




A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Conservation, Development and Planning

1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
www.co.napa.ca.us

Main: (707) 253-4417
Fax: (707) 253-4336

Hillary Gitelman
Director

To: Planning Commission	From: Sean Trippi 
Date: March 28, 2012	Re: Napa Pipe Agenda Item 5A

Attached is additional correspondence we've received since the public hearing closed on March 19, 2012. Because the public hearing is closed, the public comment period is closed and the Commission cannot consider the attached comments as part of its deliberations unless a majority of the Commission vote to re-notice and re-open the public hearing at a future date.

Trippi, Sean

From: Gitelman, Hillary
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 8:52 AM
To: 'Sandy Elles'
Cc: Trippi, Sean; Anderson, Laura
Subject: RE: Napa Pipe Mitigation Monitoring Plan

Sandy:

Thank you for this message clarifying your earlier comments. As you know the Commission closed the public hearing on March 19th, so this letter will be provided to the Commission, but they can't consider it in their deliberations unless they re-notice and re-open the hearing.

The mitigation monitoring program is included in the documents sent to the Commission prior to the February 21st hearing. All of those documents are still on our website if you go to the Agendas page and click on that date: <http://services.countyofnapa.org/AgendaNet/MeetingDocuments.aspx?ID=3285>

Hillary Gitelman
Director of Conservation, Development & Planning
1195 Third Street, Napa, CA 94559
(707) 253-4805

From: Sandy Elles [<mailto:selles@napafarmbureau.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 5:10 PM
To: 'Michael Basayne'; 'Bob Fiddaman'; Terry Scott; Gitelman, Hillary; Heather Phillips; matt pope384@gmail.com
Subject: Napa Pipe Mitigation Monitoring Plan

Hi All,

Thanks for your patience in listening to the public at the 3/19 Napa Pipe meeting. And congratulations to Mike for adeptly leading the meeting and allowing everyone's voice to be heard before the bewitching midnight hour.

I know that you're inundated with Napa Pipe comments, but I wanted to follow-up on NCFB's comments regarding the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan and the need to know 1) who's responsible 2) the source and adequacy of the funding 3) how the mitigation will be reported and monitored. Hillary mentioned that a MMRP has been completed, but I can't find it. Hillary – could you please point me to the document?

I've attached our DEIR comment letter and the FEIR responses to our questions regarding the mitigations. We find the responses to comments 19-2 and 19-33 to 19-38 vague. We hope to hear discussion and more clarity on this at the April 2nd Commission meeting.

I would also note that the updated fiscal analysis on the project seems incomplete as it uses generic per capita data, which doesn't reflect the extraordinary costs of the multitude of mitigation measures. It seems prudent to understand the direct & indirect fiscal impact to government as well as the cumulative fiscal burden on the homeowners and/or developer for the infrastructure and required mitigation.

Finally, I want to reiterate our concerns regarding the water supply. At the end of the day, aside from the groundwater it claims in derogation of longstanding, important policies in the County's General Plan, the simple fact is that the Napa Pipe project *has* no water supply of its own—and none of the sources or potential purveyors it has identified, in all of the FEIR's thousands of pages and supporting documents, has yet come to fruition—nor is there any certainty that any of these sources will *ever* come to fruition as the core of Napa Pipe's assumed conjunctive use proposal and related mitigation.

Again, thanks for your careful consideration and conscientious deliberations!
Sandy

=====

Sandy Elles
Executive Director
Napa County Farm Bureau
811 Jefferson St.
Napa, CA 94559

(707)224-5403 x 103
(707)235-6135 cell
www.napafarmbureau.org
selles@napafarmbureau.org



THE FULL TEXT OF THIS COMMENT LETTER
AND RESPONSES ARE INCLUDED IN VOLUME 1C
OF THE NAPA PIPE FINAL EIR

NAPA COUNTY FARM BUREAU

811 Jefferson Street Napa, California 94559 Telephone 707-224-5403 Fax 707-224-7836

February 5, 2010

Mr. Sean Trippi
Napa County Dept. of Conservation, Development & Planning
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

RECEIVED

FEB 05 2010

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

RE: Napa Pipe Redevelopment Draft EIR comments

Dear Mr. Trippi,

Napa County Farm Bureau appreciates the opportunity to offer the following comments on the Napa Pipe Draft EIR. While the proposed project presents an opportunity for desirable redevelopment of a brownfield site, the Draft EIR indicates that the massive size and scale of the project present many environmental, land use and water policy challenges and conflicts for the county. In reviewing the lengthy analysis, we find the project to be inconsistent with long-standing Napa County regional policies and this will likely have an impact on all jurisdictions in the county.

