

bae



PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

**City of St. Helena
Housing Element Update
Housing Needs Assessment**

Submitted to:
Carol Poole
Planning Director
City of St. Helena

December 29, 2008

Bay Area Economics

Sacramento Region Office
803 Second Street, Suite A
Davis, CA 95616

530.750.2195
fax 530.750.2194
bae1@bae1.com
bayareaeconomics.com

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
Executive Summary	iv
Introduction	1
Housing Element Purpose	1
Authority	1
Status	1
Consistency with the General Plan.....	2
Public Participation	2
Review of Existing Housing Element	4
Progress in Implementation.....	4
Demographic and Economic Trends.....	19
Population and Employment Characteristics	19
Employment Trends	23
Population, Household and Employment Projections, 2010-2035.....	25
Summary	27
Housing Conditions	39
Existing Housing Conditions	39
Housing Market Conditions	53
Summary	55
Special Needs Populations	63
Persons with Disabilities	63
Elderly	64
Large Households.....	67
Single Female-Headed Households with Children	68
Farmworkers	69
Families and Persons in Need of Emergency Shelters	71
Summary	72
Non-governmental and Governmental Constraints	84
Non-governmental Constraints	84
Governmental Constraints.....	87
Summary	100

Opportunities for Energy Conservation.....	105
Sites Inventory and Analysis and Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types	108
Regional Housing Needs Allocation	108
Housing Sites Inventory	109
Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types	110
Summary	114
Appendix A: Definitions.....	117
Appendix B: Acquisition and Preservation Costs for Affordable Housing	121
Appendix C: Construction Costs, Recent Affordable Housing Projects	122
Appendix D: Rental Subsidy Costs for Affordable Housing	123
Appendix E: List of Entities Qualified to Assist with Preservation of Affordable Housing.....	124
Appendix F: CDBG Housing Conditions Survey.....	125

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan	12
Table 2: Population and Household Trends, 1990, 2000, and 2008	29
Table 3: Age Distribution, 1990, 2000, and 2008.....	30
Table 4: Household Income Distribution, 1999 and 2008.....	31
Table 5: Household Income Categories, City of St. Helena, 1999	32
Table 6: Labor Force Trends, 2000 and 2007.....	33
Table 7: Jobs by Industry, 2000 and 2007	34
Table 8: St. Helena Workers by Place of Residence, 2000	35
Table 9: St. Helena Residents by Place of Work, 2000	36
Table 10: Ratio of Jobs to Employed Residents, 2005	37
Table 11: ABAG Population, Household, and Employment Projections	38
Table 12: Housing Stock Characteristics, 2000 and 2008	46
Table 13: Housing Stock by Year Built, 2000.....	47
Table 14: Housing Occupancy and Vacancy Status, 2000	48
Table 15: Overcrowding by Income Category and Tenure, St. Helena, 2000.....	49
Table 16: Housing Cost Burden, City of St. Helena, 1999.....	50
Table 17: Housing Conditions Survey Results for St. Helena, October 2008	51
Table 18: Costs of Replacement and Preservation	52
Table 19: Single-Family Housing Sales Prices, St. Helena, August 2007 to August 2008.....	57
Table 20: Affordable For-Sale Housing Prices, Napa County, 2008.....	58
Table 21: Multi-Family Housing Survey Results for St. Helena, October 2008	59
Table 22: Market-Rate Apartment Rental Rates, St. Helena, 2008	60
Table 23: Affordable Rents, Napa County, 2008	61
Table 24: Affordable Housing Developments, St. Helena	62
Table 25: Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population with Disabilities, 2000 and 2008	74
Table 26: Household Tenure by Age of Householder, 2000 and 2008.....	75
Table 27: Elderly Households and Household Cost Burden, City of St. Helena, 1999.....	76
Table 28: Family and Non-Family Households by Size, 2000 and 2008	77
Table 29: Large Family Households and Housing Cost Burden, City of St. Helena, 1999.....	78
Table 30: Single Female-Headed Households with Children, 2000 and 2008	79
Table 31: Farm Employment, Napa County, 1993 - 2007.....	80
Table 32: Farmworkers, Napa County, 2005.....	81
Table 33: Farmworker Rents and Income, Napa County, 2005.....	82
Table 34: Emergency, Transitional, and Permanent Supportive Housing, Napa County, 2007.....	83
Figure 1: Building Permit and Development Impact Fees, Single-Family Home, 2008	95
Table 35: St. Helena Residential Zoning Districts	103
Table 36: St. Helena Regional Housing Needs Allocation, 2007 – 2014.....	115
Table 37: Available Land Inventory Summary	116

Executive Summary

This document represents the first of two documents that will constitute the 2009 St. Helena Housing Element Update. The Housing Element is one of the seven General Plan elements, and every jurisdiction in the State of California is required to submit a Housing Element to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review and certification. St. Helena is a member of the Bay Area Association of Governments (ABAG) and, therefore, must submit an updated Housing Element to HCD by June 30, 2009.

Review of Existing Housing Element

Since the City of St. Helena adopted a Housing Element in 2002, the City of St. Helena has successfully removed many of the previously identified governmental constraints to housing production, maintenance, and rehabilitation, and increased the production and funding of affordable housing with assistance from the private sector under Municipal Code Chapter 17.146 Housing Trust Fund, Housing Impact Fee, and Inclusionary/In Lieu Fee Requirements. The City could improve upon its policies, however, related to special needs populations including the homeless, disabled, and senior citizens. Review of the City's progress since adopting the 2002 Housing Element indicates that the City has not yet been able to fully meet these groups' needs.

Demographic and Economic Trends

Since 2000, the City of St. Helena experienced a slight population decline and an increase in the number of households, causing the average household size in St. Helena to fall. The median age of St. Helena residents decreased slightly while the average age of Napa and Bay Area residents continued to rise. The median household income in St. Helena (\$79,200 in 2008) exceeds the medians of both Napa County and the Bay Area. Many people travel into St. Helena from the surrounding area for work, and that pattern will continue as local population and household growth projections lag strong employment growth estimates for the next three decades.

Existing Housing and Market Conditions

Around 2,750 housing units exist in St. Helena in 2008, an increase of about 40 units since 2000. Almost all of the new homes are single-family units. There is a significant difference between the income necessary to purchase the median priced single-family home in St. Helena (more than \$250,000 a year) and St. Helena's 2008 median household income of \$79,200. Rental units in St. Helena, while limited in supply, provide more affordable options for low- and moderate-income households, but remain unaffordable to some very low-income households and all extremely low-income households. This highlights the need for subsidized affordable housing, to meet the needs of local households in these lower income categories. While only seven percent of households in St. Helena live in overcrowded conditions, most households experiencing overcrowding are renters.

Special Housing Needs

Both St. Helena and Napa County have high concentrations of disabled persons compared to the Bay Area, with residents ages 65 and over experiencing more than half of the total disabilities in St. Helena. In addition, a disproportionately large number of St. Helena's elderly households have excessive housing cost burdens compared to the overall population. The percentage of large family households in St. Helena closely aligns with the rates in Napa County and the Bay Area, but St. Helena has a higher percentage of single female-headed households. While the number of farmworkers and homeless persons in need of permanent or transitional housing specifically within the City of St. Helena is unknown, these two special needs populations have an unmet need for housing in Napa County as a whole and St. Helena must work with surrounding jurisdictions to meet that need.

