2. Any facts, rights, interests, or claims Which are not shown by the public records but which could be ascertained by an inspection of the land which may be asserted by persons in possession thereof,
3. Easements, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, which are not shown by the public records.
4. Discrepancies, conflicts in boundary lines, shortage in area, encroachments, or any other facts which a correct survey would disclose, and which are not shown by the public records.
5. (a) Unpatented mining claims; (b) reservations or exceptions in patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof; (c) water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not the matters excepted under (a), (b) or (c) are shown by the public records.
6. Any lien or right to a lien for services, labor or material not shown by the public records.

**AMERICAN LAND TITLE ASSOCIATION
LOAN POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE - 2006
EXCLUSIONS FROM COVERAGE**

The following matters are expressly excluded from the coverage of this policy, and the Company will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees, or expenses that arise by reason of:

1. (a) Any law, ordinance, permit, or governmental regulation (including those relating to building and zoning) restricting, regulating, prohibiting, or relating to
 - (i) the occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the Land;
 - (ii) the character, dimensions, or location of any improvement erected on the Land;
 - (iii) the subdivision of land; or
 - (iv) environmental protection; or the effect of any violation of these laws, ordinances, or governmental regulations.This Exclusion 1(a) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 5.
- (b) Any governmental police power. This Exclusion 1(b) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 6.
2. Rights of eminent domain. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 7 or 8.
3. Defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters
 - (a) created, suffered, assumed, or agreed to by the Insured Claimant;
 - (b) not Known to the Company, not recorded in the Public Records at Date of Policy, but Known to the Insured Claimant and not disclosed in writing to the Company by the Insured Claimant prior to the date the Insured Claimant became an Insured under this policy;
 - (c) resulting in no loss or damage to the Insured Claimant;
 - (d) attaching or created subsequent to Date of Policy (however, this does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 11, 13, or 14); or
 - (e) resulting in loss or damage that would not have been sustained if the Insured Claimant had paid value for the Insured Mortgage.
4. Unenforceability of the lien of the Insured Mortgage because of the inability or failure of an Insured to comply with applicable doing-business laws of the state where the Land is situated.
5. Invalidity or unenforceability in whole or in part of the lien of the Insured Mortgage that arises out of the transaction evidenced by the Insured Mortgage and is based upon usury or any consumer credit protection or truth-in-lending law.
6. Any claim, by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws, that the transaction creating the lien of the Insured Mortgage, is
 - (a) a fraudulent conveyance or fraudulent transfer, or
 - (b) a preferential transfer for any reason not stated in Covered Risk 13(b) of this policy.
7. Any lien on the Title for real estate taxes or assessments imposed by governmental authority and created or attaching between Date of Policy and the date of recording of the Insured Mortgage in the Public Records. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 11(b).

EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE – SCHEDULE B, PART 1, SECTION ONE

This policy does not insure against loss or damage (and the Company will not pay costs, attorneys' fees or expenses) that arise by reason of:

1. (a) Taxes or assessments that are not shown as existing liens by the records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or assessments on real property or by the Public Records; (b) proceedings by a public agency that may result in taxes or assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of such agency or by the Public Records.
2. Any facts, rights, interests, or claims that are not shown by the Public Records but that could be ascertained by an inspection of the Land or that may be asserted by persons in possession of the Land.
3. Easements, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, not shown by the Public Records.
4. Any encroachment, encumbrance, violation, variation, or adverse circumstance affecting the Title that would be disclosed by an accurate and complete land survey of the Land and not shown by the Public Records.
5. (a) Unpatented mining claims; (b) reservations or exceptions in patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof; (c) water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not the matters excepted under (a), (b), or (c) are shown by the Public Records.



**WHAT DOES OLD REPUBLIC TITLE
DO WITH YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION?**

Why?	Financial companies choose how they share your personal information. Federal law gives consumers the right to limit some but not all sharing. Federal law also requires us to tell you how we collect, share, and protect your personal information. Please read this notice carefully to understand what we do.
What?	<p>The types of personal information we collect and share depend on the product or service you have with us. This information can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Security number and employment information • Mortgage rates and payments and account balances • Checking account information and wire transfer instructions <p>When you are no longer our customer, we continue to share your information as described in this notice.</p>
How?	All financial companies need to share customers' personal information to run their everyday business. In the section below, we list the reasons financial companies can share their customers' personal information; the reasons Old Republic Title chooses to share; and whether you can limit this sharing.