ORG19-1
cont.

The Draft EIR tries to reduce most of the very significant impacts of the proposed project with a hefty list of mitigation measures. We find the mitigation measures to be inadequate, as most are conceptual and speculative and offer no formal plans that would meet the requirements and intent of CEQA (15097e (1-6)). Most of the measures do not define agency responsibility, lack adequate funding and offer no reporting & monitoring plan.

ORG19-2

Before enumerating our many concerns, we note that CEQA 15141 states that, "EIRs should normally be less than 150 pages and for proposals of unusual scope or complexity should normally be less than 300 pages." Including the main body of the EIR, appendixes, and referenced documents, the Napa Pipe EIR well exceeds 6,000 pages. The excessive amounts of pages from the Napa Pipe EIR and referenced documents slows and degrades the ability of interested parties to achieve a true understanding of the impacts associated with the project. We appreciate the extra time granted to review the Draft EIR and suggest Napa County manage future EIR projects to provide the public with CEQA documents that are concise and within the intent of 15141.

ORG19-3

Our main concerns with the Draft EIR revolve around these five core issues:

1. Groundwater impacts with both public policy and availability of groundwater resources

ORG19-4

Trippi, Sean

Subject: FW: Napa Pipe

From: Lisa Batto [<mailto:lisa@hbtg.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 7:54 AM
To: Basayne Michael
Cc: McDowell, John
Subject: Napa Pipe

http://napavalleyregister.com/news/local/questioning-feasibility-board-rejects-winery-expansion/article_e03b8160-7897-11e1-a7e6-0019bb2963f4.html

Dear Commissioners -

It seems that Napa Pipe could easily take the place of the winery in this article. I know each of you are working hard with your decision. Please remember that accepting Napa Pipe also sets precedent for future projects, just like the expansion of this winery would.

Also, in comparison to the Chardonnay Golf Club decision as one commission cited, please apply this same thought process to Napa Pipe.

Please do not approve this project, it is not the right fit for our county and it will change the definition of who we are.

Best wishes,

Lisa Batto

Lisa Batto
Managing Principal

Healthy Buildings Technology Group
3432 Valle Verde, Napa, CA 94558
T. 707.676.8999
lisa@hbtg.com

Please sign up for our eNewsletter!

www.hbtg.com/ohome-newsletter/



Questioning feasibility, board rejects winery expansion

PETER JENSEN | Posted: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 10:35 pm

The Napa County Planning Commission scuttled a south county winery's plans to expand to become the fifth-largest in the county last week, and in the process called into question an important aspect of the county's decades-old winery definition ordinance.

Can a winery expand its bottling-to-production ratio so much, while moving key components of the winemaking process off-site, that it becomes a commercial-industrial operation, and no longer agricultural?

Commissioner Bob Fiddaman said he felt that way about Reata Winery's proposal to expand its operation from 200,000 gallons annually to 1.1 millions gallons through on-site fermentation and bottling, with an additional 2.4 million gallons in bulk wine bottling.

Reata owns the former Kirkland Ranch winery site on Jameson Canyon Road.

Reata planned to comply with the county's 75-percent rule, which requires 75 percent of the wine be made from Napa County fruit. The expansion would have consumed 7 to 11 percent of the county's grape production.

"It's very unusual to receive a request like this," Planning Director Hillary Gitelman said. "It's never been of such magnitude that it would cause to say, 'Hey, is this still in connection with a winery?'"

On March 21, Fiddaman and his fellow commissioners unanimously rejected Reata's proposed expansion, and went with a recommendation from county planning staff that the winery expand production to only 800,000 gallons, with up to 350,000 gallons of bulk wine bottling.