Non-governmental and Governmental Constraints

The non-governmental constraints that restrict building in St. Helena are the price of land, the availability of financing with the tightening of the national credit market, and the hazards from frequent flooding of the Napa River. The governmental constraints present in St. Helena include sewer capacity, given that the City has yet to receive approval for increased capacity from the California Regional Water Quality Resource Board, the incomplete Flood Protection Project, uncertainty regarding the processing and permitting procedures for multifamily projects, and failure to create and adopt a Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance in accordance with Senate Bill 520. Other non-governmental and governmental conditions such as construction costs, zoning code, General Plan land use designations, and impact fees do not unnecessarily inhibit housing production.

Housing Sites Inventory and Analysis of Suitability and Availability

[Pending the completion of the sites inventory analysis]

Introduction

Since 1969, California Housing Element Law has required that local governments develop plans to accommodate and facilitate housing for current and future residents, at all income levels.

Housing Element Purpose

The purpose of the Housing Element is to establish a comprehensive plan to address housing needs in St. Helena over the five-year planning period between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2014. The Housing Element sets the policies surrounding the development, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing units that meet the needs of St. Helena residents.

The Housing Element consists of two parts, the Housing Needs Assessment and a Housing Element Policy Document. The Housing Needs Assessment identifies and analyzes the existing and projected housing needs for St. Helena and also identifies sites for housing development that are adequate to accommodate the City's regional housing needs allocation. The forthcoming Housing Policy document will state goals, policies, quantified objectives, and implementation programs for the development, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing, based upon the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment and input received through the public outreach that the City incorporated into the Housing Element Update process. Then, throughout the five-year planning period, St. Helena will implement a set of programs to meet the goals included in the Housing Element Policy Document.

Authority

Housing Elements are required by section 65302(c) of the California Government Code. Housing Elements are one of seven mandatory General Plan Elements. Specific requirements for Housing Elements are set forth beginning at section 65580 of the Government Code, with additional guidance provided by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The combination of the Housing Needs Assessment and the Housing Element Policy Document will address all applicable requirements of State law.

Status

The St. Helena City Council adopted the prior Housing Element in 2002. Upon review of the adopted Housing Element, HCD sent the City of St. Helena a letter of compliance on October 21, 2002.² The 2009 Housing Element Update will plan for St. Helena's housing needs through June

¹ California Department of Housing and Community Development. "Housing Element Compliance Report." June 18, 2008. <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/status.pdf>. Accessed on September 19, 2008.

² California Department of Housing and Community Development. "Housing Element Compliance Report." June 18, 2008. <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/status.pdf>. Accessed on September 19, 2008.

30, 2014 in accordance with the Housing Element planning period for jurisdictions in the Association of Bay Area Governments.³

Consistency with the General Plan

State Law requires that a General Plan and its constituent elements “comprise an integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statement of policies.”⁴ Each and every element has equal standing in the eyes of the law. The City of St. Helena is undertaking a comprehensive General Plan Update concurrent with the Housing Element Update. Due to mandated schedule for adoption of the Housing Element Update, the remainder of the General Plan Update will be completed after adoption of the Housing Element. This will provide the City with the opportunity to review and revise all policies and programs in the remaining General Plan elements, to ensure internal consistency across all seven General Plan elements.

Public Participation

Public participation in the Housing Element process began with the formation of a Housing Element Subcommittee that included members of the General Plan Steering Committee. At their first meetings in fall 2008, subcommittee members received an overview of the Housing Element update process and then gave City staff and BAE input on local challenges and opportunities to consider when updating the Housing Element. Given the input from the subcommittee, BAE began work on the Housing Needs Assessment and in mid-November submitted a draft of the Housing Needs Assessment for both City Staff and the subcommittee to review.

Approximately 25 people attended the first public Housing Element Workshop on December 1, 2008. The attendees represented a variety of organizations such as local housing advocacy organizations, developers, the St. Helena Chamber of Commerce, and members of the general public. Attendees were presented with a summary of the preliminary key findings from the Housing Needs Assessment regarding special housing needs, existing housing and market conditions, demographic and economic trends, and a review of the 2002 St. Helena Housing Element. A breakout session with three different work stations gave participants the opportunity to learn more about the housing element needs assessment findings, give input on potential housing development opportunity sites, and review the existing (2002) St. Helena Housing Element goals and policies. At the second Housing Element Workshop planned for January 8, 2008, attendees will have the opportunity to comment on a public review draft of the Housing Needs Assessment, give further feedback on housing development opportunity sites, and participate in an exercise to identify needed changes and updates to the Housing Element goals and policies.

³ California Department of Housing and Community Development. Schedule for ABAG Regional Housing Needs Allocation. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/abag_update.pdf. September 19, 2008.

⁴ Government Code Section 65300.5

To augment the public outreach process, BAE also conducted interviews with the key housing stakeholders in St. Helena. City staff generated an initial list of key stakeholders and BAE completed interviews with six stakeholders including two market rate developers, one affordable housing developer, and three people representing different special needs populations in the community. The input from these key stakeholders is reflected and attributed accordingly within the remainder of this document.

[To be completed once housing element update process is finished.]

Review of Existing Housing Element

This section examines the effectiveness of the 2002 Housing Element, the progress made in achieving the goals, objectives and policies outlined in the Housing Element, along with a discussion of the Element's appropriateness given current conditions within the City of St. Helena. This evaluation will inform the policies and programs developed as part of the 2009 Housing Element Update.

Progress in Implementation

The 2002 Housing Element established the following six main goals and a coordinated set of policies and implementing programs.

1. A Diversity of Housing to Meet Local Needs
2. Efficient Land Use and High Quality Neighbors
3. Conservation of Existing Housing
4. Assistance to Support Affordable Housing
5. Resource Conservation
6. Equal Housing Opportunities

Table 1 provides a summary of the policies and implementing programs that support each of these goals, and the subsequent sections discuss the extent to which the 2002 Housing Element policies and implementing programs helped the City of St. Helena meet the goals.

Diversity of Housing to Meet Local Needs

In order to supply a diversity of housing types to meet local needs, the 2002 Housing Element developed Policies 1A through 1E. Almost all of the implementing programs outlined under Policy 1A address how the Growth Management System (GMS) policies impact the production of housing in St. Helena. The City of St. Helena completed five of the six implementing programs including 1A-1 through 1A-4, and the majority of 1A-6.

Completion of the first four implementing programs involved exempting affordable housing from the GMS-established maximum of nine building permits per year, and only allowing surplus building permits not used in previous years to be allocated towards housing developments with 40 percent of the total units designated as either affordable rental or for-sale units. The last implementing program, 1A-6 relates to water conservation, and St. Helena has amended the Municipal Code rules pertaining to swimming pools and landscaping, but has not changed the water conservation guidelines for commercial uses. Implementation of program 1A-5 was not completed because the GMS was not revised to differentiate between the types and sizes of housing units that receive the nine annual building permits, beyond the fact that both affordable housing

and second units are exempt from the GMS.

Policy 1B outlined ways the City of St. Helena could intervene to facilitate the development of affordable housing on some of the opportunity sites identified in the City of St. Helena's vacant/underutilized land inventory from 2001. The City approved the Magnolia Oaks development for Site #33 in November 2007, and three market rate units with one second unit on Site #21. The Magnolia Oaks development will contain 45 units, including 18 affordable housing units.⁵ Development is still pending on Site #45, and no development occurred on Sites #44, #28, #30, #31, #42, #25, #32, #20, or #23 due to a lack of community consensus, limited interest from prospective developers, flooding issues, or vineyard activities. Site #31 will be necessary in the flood protection project and it is no longer available for housing. The City has received a pre-application for development of Site #28. Therefore, St. Helena completed portions of implementing programs 1B-2, 1B-5 1B-6 and 1B-7 under Policy 1B, leaving the remaining implementing programs incomplete.