Reasons we can share your personal information	Does Old Republic Title share?	Can you limit this sharing?
For our everyday business purposes — such as to process your transactions, maintain your account(s), or respond to court orders and legal investigations, or report to credit bureaus	Yes	No
For our marketing purposes — to offer our products and services to you	No	We don't share
For joint marketing with other financial companies	No	We don't share
For our affiliates' everyday business purposes — information about your transactions and experiences	Yes	No
For our affiliates' everyday business purposes — information about your creditworthiness	No	We don't share
For our affiliates to market to you	No	We don't share
For non-affiliates to market to you	No	We don't share

Go to www.oldrepublictitle.com (Contact Us)

Who we are	
Who is providing this notice?	Companies with an Old Republic Title name and other affiliates. Please see below for a list of affiliates.

What we do	
How does Old Republic Title protect my personal information?	To protect your personal information from unauthorized access and use, we use security measures that comply with federal law. These measures include computer safeguards and secured files and buildings. For more information, visit http://www.OldRepublicTitle.com/newnational/Contact/privacy .
How does Old Republic Title collect my personal information?	<p>We collect your personal information, for example, when you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give us your contact information or show your driver's license • Show your government-issued ID or provide your mortgage information • Make a wire transfer <p>We also collect your personal information from others, such as credit bureaus, affiliates, or other companies.</p>
Why can't I limit all sharing?	<p>Federal law gives you the right to limit only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing for affiliates' everyday business purposes - information about your creditworthiness • Affiliates from using your information to market to you • Sharing for non-affiliates to market to you <p>State laws and individual companies may give you additional rights to limit sharing. See the "Other important information" section below for your rights under state law.</p>

Definitions	
Affiliates	<p>Companies related by common ownership or control. They can be financial and nonfinancial companies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our affiliates include companies with an Old Republic Title name, and financial companies such as Attorneys' Title Fund Services, LLC, Lex Terrae National Title Services, Inc., Mississippi Valley Title Services Company, and The Title Company of North Carolina.
Non-affiliates	<p>Companies not related by common ownership or control. They can be financial and non-financial companies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Republic Title does not share with non-affiliates so they can market to you
Joint marketing	<p>A formal agreement between non-affiliated financial companies that together market financial products or services to you.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Republic Title doesn't jointly market.

Other Important Information

Oregon residents only: We are providing you this notice under state law. We may share your personal information (described on page one) obtained from you or others with non-affiliate service providers with whom we contract, such as notaries and delivery services, in order to process your transactions. You may see what personal information we have collected about you in connection with your transaction (other than personal information related to a claim or legal proceeding). To see your information, please click on "Contact Us" at www.oldrepublictitle.com and submit your written request to the Legal Department. You may see and copy the information at our office or ask us to mail you a copy for a reasonable fee. If you think any information is wrong, you may submit a written request online to correct or delete it. We will let you know what actions we take. If you do not agree with our actions, you may send us a statement.

Affiliates Who May be Delivering This Notice

American First Abstract, LLC	American First Title & Trust Company	American Guaranty Title Insurance Company	Attorneys' Title Fund Services, LLC	Compass Abstract, Inc.
eRecording Partners Network, LLC	Genesis Abstract, LLC	Kansas City Management Group, LLC	L.T. Service Corp.	Lenders Inspection Company
Lex Terrae National Title Services, Inc.	Lex Terrae, Ltd.	Mara Escrow Company	Mississippi Valley Title Services Company	National Title Agent's Services Company
Old Republic Branch Information Services, Inc.	Old Republic Diversified Services, Inc.	Old Republic Exchange Company	Old Republic National Title Insurance Company	Old Republic Title and Escrow of Hawaii, Ltd.
Old Republic Title Co.	Old Republic Title Company of Conroe	Old Republic Title Company of Indiana	Old Republic Title Company of Nevada	Old Republic Title Company of Oklahoma
Old Republic Title Company of Oregon	Old Republic Title Company of St. Louis	Old Republic Title Company of Tennessee	Old Republic Title Information Concepts	Old Republic Title Insurance Agency, Inc.
Old Republic Title, Ltd.	Republic Abstract & Settlement, LLC	Sentry Abstract Company	The Title Company of North Carolina	Title Services, LLC
Trident Land Transfer Company, LLC				

eRecording Partners Network, LLC
400 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2499



ELECTRONIC RECORDING RECEIPT

TO:
CA - Old Republic Title C
275 Battery St. #1500
San Francisco, CA 94111

Date: 4/24/2018
Receipt#: 8732161
Customer Reference: 0530016990-ML

Napa County, CA

Recorded Date	Doc Name	Document	Recorder's Fee	Tax	E-Recording Fee	Total Fees	Memo
4/24/2018 11:06:44AM	2018-0008217	Notice	\$93.00	\$0.00	\$20.00	\$113.00	
Total:			\$93.00	\$0.00	\$20.00	\$113.00	