Reata, owned by Colorado-based Madison Vineyard Holdings LLC, planned to phase in its increased production over time but without expanding its facilities at the winery. Instead, it planned to accommodate the increased production by using off-site areas in the nearby airport industrial area for barrel storage.

"Is this still a winery?" Fiddaman asked. "Two-thirds of the winemaking process isn't at this winery at all. And that starts to make me feel like this isn't a winery."

Gary Burghart, general counsel for Madison cited company policy in declining to comment Tuesday on what Reata plans to do next.

At the Planning Commission meeting, backers of the proposal touted it as an innovative expansion that would provide an economic shot in the arm to the airport industrial area, and its traffic mitigation fees would help pay for the Devlin Road extension, a project whose construction the Board of Supervisors recently voted to expedite.

"This could be the perfect project to spur that development," said Tom Carey, a Napa land-use attorney who's working on the proposal.

Reata had an agreement with the city of American Canyon to pay it \$500,000 annually for an anticipated average water demand of almost 26,000 gallons per day, with a maximum of almost 49,000 gallons per day. It also planned to use 10 acre-feet of recycled water from Napa Sanitation District to irrigate vineyards.

Carey told the commission that at each phase of the 3.5-million gallon expansion, Reata would have to prove that it was complying with the county's 75-percent rule, otherwise it couldn't expand further.

"We're not holding any punches back," said Erich Kroll, vice president of operations for Reata. "This is our ultimate plan of where we want to go."

Commissioners questioned how compliance with the 75-percent rule would be possible. Planning staff noted in a report that the expansion would need the grapes from 4,805 acres, or 11 percent of the 43,267 total vineyard acres in Napa County in 2010.

Tom Selfridge, a wine industry consultant, said the predicted growth in vineyard acreage in Napa County, and the practice of replanting vines to increase quality and yield, could allow growers to harvest 230,000 tons of grapes annually. Reata's expansion would consume 16,000 tons, or 7 percent of that total.

"I don't think you could say that the winery would be unable to acquire this fruit over time," Selfridge said. "You say that's ambitious, but I'm sure when Robert Mondavi started his winery, it was considered ambitious, too."

Volker Eisele of the Napa County Farm Bureau called that forecast 'silly.'

"It's simply not plausible," Eisele said. "I don't know where anybody would find that much Napa Valley bulk wine. We are losing acreage right now. I just don't see how mathematically you can find the grapes in Napa County."

Selfridge said that with replanting, vineyards can increase their yield from 3-1/2 tons per acre to 4-1/2 tons per acre, and even higher. Eisele said that 3-1/2 tons per acre was the maximum for producing the highest quality grapes.

"This promise of replanting land and getting higher yield — that's the biggest pipe dream I've ever heard," Eisele said.

At the meeting, Burghart offered a rebuttal.

"It can't be done; the world is full of people who say, 'It can't be done,' " Burghart said. "We're making a very significant economic bet. The economic risk is ours. We're willing to take it if you'll give us a chance. It can be done."

Commissioner Terry Scott said he was concerned about the expansion's impacts on traffic, but also the percentage of Napa Valley grapes the winery hoped to consume. Ultimately, he felt approving the expansion would set a bad precedent.

"It's pretty aggressive," Scott said. "My primary concern is setting a precedent. Do I want this repeated? If so, how often?"

Fiddaman asked what would happen if this large of an expansion proposal came from an Upvalley winery.

"It would be another Sutter Home," Fiddaman said. "They're terrific. I don't know of anyone who would say, 'Let's do another one.' It sets an extremely bad precedent for our Ag Preserve."

Fiddaman cited the Board of Supervisors' recent decision to reject a tweak to the county's zoning ordinances and General Plan to allow the Chardonnay Golf Course to serve the public at its restaurant. The majority of supervisors said they felt that allowing the change would set a bad precedent for the Ag Preserve. Fiddaman called Reata's expansion a much bigger threat.

Commissioner Matt Pope said he was concerned that allowing an expansion with a high bottling-to-production ratio would change the winery definition.

"Are we on the precipice of redefining a winery?" Pope asked.