The implementing programs listed for Policy 1C changed the St. Helena Municipal Code and Planning Department protocol related to affordable housing development. The addition of Chapter 17.146 to the Municipal Code established Inclusionary Housing Requirements on all market rate housing developments so that 20 percent of each development is affordable rental or for-sale units. Other changes to Title 17 of the St. Helena Zoning Code mandate that apartments and dwelling groups of four units or less are allowed in the high-density residential (HR) district by right and that the medium-density residential district (MR) permits attached duplex or triplex units by right. Consequently, St. Helena completed all of the implementing programs listed with Policy 1C in the last Housing Element planning period.

The final two policies under Goal 1, Policy 1D and 1E, each have only one implementing program. Under Policy 1D, the City set out to encourage the development of nontraditional housing, but the City could not find interested owners or developers, and nontraditional housing such as cohousing or cohousing was not built in St. Helena. Policy 1E called for changes in the zoning code to permit emergency shelters and transitional housing facilities as a conditional use in the Central Business (CB), Service Commercial (SC), and Quasi and Public/Quasi-Public zoning districts, but the current zoning code still does not define or include provisions for emergency shelters or transitional housing.

The City of St. Helena met a significant portion, but not all of the quantified objectives related to the construction of affordable housing. The original quantified objective for Policy 1A called for the construction of 31 very low-income, 20 low-income, and 36 moderate-income homes. From

⁵ City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008 (Pg. 4).

January 1, 1999 through December 31, 2006, 10 very-low income, 10 low-income and 21 moderate-income units were either approved or built within the City of St. Helena.

Efficient Land Use and High Quality Neighbors

Policies 2A through 2F facilitate “efficient use of land within the Urban Limit Line to protect agricultural lands, promoting compact, well-designed developments that ‘fit in’ with existing neighborhoods, and contribute to the overall livability of our [St. Helena] community.”⁶ The first policy, Policy 2A, aimed to increase the density of development by increasing the maximum density, and establishing a set minimum density for both the MR and HR districts. The MR district now has a density range of 5.1 to 16 dwelling units per acre (dua), and the HR district now allows 16.1 to 28 dua plus a 25 percent density bonus for affordable projects. In addition, Municipal Code Chapter 17.144 sets additional provisions for a density bonus, incentives, and concessions for development that are affordable to “lower income, very low income, senior households, and for condominium and planned development projects, [for] moderate income.”⁷ St. Helena completed all of the implementing programs for Policy 2A.

Policies 2B and 2C, each with one implementing program, address monitoring the supply of high-density residential land and altering the zoning code to eliminate regulatory inconsistencies. The City of St. Helena made changes to its policies and does not permit a rezone of high-density residential land unless the rezone complies with Government Code Section (GCS) 65863, and the City Council approves a General Plan amendment. The City also changed the provisions of the MR and HR zones in 2005 to eliminate regulatory inconsistencies, thus completing the implementing programs related to Policies 2B and 2C.

Policy 2D presents four implementing programs that promote mixed-use development in St. Helena but, during the Housing Element planning period, no developers completed mixed-use developments. City Planning Department staff did however offer assistance to these projects. Therefore, despite the City’s efforts to facilitate mixed-use development, the policy did not result in additional mixed-use development in St. Helena. In the future, the City may wish to consider targeting specific sites or areas and offering incentives for mixed-use development as recommended by implementing program 2D-4.

Implementing programs for Policy 2E relate to second unit development. St. Helena amended its Municipal Code to permit second units by right in all residential zones except some areas within the Woodland/Watershed (WW) district. In addition, the maximum size of second units was increased to 850 square feet. The only two implementing programs associated with second units

⁶ City of St. Helena, Housing Element Update. 2002 (Pg. 48)

⁷ City of St. Helena Municipal Code 17.144.010.

that are not complete are the dissemination of information to the public (program 2E-4) and an amnesty program for illegal second units (program 2E-6).

Finally, Policy 2F aimed to convert some single-family units to multi-unit dwellings. There was very limited interest from owners in this type of unit conversion, despite the fact that the City allows existing dwellings in the MR district to be converted into duplexes and triplexes. The City implemented programs 2F-2 and 2F-3, but could not fully implement 2F-1 because of a lack of interest from property owners.

Conservation of Existing Housing

Policies 3A and 3B compliment one another, as Policy 3B called for St. Helena to monitor existing housing conditions and Policy 3A works to maintain the current supply of affordable housing. In implementing program 3A-1, the City Council denied the conversion of an apartment building to a condominium in an effort to preserve rental units. The remaining implementing programs under Policy 3A have not been completed.

Implementing program 3A-2 recommended that the City of St. Helena charge an affordable housing impact fee if existing affordable housing converted to market rate, but in 2005 when this issue arose, the City did not charge a fee, but rather required that units in the newly renovated Grandview Apartment building be regulated as affordable units. For implementing programs 3A-3 and 3A-4, the City did not have the resources to preserve the one residential care facility that closed in 2003, and the City no longer supports the Christmas in April program because it is no longer active.

In addition to implementing programs, Policy 3A also contains a quantified objective that all affordable housing units remain affordable and that the City provide 20 low-interest loans to moderate-, low-, and very low-income households for rehabilitation. St. Helena did not provide loans for rehabilitation.

Finally, the only implementing program under Policy 3B, an annual review of housing issues in St. Helena, was not completed as part of the City's annual General Plan Review.

Assistance to Support Affordable Housing

There are four policies and two quantified objectives designed to support this fourth goal. Policy 4A presents multiple ways to collect money for affordable housing from local sources. In accordance with implementing programs 4A-1, 4A-2, and 4A-3, the City established Municipal Code Chapter 17.146, which provides for a housing trust fund, housing impact fee for nonresidential development, and an inclusionary housing requirement for residential development with five or more units, charging an in-lieu fee for residential development of four units or less.

With regard to implementing programs 4A-4 and 4A-6, while the City has both a Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) and a Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT), neither of these taxes is directed explicitly towards affordable housing. The last implementing program, 4A-5, a reduction, or waiver of fees for affordable housing developments, is not applicable universally, but rather decided on a case-by-case basis. Overall, St. Helena implemented three of the programs under Policy 4A.

Policy 4B presents ways that St. Helena could acquire State and Federal funding for affordable housing. Due to the small size of St. Helena, the City contracts with the City of Napa Housing Authority for affordable housing services that City of St. Helena staff are not able to provide. Therefore, the City of Napa handles implementing programs 4B-1 and 4B-2 for the City of St. Helena. The City of St. Helena, along with surrounding cities and the County of Napa have discussed sharing a housing coordinator for all of the “up-valley” communities, as recommended in implementing program 4B-3, but a coordinator has not been hired. Therefore, the City of St. Helena’s contract with the City of Napa Housing Authority implements programs 4B-1 and 4B-2, but 4B-3 remains incomplete. The quantified objective for Policy 4B was partially achieved because Woodbridge continues to receive Section 8 rental assistance, but the City did not provide assistance to 10 first-time homebuyers by 2006, as targeted in the 2002 Housing Element.