In evaluating the proposal, planning staff noted that the Robert Mondavi Winery has a bottling-to-production ratio that was similar to what Reata's would be. Mondavi Winery underwent 13 modifications to get to its current annual production capacity of 3 million gallons, staff noted.

Dean Holland

RECEIVED

March 8, 2012

MAR 20 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Dear Mr. Basayne:


As a senior resident of Napa, I am hoping that plans for homebuilding at Napa Pipe are approved very soon. Many people are aware that there is a serious housing shortage in the Napa Valley area, and I can speak of this from personal experience. There's been hardly any affordable new development in the last decade, overall or specifically for senior residents particularly. That's why Napa Pipe's proposal is so timely, and so critical for our community. We need the affordable housing it will create, and we need it now.

I've been disappointed to see the overall quantity of planned housing for Napa Pipe get reduced with each revision of the plan over the last few years. I know that the final Environmental Impact Review was released recently, and I was at least glad to see that they recommended the ideal number of housing units at 2,050. That is where the developers' plan currently stands, and it should not be reduced any further.

This is going to be such a key supply of affordable housing for the area, and it's designed to meet the specific needs of demographics that have largely been shut out of Napa's pricey housing market, including younger couples, smaller families, and retirees like myself. If the number of housing units is reduced, then the percentage of housing dedicated to seniors is also reduced – and there's no good reason for that, especially when we are suffering from such a general housing shortage at present.

Please approve the current plan for 2,050 units at Napa Pipe. The location is perfect for new housing, and we would be foolish not to take full advantage of the available land at Napa Pipe to maximize new housing options.

Sincerely,



Dean Holland
710 Trancas Street, Apt. 229
Napa, CA

JONNA LEWIS

1059 WESTVIEW DR.

NAPA, CA 94558

March 08, 2012

Napa County Planning Commission
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Dear Michael Basayne,

I am writing regarding the future of Napa Pipe. I am tired of hearing about potential lawsuits and I am tired of dealing with horrible traffic. We haven't had many options recently to alleviate these problems and I feel that the Napa Pipe project actually gives us a chance to find some breathing room.

Responsible planning is not just about fixing the current situation; it is about anticipating the future and adjusting accordingly. Our projected jobs vs. housing growth comparison is looking grim. Compared to the Bay Area, which is projected to have about a 35% differential by 2035, we are looking at nearly an 80% gap (when measuring growth of the two rates since 1996).

If we don't act to fix this disparity beforehand, we will be forced to deal with it before it is too late. Building over 2,000 houses now will lessen our traffic problems quickly and take off some of the pressure we are feeling from lawsuits. Although there is no silver bullet, this plan is a common sense way to work toward a solution.

Thank You For Your Time,

Jonna Lewis



*I urge you to pass this project!
This town desperately needs a new
idea for the young work force!*

RECEIVED

MAR 22 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

| Catalina Arnold
| 2525 Flosden Road
| American Canyon, CA

3/5/2012

Dear Mr. Basayne:

I would like to see our city planners approve the current proposal to redevelop Napa Pipe. It's an excellent way to use that property for a much greater purpose.

Everyone is familiar with the effects of Napa's housing shortage - the horrible traffic, the high home prices, the threat of encroachment on our ag land to build more homes. Well, redeveloping Napa Pipe is the perfect answer to these issues. By recycling this already-developed industrial property, Napa will be able to add more than 2,000 new homes in a central location, close to thousands of area jobs.

All of this will not cost current residents anything. Rather, we'll benefit from having the Napa Pipe site cleaned up by developers. We'll see many fewer cars on the road, as more of the current daily commuter population will be able to buy affordable homes in the area. We'll also have more access to the river, as well as more parks and trails and open space that will come along with the redevelopment.

These benefits are all part of the developers' current proposal for Napa Pipe. This is the plan that should be approved, because it offers the greatest quantity of new housing for Napa - as well as many other additional amenities, like parks and trails and riverfront access. I hope we can count on your good judgment in selecting this plan over other alternatives that offer far less.

Thank you,

Catalina Arnold

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Dean Holland

RECEIVED

March 8, 2012

MAR 20 2012

**NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.**

Dear Mr. Scott:

As a senior resident of Napa, I am hoping that plans for homebuilding at Napa Pipe are approved very soon. Many people are aware that there is a serious housing shortage in the Napa Valley area, and I can speak of this from personal experience. There's been hardly any affordable new development in the last decade, overall or specifically for senior residents particularly. That's why Napa Pipe's proposal is so timely, and so critical for our community. We need the affordable housing it will create, and we need it now.

I've been disappointed to see the overall quantity of planned housing for Napa Pipe get reduced with each revision of the plan over the last few years. I know that the final Environmental Impact Review was released recently, and I was at least glad to see that they recommended the ideal number of housing units at 2,050. That is where the developers' plan currently stands, and it should not be reduced any further.

This is going to be such a key supply of affordable housing for the area, and it's designed to meet the specific needs of demographics that have largely been shut out of Napa's pricey housing market, including younger couples, smaller families, and retirees like myself. If the number of housing units is reduced, then the percentage of housing dedicated to seniors is also reduced – and there's no good reason for that, especially when we are suffering from such a general housing shortage at present.

Please approve the current plan for 2,050 units at Napa Pipe. The location is perfect for new housing, and we would be foolish not to take full advantage of the available land at Napa Pipe to maximize new housing options.

Sincerely, 

Dean Holland
710 Trancas Street, Apt. 229
Napa, CA

JONNA LEWIS

1059 WESTVIEW DR.

NAPA, CA 94558

March 08, 2012

Napa County Planning Commission
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Dear Terry Scott,

I am writing regarding the future of Napa Pipe. I am tired of hearing about potential lawsuits and I am tired of dealing with horrible traffic. We haven't had many options recently to alleviate these problems and I feel that the Napa Pipe project actually gives us a chance to find some breathing room.

Responsible planning is not just about fixing the current situation; it is about anticipating the future and adjusting accordingly. Our projected jobs vs. housing growth comparison is looking grim. Compared to the Bay Area, which is projected to have about a 35% differential by 2035, we are looking at nearly an 80% gap (when measuring growth of the two rates since 1996).

If we don't act to fix this disparity beforehand, we will be forced to deal with it before it is too late. Building over 2,000 houses now will lessen our traffic problems quickly and take off some of the pressure we are feeling from lawsuits. Although there is no silver bullet, this plan is a common sense way to work toward a solution.

Thank You For Your Time,

Jonna Lewis

*I urge you to pass this project!
it will be great for Napa.
Jonna*

RECEIVED

MAR 22 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT

| Catalina Arnold
| 2525 Flosden Road
| American Canyon, CA

3/5/2012

Dear Mr. Scott:

I would like to see our city planners approve the current proposal to redevelop Napa Pipe. It's an excellent way to use that property for a much greater purpose.

Everyone is familiar with the effects of Napa's housing shortage - the horrible traffic, the high home prices, the threat of encroachment on our ag land to build more homes. Well, redeveloping Napa Pipe is the perfect answer to these issues. By recycling this already-developed industrial property, Napa will be able to add more than 2,000 new homes in a central location, close to thousands of area jobs.

All of this will not cost current residents anything. Rather, we'll benefit from having the Napa Pipe site cleaned up by developers. We'll see many fewer cars on the road, as more of the current daily commuter population will be able to buy affordable homes in the area. We'll also have more access to the river, as well as more parks and trails and open space that will come along with the redevelopment.

These benefits are all part of the developers' current proposal for Napa Pipe. This is the plan that should be approved, because it offers the greatest quantity of new housing for Napa - as well as many other additional amenities, like parks and trails and riverfront access. I hope we can count on your good judgment in selecting this plan over other alternatives that offer far less.

Thank you,

Catalina Arnold

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

JONNA LEWIS

1059 WESTVIEW DR.

NAPA, CA 94558

March 08, 2012

Napa County Planning Commission
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Dear Bob Fiddaman,

I am writing regarding the future of Napa Pipe. I am tired of hearing about potential lawsuits and I am tired of dealing with horrible traffic. We haven't had many options recently to alleviate these problems and I feel that the Napa Pipe project actually gives us a chance to find some breathing room.