Policy 4C addresses the special needs of farmworkers and the homeless population. The housing of farmworkers and the homeless is handled on a countywide basis. The County improved housing conditions for farmworkers when the Napa Valley Housing Authority built the River Ranch Center and rehabilitated the Mondavi and Calistoga farmworker housing facilities with private and public funds in accordance with Policy 4C-1. In addition, the City of St Helena now allows farm labor housing with a conditional use permit in the A-20 and W zoning districts.

St. Helena continually supports the needs of the homeless through the Napa County Housing Authority as recommended in implementing program 4C-4, but St. Helena does not allow homeless shelters as a conditional use in certain commercial zones as suggested by implementing program 4C-3. Overall, the City of St. Helena completed implementing programs 4C-1 and 4C-4 and a portion of 4C-2, however, implementation of program 4C-3 remains outstanding.

The final policy, 4D, addresses the needs of senior citizens and the disabled, and the City of St. Helena completed none of the implementing programs under this heading to date. Furthermore, the City did not assure that of the new units built in St. Helena, 20 percent were available for seniors and 10 percent available to the disabled.

Resource Conservation

The City of St. Helena took an active role in promoting the use of alternative energy sources and encouraging energy conservation, as targeted by Policies 5A and 5B. The City of St. Helena formed a Climate Protection Task Force in 2006, and per the recommendation of the task force, the City passed a resolution waiving the building permit fees for photovoltaic (PV) installations. The City also adopted the 2007 State Building Codes and a new City Green Building Ordinance will be presented for adoption after City staff are trained in the implementation measures. Through these steps, the City has implemented all of the programs under Policies 5A and 5B, with the exception of program 5B-3, which called for the City to administer low-interest loans for energy conservation measures.

Equal Housing Opportunities

The sixth and final goal has only one policy, and four implementing programs. Implementing program 6A-1 (City support of a job/housing balance) led the City Council to adopt Resolution 2005-98: Local Preference Policy for Affordable Housing, and to continue regulating the resale of the 31 affordable single-family homes in St. Helena. The last three implementing programs 6A-2, 6A-3, and 6A-4, are all administered through St. Helena's contract with the City of Napa Housing Authority.

Summary

In summary, the major policies and implementing programs completed since 2002 include the following:

- Modification of the City's Growth Management System under Policy 1A.
- Establishment of Municipal Code Chapter 17.146 Housing Trust Fund, Housing Impact Fee and Inclusionary/In-Lieu Fee Requirements, which assisted in the completion of implementing programs for both Policies 1C and 4A.
- Changes to the density and uses permitted by right in the MR and HR zoning districts to facilitate Policies 2A and 2F.

The most crucial remaining incomplete policies and implementing programs are listed below.

- The development of affordable housing did not occur on the majority of sites listed under Policy 1B.
- The City's zoning code still does not permit homeless shelters as a conditional use in all the zones as recommended under Policy 4C.
- Implementing programs for Policy 4D addressing the needs of senior citizens and the disabled were not completed.

- There are currently no City policies to address the need for the reasonable accommodation of persons with disabilities.
- The City did not provide low-interest loans to moderate-, low- and very low-income households to help them rehabilitate their homes.

Effectiveness of 2002 Housing Element

This section evaluates the effectiveness of the prior Housing Element's goals, policies, and implementing programs by analyzing the progress made towards implementing the quantified objectives. The section also examines completed policies and the reason behind why certain policies or actions in the 2002 Housing Element were not fully implemented.

As outlined in the summary the City made many policy changes that facilitated housing production. In some cases, the City made the necessary policy changes, but the changes did not have the desired results. For example, the City worked with potential mixed-use developers and discussed concessions, but the developers still decided not to follow through with development. Also, the City now allows second units as a permitted use in many residential zoning districts and increased the maximum size, but second unit production still fell short of the number necessary to help St. Helena meet its 1999-2006 RHNA for moderate-income households. In these instances, the City may wish to consider additional policy or program changes to bolster mixed-use and second unit production in the 2009-2014 planning period.

Certain policies and implementing programs were incomplete because the City did not change City regulations. This includes program 1A-5 which called for the City to change the GMS polices to treat certain housing types and sites differently; 1E-1 which called for the City to change the Municipal Code to allow emergency shelters and transitional housing as a conditional use in given zoning districts, and 4A-4 and 4A-6 which called for the City to allocate funds generated from transient occupancy tax and real estate transfer tax for affordable housing. Meanwhile the development of some of the housing sites as outlined under Policy 1B did not occur because of delays in the implementation of the flood protection program due to litigation that the City could not have predicted back in 2002.

The City of St. Helena did not fully achieve any of the quantified objectives. The City did, however, make significant progress towards the construction of homes for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households, and Section 8 rental assistance continued at the Woodbridge Apartments.

The 2009 Housing Element Update Policy Document will consider the progress made by the City of St. Helena in implementing the 2002 Housing Element goals, policies, and programs. The Policy Document maintains or expands upon many of the major policy and program changes made

since 2002, abandons policy and programs that are no longer feasible, and inserts additional policies as dictated by State Housing Element Law and the results of the 2009 Housing Needs Assessment and public outreach process.

Some of the effective policies from the 2002 Housing Element include those related to the GMS (Programs 1A-2 and 1A-3), the completion of the Flood Protection project (Program 1-B3), and the promotion of second units (Programs 2E-1 through 2E-6). These are incorporated into the 2009 Policy Document. Other policies from the 2002 Housing Element are expanded upon in the 2009 Housing Policy document. For example, , all of the programs under Policy 2D from the 2002 Housing Element related to mixed use development are more broad and aggressive in the 2009 Housing Element Policy Document because Policy 2D in the 2002 Housing Element did not generate any new mixed-use developments. Finally, certain 2002 policies that were either completed or deemed no longer applicable are not included in the 2009 Housing Policy document, including programs under Policies 1B related to specific sites, which are no longer feasible for affordable housing development.

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan (Page 1 of 7)

Policies	Responsibility (a)	Timeframe	Results
Policy 1A: Ensure that the General Plan's Growth Management Policies Do Not Limit Our Ability to Meet Regional Housing Needs.			
1A-1: Amend the Growth Management System (GMS) to exempt permits for regulated Affordable Units.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. The GMS exempts building permits for regulated affordable housing, pursuant to Municipal Code Section (MCS) 17.152.040.A.10.
1A-2: Continue to allow a maximum of nine market rate units per year.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. There is a new allocation for nine building permits for market rate units each year.
1A-3: Provide for a process to give priority allocation of market rate permits to developers of projects that are affordable or are a mix of market rate and affordable units.	Planning Department	2002	Complete. Unused building permits roll over into a special category of permits available only to market rate developments with 40 percent or more of the total units in the development designated as affordable.
1A-4: Amend or delete General Plan (GP) Policy 2.6.10.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. Policy 2.6.10 was amended.
1A-5: Revise the GMS Policies of the GP to recognize the different levels of impact of different types and sizes of housing units.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Not complete.
1A-6: Address impact of other uses, including swimming pools, drought-tolerant landscaping, and high water consumption commercial uses.	Planning Department	2003	Partially complete. Water Conservation and Use Guidelines amended in March 2004, which addresses swimming pools; MCS 17.112.140 pertains to water efficient landscaping; but changes for commercial uses not completed.
Quantified Objectives for Policy 1A: Construction of 31 units of housing affordable to very low-income households; 20 units for low-income households, and 36 units for moderate income households.	Planning Department City Council	Ongoing	Partially Complete. Either built or approves 10 very low-income, 10 low-income, and 21 moderate-income housing units from Jan. 1, 1999 through December 31, 2006.
Policy 1B: Focus on Key Opportunity Sites and Work with Property Owners and Developers to Facilitate Development of New Affordable Housing.			
1B-1: Facilitate mixed use housing development on the Adams Street Property (Site #44).	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002-2004	Not complete. Development of the property delayed until there is a community consensus on how the property should be utilized.
1B-2: Facilitate development on the Romero Property (Site #28).	Private Property Owner Planning Department	2003	Complete. Property not developed although the City has received a pre-application from a non-profit housing developer for a 112 unit project with varying levels of affordability.
1B-3: Explore opportunities created through the Flood Protection Project (Site #30 and #31).	Planning Department Public Works	2005	Not complete. Site #31 will be used for the St. Helena flood protection project, which has been slowed due to litigation and lack of funding. Site #30 will remain a potential housing site.

Note:

(a) The duties previously performed by the Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA) are now handled by the City of Napa Housing Authority through a contract agreement with the City of St. Helena.

Sources: 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, 2008; City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008; City of St. Helena Staff, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan (Page 2 of 7)

Policies	Responsibility (a)	Timeframe	Results
1B-4: Facilitate mixed use development behind Taylor Refresher (Site #42).	Planning Department Public Works Private Property Owner	2004	Not complete. Development hindered by flooding issues, lack of sewer, and only one ingress/egress point at an impacted intersection.
1B-5: Explore opportunities on the parcel behind the Bonita Motel (Site #25 and #33).	Private Property Owner Planning Department	2004	Complete. Site #25 remains a vineyard, and Site #33 was approved for the Magnolia Oaks Development in November 2007.
1B-6: Highway 29 Specific Plan Area (Sites #32 and #45).	Private Property Owner Planning Department	2003	Complete. Site #32 remains a vineyard, and the development proposal for Site #45 is currently being revised to include both housing and office development.
1B-7: Spring Street Area (Sites #20,#21, and #23).	Private Property Owner Planning Department	2005	Complete. Sites #20 and #23 remain unchanged. Three market rate homes plus one second unit were approved for Site #21.
Policy 1C: Ensure that Affordable Housing Gets Built.			
1C-1: Establish Inclusionary Zoning for affordable housing.	Planning Department Planning Commission	2002	Complete. In 2004, the City Council passed ordinance 2004-7, adding Chapter 17.146 to the St. Helena Municipal Code, creating and establishing a Housing Trust Fund, a Housing Impact Fee on Non-Residential Development, and an Inclusionary Housing Requirement.
1C-2: Remove conditional use requirements for multifamily developments.	Planning Department Planning Commission	2003	Partially complete. The HR district was revised to allow multifamily dwellings, apartments, and dwelling groups containing four units or less as permitted uses. The MR regulations were amended to allow attached duplex or triplex units, or conversion of existing single-family units, as conditional uses.
1C-3: Fast-track housing developments that meet lower-income and special housing needs.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Complete. Staff has given priority to projects that include affordable housing.
Policy 1D: Encourage innovative Housing Types and Designs.			
1D-1: Encourage development of cohousing, ecohousing, and other nontraditional forms of housing.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Complete. There has been little interest by owners/developers in constructing nontraditional forms of housing in St. Helena.
Policy 1E: Address Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Requirements.			
1E-1: Allow emergency shelters and transitional housing facilities in appropriate locations.	Planning Department	2003	Not complete.

Note:

(a) The duties previously performed by the Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA) are now handled by the City of Napa Housing Authority through a contract agreement with the City of St. Helena.

Sources: 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, 2008; City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008; City of St. Helena Staff, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan (Page 3 of 7)

Policies	Responsibility (a)	Timeframe	Results
Policy 2A: Encourage Higher Density Development.			
2A-1: Increase the maximum density in MR to 16 dua net with a 25 percent density bonus up to 20 dua for affordable projects.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. The density range for the MR district was increased to 5.1-16 dua. In addition, under Municipal Code Chapter (MCC) 17.144, the City provides density bonuses and other incentives or concessions for the construction of certain affordable housing projects.
2A-2: Increase the maximum density in HR to 28 dua net with a 25 percent density bonus of up to 35 dua for affordable projects.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. HR was increased to 16.1-28 dua, or up to 35 dua with a 25 percent density bonus.
Policy 2B: Make Sure Higher Density Lands are Not Lost to Lower Density Uses.			
2B-1: Establish minimum density requirements in the Zoning Ordinance.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. Adopted the most recent minimum density requirements in 2005.
2B-2: Establish policies to discourage or restrict rezoning of high-density residential properties to lower densities and/or nonresidential uses.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2003	Complete. Property cannot be rezoned to a lower density unless a General Plan Amendment is approved that complies with California State Government Code Section (GCS) 65863.
Policy 2C: Make Sure Development Standards Do Not Constrain Development at the Zoned Densities.			
2C-1: Revise the Zoning Ordinance to address regulatory inconsistencies.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. Made amendments in 2005 to the MR and HR districts to achieve higher densities without dramatically changing the visual characteristics of the districts.
Policy 2D: Be More Aggressive in Promoting Mixed Use Developments.			
2D-1: Promote both vertical and horizontal mixed use developments.	Planning Department	2002	Complete. Worked with developers on two proposed projects, but the developers decided not to move forward with the projects.
2D-2: Allow residential uses on commercial properties, where appropriate, in excess of established FAR.	Planning Department	2002	Complete. Discussed these concessions in regard to the two proposed projects mentioned above in Policy 2D-1.
2D-3: Allow/encourage 'shared parking' in mixed use developments.	Planning Department	2002	Complete. Discussed these concessions in regards to the two proposed projects mentioned above in Policy 2D-1.
2D-4: Identify specific sites or areas to 'target' mixed uses development, providing incentives to facilitate such development in those areas.	Planning Department	2002	Not complete.
Policy 2E: Be More Aggressive in Promoting Second Units.			
2E-1: Review and revise development standards pertaining to second units.	Planning Department	2003	Complete. Second units are permitted uses in all of the residential zoning districts, except in WW district where environmental impacts may need to be mitigated. Increased maximum size of second units from 600 sq. ft. to 850 sq. ft. to increase the likelihood of full-time occupancy.

Note:

(a) The duties previously performed by the Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA) are now handled by the City of Napa Housing Authority through a contract agreement with the City of St. Helena.