Responsible planning is not just about fixing the current situation; it is about anticipating the future and adjusting accordingly. Our projected jobs vs. housing growth comparison is looking grim. Compared to the Bay Area, which is projected to have about a 35% differential by 2035, we are looking at nearly an 80% gap (when measuring growth of the two rates since 1996).

If we don't act to fix this disparity beforehand, we will be forced to deal with it before it is too late. Building over 2,000 houses now will lessen our traffic problems quickly and take off some of the pressure we are feeling from lawsuits. Although there is no silver bullet, this plan is a common sense way to work toward a solution.

Thank You For Your Time,

Jonna Lewis

RECEIVED
MAR 22 2012
NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

*I urge you to pass this project.
it will be a great alternative
for the young work-force!*
JL

| Catalina Arnold
| 2525 Flosden Road
| American Canyon, CA

3/5/2012

Dear Mr. Fiddaman:

I would like to see our city planners approve the current proposal to redevelop Napa Pipe. It's an excellent way to use that property for a much greater purpose.

Everyone is familiar with the effects of Napa's housing shortage - the horrible traffic, the high home prices, the threat of encroachment on our ag land to build more homes. Well, redeveloping Napa Pipe is the perfect answer to these issues. By recycling this already-developed industrial property, Napa will be able to add more than 2,000 new homes in a central location, close to thousands of area jobs.

All of this will not cost current residents anything. Rather, we'll benefit from having the Napa Pipe site cleaned up by developers. We'll see many fewer cars on the road, as more of the current daily commuter population will be able to buy affordable homes in the area. We'll also have more access to the river, as well as more parks and trails and open space that will come along with the redevelopment.

These benefits are all part of the developers' current proposal for Napa Pipe. This is the plan that should be approved, because it offers the greatest quantity of new housing for Napa - as well as many other additional amenities, like parks and trails and riverfront access. I hope we can count on your good judgment in selecting this plan over other alternatives that offer far less.

Thank you,

Catalina Arnold

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Dean Holland

RECEIVED

March 8, 2012

MAR 20 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Dear Ms. Phillips:

As a senior resident of Napa, I am hoping that plans for homebuilding at Napa Pipe are approved very soon. Many people are aware that there is a serious housing shortage in the Napa Valley area, and I can speak of this from personal experience. There's been hardly any affordable new development in the last decade, overall or specifically for senior residents particularly. That's why Napa Pipe's proposal is so timely, and so critical for our community. We need the affordable housing it will create, and we need it now.

I've been disappointed to see the overall quantity of planned housing for Napa Pipe get reduced with each revision of the plan over the last few years. I know that the final Environmental Impact Review was released recently, and I was at least glad to see that they recommended the ideal number of housing units at 2,050. That is where the developers' plan currently stands, and it should not be reduced any further.

This is going to be such a key supply of affordable housing for the area, and it's designed to meet the specific needs of demographics that have largely been shut out of Napa's pricey housing market, including younger couples, smaller families, and retirees like myself. If the number of housing units is reduced, then the percentage of housing dedicated to seniors is also reduced – and there's no good reason for that, especially when we are suffering from such a general housing shortage at present.

Please approve the current plan for 2,050 units at Napa Pipe. The location is perfect for new housing, and we would be foolish not to take full advantage of the available land at Napa Pipe to maximize new housing options.

Sincerely, 

Dean Holland
710 Trancas Street, Apt. 229
Napa, CA

| Catalina Arnold
| 2525 Flosden Road
| American Canyon, CA

3/5/2012

Dear Ms. Phillips:

I would like to see our city planners approve the current proposal to redevelop Napa Pipe. It's an excellent way to use that property for a much greater purpose.

Everyone is familiar with the effects of Napa's housing shortage - the horrible traffic, the high home prices, the threat of encroachment on our ag land to build more homes. Well, redeveloping Napa Pipe is the perfect answer to these issues. By recycling this already-developed industrial property, Napa will be able to add more than 2,000 new homes in a central location, close to thousands of area jobs.