Sources: 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, 2008; City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008; City of St. Helena Staff, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan (Page 4 of 7)

Policies	Responsibility (a)	Timeframe	Results
2E-2: Provide financial incentives for second unit development.	Planning Department	2003	Complete. Up to 400 sq. ft. of additional floor area permitted for a primary residence within a residential districts if the site include a second unit.
2E-3: Target specific areas for second unit incentives. Encourage second units in the medium density areas not near downtown.	Planning Department	2003	Complete. Staff suggests to those seeking a conditional use permit for a guest house (without a kitchen) to add a kitchen thus creating a legal second unit.
2E-4: Provide public information regarding second units.	Planning Department	2003	Not complete.
2E-5: Link incentives and development standard revisions to affordability provisions.	Planning Department	2003	Not complete. As a permitted use, second units no longer have conditions of approval. Therefore, there is no readily available mechanism to regulate the rental price.
2E-6: Consider an amnesty program for illegal second units.	Planning Department	2003	Not complete. Concerns regarding potential illegal units with serious defects.
Policy 2F: Allow Conversion of Single-Family Homes to Multi-Unit Dwellings.			
2F-1: Identify appropriate target areas for conversion from single-family homes to multi-unit dwellings.	Planning Department	2004	Not complete. Owners have little interest in converting single-family units into multifamily units.
2F-2: Develop criteria and standards for conversions.	Planning Department	2004	Complete. City allows second units, duplexes, and triplexes to be created from existing dwellings in the MR district by use permit.
2F-3: Provide public information regarding conversions.	Planning Department	2004	See Policies 2F-1 and 2F-2 above.
Policy 3A: Protect the Existing Stock of Affordable Housing.			
3A-1: Restrict the conversion of rental units to condominiums.	Planning Department	2002	Complete in November 2006, the City Council denied an application to convert a 10-unit apartment building to condominiums.
3A-2: Charge an affordable housing impact fee whenever affordable units are converted to other uses.	Planning Department	2002, Ongoing	Not complete. When this issue arose in 2005, the City did not believe that a housing impact fee was appropriate mitigation, and instead, the City required the provision of housing that is regulated as affordable on site.
3A-3: Address the potential loss of assisted units.	Planning Department	2002, Ongoing	Not complete. A residential care facility in St. Helena closed in 2003. The City did not have the funds to purchase the property, nor did a new operator come forward.
3A-4: Support programs such as Christmas in April.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Not complete. Christmas in April program is no longer active locally.

Note:

(a) The duties previously performed by the Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA) are now handled by the City of Napa Housing Authority through a contract agreement with the City of St. Helena.

Sources: 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, 2008; City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008; City of St. Helena Staff, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan (Page 5 of 7)

Policies	Responsibility (a)	Timeframe	Results
Quantified Objective for Policy 3A: Conservation of all existing affordable housing units. Low-interest loans for rehabilitation provided to 20 moderate-, low-, or very low-income households by 2006.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Not complete
Policy 3B: Monitor Housing Conditions.			
3B-1: Review housing needs, conditions, achievements, and challenges as part of the City's regular General Plan review.	Planning Department	Annually	Not complete.
Policy 4A: Develop Permanent Local Sources of Funding to Support Affordable Housing.			
4A-1: Establish an Inclusionary Zoning Program with in-lieu fee payments.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Complete. Inclusionary requirement for 20 percent affordable housing in residential developments of five or more units/lots. The fee for residential development of four or fewer units/lots is 2.5 percent of the valuation of construction.
4A-2: Levy an affordable housing impact fee for commercial development.	Planning Department City Council	2002	Complete. MCC 17.146 established fees for nonresidential development.
4A-3: Establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund.	Planning Department Napa Valley Community Fund	2002	Complete. MCC 17.146 established a Housing Trust Fund.
4A-4: Generate revenues for affordable housing through the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT).	Planning Department City Council	2003	Not complete. TOT money goes into the General Fund.
4A-5: Reduce, defer, or waive fees for affordable housing development.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	Ongoing	Complete. MCS 3.32.120 provides for fee adjustments for affordable housing projects on a case-by-case basis. MCC 17.144 allows for concessions or incentives for affordable housing projects.
4A-6: Establish a Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) for affordable housing.	Planning Department City Council	2002	Not complete. RETT money collected is not targeted for affordable housing.
Policy 4B: Aggressively Pursue and 'Leverage' State and Federal Housing Funds.			
4B-1: Pursue mortgage revenue bonds and/or mortgage credit certificates. Promote affordable homeownership opportunities for moderate and lower income households.	Planning Department NVHA	2002, Ongoing	Complete. The City of St. Helena has a contract with the City of Napa Housing Authority to provide services related to affordable housing.
4B-2: Continue Section 8 subsidies.	NVHA	Ongoing	Complete.
4B-3: Explore the possibility of establish a full time, shared Housing Coordinator for the up-valley communities.	Planning Department City Council NVHA	2002	Discussed, but not complete.
Quantified Objectives for Policy 4B: Provide assistance to 10 first-time homebuyers through 2006. Facilitate the continuance of Section 8 rental assistance.	Planning Department City Council NVHA	Ongoing	Woodbridge continues to receive Section 8 rental assistance, but did not provide assistance to first-time homebuyers by 2006

Note:

(a) The duties previously performed by the Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA) are now handled by the City of Napa Housing Authority through a contract agreement with the City of St. Helena.

Sources: 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, 2008; City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008; City of St. Helena Staff, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan (Page 6 of 7)

Policies	Responsibility (a)	Timeframe	Results
Policy 4C: Address Farmworker Housing Needs and Homelessness.			
4C-1: Collaborate with countywide efforts to address farmworker housing needs.	Planning Department City Council	2002	Complete, in 2004, Napa Valley vintners and grape-growers voted to self impose a tax on vineyard land for farmworker housing. With these and other funds the NVHA built the River Ranch Center, and substantially rehabilitated the Mondavi and Calistoga Farm Centers.
4C-2: Establish seasonal farmworker housing as a conditional use in all zoning districts.	Planning Department	2002	Partially complete. Farm labor housing is allowed as a conditional use only in the A-20, W and AP districts.
4C-3: Allow homeless shelters as a conditional use in the Central Business District, Service Commercial, Office, and Public/Quasi-Public zoning districts.	Planning Department	2002	Not complete.
4C-4: Support the Housing Authority's ongoing efforts to address homeless needs in the County.	Planning Department City Council	Ongoing	Complete.
Policy 4D: Support Housing that Meets Special Needs, Including Senior Citizens and People with Disabilities			
4D-1: Encourage the development of housing that meets the needs of seniors and the inclusion of accessible units in all new development	Planning Department	Ongoing	Not complete.
4D-2: Encourage the development of housing that meets the needs of seniors.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Not complete.
4D-3: Reasonable Accommodation.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	2002	Not complete.
Quantified Objectives for Policy 4D: 20 percent of new units to meet senior housing needs; 10 percent accessible to people with disabilities.	Planning Department Planning Commission City Council	Ongoing	Not complete
Policy 5A: Alternative Energy Sources			
5A-1: Promote the use of solar energy.	Planning Department	2002	Complete. The City of St. Helena formed a Climate Protection Task Force in 2006. The Council passed a resolution waiving fees for photovoltaic installations in 2007.
5A-2: Promote the use of alternative energy technologies.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Partially Complete. Drafted a Green Building Ordinance will be presented for adoption after staff is trained for implementation.
5A-3: Provide public information on alternative energy technologies for residential developers, contractors, and property owners.	Planning Department	2003, Ongoing	See Policy 5A-2 above.

Note:

(a) The duties previously performed by the Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA) are now handled by the City of Napa Housing Authority through a contract agreement with the City of St. Helena.

Sources: 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, 2008; City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008; City of St. Helena Staff, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 1: Summary of 2002 Housing Element Policies, and Five-Year Action Plan (Page 7 of 7)

Policies	Responsibility (a)	Timeframe	Results
Policy 5B: Encourage Energy Conservation			
5B-1: Promote the energy conservation measures in all new and rehabilitated units.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Complete. Adopted 2004 State Building Code. The City plans additional energy conservation measures in the form of a local Green Building Ordinance.
5B-2: Require cost-effective energy conservation measures in new housing to promote long-term affordability for occupants.	Planning Department	Ongoing	See Policy 5B-1 above.
5B-3: Provide low-interest loans for the implementation of energy conservation measures.	Planning Department	2003, Ongoing	Not complete.
5B-4: Provide public information on energy conservation measures.	Planning Department	Ongoing	See Policy 5B-1 above.
Quantified Objective for 5B: Low-interest loans for rehabilitation, including energy conservation provided to 20 moderate-, low-, or very low-income households by 2006.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Not complete.
Policy 6A: Ensure Equal Housing Opportunities for all Residents of St. Helena.			
6A-1: Support a jobs/housing balance by encouraging housing that provides for St. Helena's workforce.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Complete. 31 homes are designated for re-sale to moderate-income families. The City Council adopted Resolution 2005-98, approving a Local Preference Policy for Affordable Housing.
6A-2: Provide educational materials.	Planning Department	Ongoing	Complete. Fair housing issues are handled through the City of Napa Housing Authority.
6A-3: Identify a Fair Housing Officer among the City staff.	City Manager	2002, Ongoing	See Policy 6A-2 above.
6A-4: Document efforts at equal opportunity housing loans.	Planning Department	Annually	See Policy 6A-2 above.

Note:

(a) The duties previously performed by the Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA) are now handled by the City of Napa Housing Authority through a contract agreement with the City of St. Helena.

Sources: 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, 2008; City of St. Helena 2007 Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, June 2008; City of St. Helena Staff, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Demographic and Economic Trends

In order to understand the current housing needs of St. Helena residents, this section examines historic, current, and projected population, household, and employment trends. The figures for St. Helena are compared with the equivalent figures for Napa County and the Bay Area, to frame the St. Helena figures within the trends of the greater region.⁸

The data for the analysis of population, household characteristics, and employment come from the 1990 and 2000 Censuses, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the 2000 Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP), the California Department of Finance (DoF), and the California Employment Development Department (EDD). Claritas Inc., a private data vendor, provided the information regarding estimated 2008 population and household characteristics, and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) supplied the growth projection data.

Population and Employment Characteristics

This section presents information regarding population, household, and employment trends between 2000 and 2008, with some additional analysis for the period between 1990 and 2000.

Population Trends

Table 2 compares the population counts from 1990, 2000, and 2008 in St. Helena, Napa County, and the Bay Area. St. Helena averaged a 1.8 percent annual growth rate from 1990 to 2000, increasing from 4,990 to 5,950 persons. Then, from 2000 to 2008, St. Helena experienced a slight decrease of 0.1 percent in population, dropping by only 30 people to 5,920 persons in 2008 based on DoF 2008 population estimates.

In comparison, between 1990 and 2000, Napa County and the Bay Area both grew at an annual rate of 1.2 percent between the two Censuses. Napa County maintained a similar annual growth rate from 2000 to 2008 of 1.1 percent, and the growth rate of the Bay Area registered significantly lower, at 0.6 percent annually.

Household Trends

As shown in Table 2, between 1990 and 2000, the number of households in St. Helena increased slightly, by 1.1 percent annually. This closely corresponds to both Napa County and the Bay Area, which both averaged 0.9 percent annual household growth from 1990 to 2000.

⁸ For the purposes of this Housing Needs Assessment, the Bay Area is defined to include the following counties in the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG): Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Sonoma, and Solano.

DoF estimated that the number of households in St. Helena increased by only 0.2 percent annually, or about 35 households, between 2000 and 2008. Table 2 shows that the number of households in the City is approximately 2,410 in 2008. In contrast, the number of Napa County households grew by 1.1 percent annually, to 49,400 households in 2008. Napa County's growth rate represents an increase of about 4,000 households. The number of Bay Area households grew by 0.5 percent annually from 2000 to 2008.

Average Household Size

Average household size is a function of the number of people living in households divided by the number of occupied housing units in a given area. In general, a decline or increase in average household size signals that the population and the number of households are growing at different rates. Overall, the average household size in St. Helena was slightly smaller than in Napa County in 1990, 2000, and 2008. With the number of households growing, and a slight drop in population in St. Helena between 2000 and 2008, average household sizes fell from 2.48 to 2.43 persons per household, possibly reflecting a trend towards smaller retiree and empty nester households purchasing homes in the area. In contrast, the population in Napa County and the Bay Area increased more rapidly than the number of households, leading to increases in the average household size from 2.62 to 2.65 persons per household in Napa County, and from 2.69 to 2.72 in the Bay Area between 2000 and 2008.

Households by Type

Figures reported in Table 2 reveal that the percentage of households with children in 1990 was about 27 percent in St. Helena, and 33 percent in both Napa County and the Bay Area. Then, from 1990 to 2000, the percentage of households with at least one member under the age of 18 rose to nearly 33 percent in St. Helena and around 34 percent in Napa County and the Bay Area. In St. Helena, Napa County, and the Bay Area, the distribution of households with and without children did not change significantly between 2000 and 2008.

Household Tenure

As shown in Table 2, homeownership levels in St. Helena declined slightly between 1990 and 2000 and then dropped again in 2008, falling from 60 to 56 percent, and then to 55 percent. Relative to the County and the Bay Area, where 66 percent and almost 58 percent of households, respectively, own their homes in 2008, St. Helena has a lower percentage of homeowners.

Age Distribution

Based on data reported in Table 3, in 1990, 2000, and 2008, the median age of the St. Helena population slightly decreased from around 41 years of age in 1990, and fell closer to 39 by 2008. In contrast, the median age of Napa County's population increased slightly, from just over 36 years

in 1990 to around 38.5 years in 2008. Though the median age in St. Helena was higher than in Napa County in 1990, 2000, and 2008, the age gap between the two areas diminished during that time period. Furthermore, the median age in the Bay Area continually rose from about 33.5 in 1990 to 35.5 in 2000 and, finally, 38.1 in 2008.

Of all age groups, the 55 to 64 age category grew most markedly in St. Helena between 1990 and 2008. The number of people between the ages of 55 and 64 increased by over 381, raising the share of the total population in this age category from 7.5 to 13 percent. As in St. Helena, between 1990 and 2008, the 55 to 64 age category grew from nearly 9 to 12 percent of the total population in Napa County, and from around 8 to 12 percent in the Bay Area.

In St. Helena, the categories of persons under the age of 18, and between 45 to 54 years experienced high levels of growth between 1990 and 2000, but then the number of persons in each category decreased, albeit by a slightly lesser degree, from 2000 to 2008. By 2008, the percentage of persons under the age of 18 represented nearly 24 percent of the total population and those between 45 and 54 constituted nearly 14 percent of St. Helena residents. Similarly, in 2008, persons under 18 equaled about 23 percent of the total population and the share of persons aged 45 to 54 was around 15 percent of the population in both Napa County and the Bay Area.

The number of persons between 18 and 24 years rose by over 185 persons in St. Helena, increasing this category's share of the total population from about seven to nine percent from 1990 to 2008. In Napa County, the 18 to 24 age bracket increased in absolute numbers, but the share of the total population in 1990 (nine percent) was nearly identical to the share in 2008. The age category 65 and over was the only category decrease in numbers from 1990 to 2000 and then again between 2000 and 2008. The number of persons over 65 in St. Helena stood at 1,250 in 1990 before falling to about 940 in 2008. The net effect of these changes was that the St. Helena median age decreased by over one year, while the median age in Napa County and the Bay Area rose by nearly two years and almost five years, respectively.