All of this will not cost current residents anything. Rather, we'll benefit from having the Napa Pipe site cleaned up by developers. We'll see many fewer cars on the road, as more of the current daily commuter population will be able to buy affordable homes in the area. We'll also have more access to the river, as well as more parks and trails and open space that will come along with the redevelopment.

These benefits are all part of the developers' current proposal for Napa Pipe. This is the plan that should be approved, because it offers the greatest quantity of new housing for Napa - as well as many other additional amenities, like parks and trails and riverfront access. I hope we can count on your good judgment in selecting this plan over other alternatives that offer far less.

Thank you,

Catalina Arnold

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Lisa and Edward Maass | 1551 Ora Drive, Napa, CA 94559

March 6, 2012

Napa County Planning Commission
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Dear Mr. Matt Pope:

The proposal to revamp the Napa Pipe property is a smart one. A neighborhood of new and affordable housing would be a sensible and sustainable use of the formerly industrial property. It's a plan that should move forward quickly, which is why I am writing to you today.

I know that this proposal has been under discussion and review for some years now. With the final Environmental Impact Review (EIR) completed, I think it's time to push forward with the project.

I am concerned about the alternative proposals that have been floated for the site at this late stage, however. These alternates are not anywhere near as compelling as the plan that developers have been working on for so long. They promise only a small fraction of the recommended housing quantity, all in order to preserve some industrial use of the property. This would be a mistake. More than anything, Napa needs homes right now, and Napa Pipe is an ideal place to build them. We should maximize the homebuilding potential of the land (which the EIR recommended at 2,050 units, what the developers' current proposal would provide). We should not suddenly turn our attention away from the housing crisis and settle for anything less.

I hope the Planning Commission can be trusted to make the proper determination – in this case, to support the developers' current proposal so that the project can move forward quickly.

Thank you,



Edward Maass

RECEIVED

MAR 22 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

| Catalina Arnold
| 2525 Flosden Road
| American Canyon, CA

3/5/2012

Dear Mr. Pope:

I would like to see our city planners approve the current proposal to redevelop Napa Pipe. It's an excellent way to use that property for a much greater purpose.

Everyone is familiar with the effects of Napa's housing shortage - the horrible traffic, the high home prices, the threat of encroachment on our ag land to build more homes. Well, redeveloping Napa Pipe is the perfect answer to these issues. By recycling this already-developed industrial property, Napa will be able to add more than 2,000 new homes in a central location, close to thousands of area jobs.

All of this will not cost current residents anything. Rather, we'll benefit from having the Napa Pipe site cleaned up by developers. We'll see many fewer cars on the road, as more of the current daily commuter population will be able to buy affordable homes in the area. We'll also have more access to the river, as well as more parks and trails and open space that will come along with the redevelopment.

These benefits are all part of the developers' current proposal for Napa Pipe. This is the plan that should be approved, because it offers the greatest quantity of new housing for Napa - as well as many other additional amenities, like parks and trails and riverfront access. I hope we can count on your good judgment in selecting this plan over other alternatives that offer far less.

Thank you,

Catalina Arnold

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Lisa and Edward Maass | 1551 Ora Drive, Napa, CA 94559

March 6, 2012

Napa County Planning Commission
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Dear Ms. Hillary Gitelman:

The proposal to revamp the Napa Pipe property is a smart one. A neighborhood of new and affordable housing would be a sensible and sustainable use of the formerly industrial property. It's a plan that should move forward quickly, which is why I am writing to you today.

I know that this proposal has been under discussion and review for some years now. With the final Environmental Impact Review (EIR) completed, I think it's time to push forward with the project.

I am concerned about the alternative proposals that have been floated for the site at this late stage, however. These alternates are not anywhere near as compelling as the plan that developers have been working on for so long. They promise only a small fraction of the recommended housing quantity, all in order to preserve some industrial use of the property. This would be a mistake. More than anything, Napa needs homes right now, and Napa Pipe is an ideal place to build them. We should maximize the homebuilding potential of the land (which the EIR recommended at 2,050 units, what the developers' current proposal would provide). We should not suddenly turn our attention away from the housing crisis and settle for anything less.

I hope the Planning Commission can be trusted to make the proper determination – in this case, to support the developers' current proposal so that the project can move forward quickly.

Thank you,



Edward Maass

RECEIVED

MAR 22 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

| Catalina Arnold
| 2525 Flosden Road
| American Canyon, CA

3/5/2012

Dear Ms. Gitelman:

I would like to see our city planners approve the current proposal to redevelop Napa Pipe. It's an excellent way to use that property for a much greater purpose.

Everyone is familiar with the effects of Napa's housing shortage - the horrible traffic, the high home prices, the threat of encroachment on our ag land to build more homes. Well, redeveloping Napa Pipe is the perfect answer to these issues. By recycling this already-developed industrial property, Napa will be able to add more than 2,000 new homes in a central location, close to thousands of area jobs.

All of this will not cost current residents anything. Rather, we'll benefit from having the Napa Pipe site cleaned up by developers. We'll see many fewer cars on the road, as more of the current daily commuter population will be able to buy affordable homes in the area. We'll also have more access to the river, as well as more parks and trails and open space that will come along with the redevelopment.

These benefits are all part of the developers' current proposal for Napa Pipe. This is the plan that should be approved, because it offers the greatest quantity of new housing for Napa - as well as many other additional amenities, like parks and trails and riverfront access. I hope we can count on your good judgment in selecting this plan over other alternatives that offer far less.

Thank you,

Catalina Arnold

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Lisa and Edward Maass | 1551 Ora Drive, Napa, CA 94559

March 6, 2012

Napa County Planning Commission
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Dear Mr. Sean Trippi:

The proposal to revamp the Napa Pipe property is a smart one. A neighborhood of new and affordable housing would be a sensible and sustainable use of the formerly industrial property. It's a plan that should move forward quickly, which is why I am writing to you today.

I know that this proposal has been under discussion and review for some years now. With the final Environmental Impact Review (EIR) completed, I think it's time to push forward with the project.

I am concerned about the alternative proposals that have been floated for the site at this late stage, however. These alternates are not anywhere near as compelling as the plan that developers have been working on for so long. They promise only a small fraction of the recommended housing quantity, all in order to preserve some industrial use of the property. This would be a mistake. More than anything, Napa needs homes right now, and Napa Pipe is an ideal place to build them. We should maximize the homebuilding potential of the land (which the EIR recommended at 2,050 units, what the developers' current proposal would provide). We should not suddenly turn our attention away from the housing crisis and settle for anything less.

I hope the Planning Commission can be trusted to make the proper determination – in this case, to support the developers' current proposal so that the project can move forward quickly.

Thank you,



Edward Maass

RECEIVED

MAR 22 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

Trippi, Sean

To: Napa Pipe Project
Subject: Napa Pipe

Received phone call from Sally Burnham (retired registered nurse). She is opposed to the project and is concerned about emergency vehicle access to the senior care facility in the event of a medical emergency.

RECEIVED

MAR 20 2012

**NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.**

| Catalina Arnold
| 2525 Flosden Road
| American Canyon, CA

3/5/2012

Dear Mr. Trippi:

I would like to see our city planners approve the current proposal to redevelop Napa Pipe. It's an excellent way to use that property for a much greater purpose.

Everyone is familiar with the effects of Napa's housing shortage - the horrible traffic, the high home prices, the threat of encroachment on our ag land to build more homes. Well, redeveloping Napa Pipe is the perfect answer to these issues. By recycling this already-developed industrial property, Napa will be able to add more than 2,000 new homes in a central location, close to thousands of area jobs.

All of this will not cost current residents anything. Rather, we'll benefit from having the Napa Pipe site cleaned up by developers. We'll see many fewer cars on the road, as more of the current daily commuter population will be able to buy affordable homes in the area. We'll also have more access to the river, as well as more parks and trails and open space that will come along with the redevelopment.

These benefits are all part of the developers' current proposal for Napa Pipe. This is the plan that should be approved, because it offers the greatest quantity of new housing for Napa - as well as many other additional amenities, like parks and trails and riverfront access. I hope we can count on your good judgment in selecting this plan over other alternatives that offer far less.

Thank you,

Catalina Arnold

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2012

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.