Household Income Distribution

Table 4 summarizes the distribution of household incomes in 1999 and 2008. From 1999 to 2008, the median household income in St. Helena, adjusted for inflation, increased from \$72,900 to \$79,200, or by over \$6,300. In 2008, the City of St. Helena median household income is higher than the median household income of Napa County, and that of the Bay Area. The Bay Area showed an inflation-adjusted decline in median income, of just over \$3,500 from about \$78,000 in 1999 to \$74,300 in 2008.

The general trends for St. Helena indicate that inflation-adjusted household incomes grew over the past eight years, with around 40 percent of St. Helena households having incomes of \$100,000 or

more in 2008. This compares to around 22 percent just eight years earlier. In addition, the number of households in each of the income categories below \$100,000 decreased between 1999 and 2008 in the City. A similar income distribution trend occurred in Napa County between 1999 and 2008, though not to the same degree as in St. Helena. In Napa County, the percent of total households with incomes above \$100,000 increased from 19 percent in 1999 to 30 percent in 2008. While the share of total households fell in each of the income categories below \$75,000, the absolute number of households only declined in the four income categories below \$45,000. In comparison, between 1999 and 2008 the percentage of households in the Bay Area with incomes above \$100,000 rose from around 27 percent, to 35 percent. In the Bay Area, the share of total households fell in each of the income categories below \$75,000, and the absolute number of households also fell in each of these income categories.

Household Income Categories

Table 5 presents figures from the HUD 2000 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data set. This table illustrates the distribution of households among various income categories by tenure. The Department of Housing and Urban Development defines income categories as a percentage of the Area Median Family Income (AMFI). Households whose income equal 30 percent or less of the AMFI are considered extremely low-income; households with incomes between 30 and 50 percent of the AMFI are classified as very low-income; those between 50 and 80 percent of the AFMI are low-income; those between 80 and 120 percent are moderate-income; and households with incomes above 120 percent of the AMFI constitute the above moderate-income category.

In 1999, a higher percentage of households in St. Helena had incomes in the extremely low-income and the above moderate-income categories compared to Napa County. In St. Helena, approximately 47 percent of households had incomes in the above moderate income category, compared to around 40 percent for Napa County. Furthermore, 11 percent of St. Helena households had extremely low-incomes compared to ten percent in Napa County. This suggests that St. Helena overall has a higher level of income disparity relative to Napa County.

Examination of the distribution of owner and renter households indicates that owner households exhibited a lower percentage of extremely low-incomes (about 6 percent) and a higher percentage of above moderate-incomes (63 percent) than renter households in St. Helena (17 percent extremely low-income, and 27 percent above moderate-income). In addition, St. Helena had a lower percentage of owner households in the extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income categories, compared to Napa County. Approximately 49 percent of owner households in Napa County fell in the above moderate-income category, compared to 63 percent in St. Helena.

Renter households in St. Helena exhibited a more even distribution among the income categories

relative to owner households, with 17 percent of renter households in the extremely low-income category, 12 percent in the very low-income category, 19 percent in the low-income category, 26 percent in the moderate-income category, and nearly 27 percent in the above moderate-income category. The higher concentration of renter households in the moderate-income categories and below, compared to owner households, is attributable to the fact that market rate housing in St. Helena typically requires households to have incomes above the moderate level.

Employment Trends

Labor Force

As presented in Table 6, the unemployment rates in St. Helena were lower than Napa County and the Bay Area in 2000 and 2007. St. Helena exhibited a small increase of 300 employed residents between 2000 and 2007 (almost ten percent), while the number of unemployed residents held at 100. In comparison, Napa County experienced a similar percent increase of employed residents of nearly 11 percent, while the Bay Area experienced a decrease in employed residents of about four percent. Note that the preceding discussion refers to employed residents, or the number of local area residents who are currently working. This does not equate to the number of jobs in the local area, which is discussed in the following section.

The unemployment rate in St. Helena between 2000 and 2007 followed a distinctly different pattern than in Napa County or the Bay Area over the same time period. The unemployment rate in St. Helena decreased slightly, from about 3.1 percent to 2.9 percent, while the rate rose in Napa County from 3.6 percent to 4.2 percent and the Bay Area rate rose from 3.4 percent to 4.6 percent.

Jobs by Industry

Table 7 presents 2000 and 2005 ABAG estimates of the number of jobs by industry sector in both St. Helena and Napa County. According to ABAG, the number of jobs in St. Helena increased by 4 percent, or 210 jobs, between 2000 and 2005. Over the same period of time, the number of Napa County jobs grew by almost seven percent, but in the Bay Area the number of jobs decreased by around 8 percent. The distribution of jobs held relatively steady in both St. Helena and Napa County between 2000 and 2005.

In both St. Helena and Napa County, ABAG estimated that all sectors experienced some level of job growth between 2000 and 2005 while all sectors in the Bay Area experienced a loss of jobs. Employment in the “Health, Education, and Recreational Service” sector increased by the greatest number of jobs in both St. Helena and Napa County, growing by 60 and 1,570 jobs, respectively. This ABAG-defined industry sector includes jobs in the arts and entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food service industries, as well as the education, health care, and social services sectors. This industry sector held the highest job concentration in Napa County, with 36

percent of the total in 2000 and 2005. However, in St. Helena, the “Health, Education, and Recreational Service” sector comprised only 26 percent of total jobs in both 2000 and 2005.

In St. Helena, the greatest concentration of jobs was in the “Manufacturing, Wholesale, and Transportation” sector, with 27 percent of total jobs in 2000 and 2005. This sector, which includes the manufacturing operations of the wine industry, increased by 40 jobs in the City between 2000 and 2005. Napa County added approximately 860 jobs, and the Bay Area lost around 154,000 in this sector for the same time period. These data highlight the growth of the Napa County wine industry relative to the decline of other manufacturing sectors more commonly found elsewhere in the Bay Area. This sector represented 22 percent of total jobs in the County, in both 2000 and 2005, and about 21 percent of Bay Area jobs by 2005.

In addition to the “Manufacturing, Wholesale, and Transportation” sector, St. Helena demonstrated slightly higher concentrations of jobs relative to Napa County and the Bay Area in the “Agriculture and Natural Resources,” and “Retail,” sectors. In 2005, approximately 6.5 percent of St. Helena jobs compared to 5 percent in Napa County and one percent in the Bay Area were in the sector “Agriculture and Natural Resources.” The same pattern appeared in the “Retail” sector in 2005 with the percentage of total jobs equaling about 12 percent, in St. Helena and 11 percent in Napa County and Bay Area.

Commuting Patterns

Tables 8 and 9 show the commuting patterns for the St. Helena workforce as well as the number of employed City residents as reported by the Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) As summarized in Table 8, nearly 77 percent of the local workforce commuted into the City from residence locations elsewhere, while employees who also resided in St. Helena filled only 23 percent of local jobs. Approximately 60 percent of St. Helena workers lived elsewhere in Napa County, with over a third of those workers living in the City of Napa. In addition, about five percent of St. Helena workers lived in Sonoma County, nearly four percent resided in Lake County, and almost four percent commuted in from Solano County.

Table 9 provides further detail regarding the commuting patterns of employed St. Helena residents. Only 43 percent of local residents worked in St. Helena in 2000, and approximately 57 percent of employed St. Helena residents commuted out of St. Helena for work each day. Most of the out-commuters worked elsewhere in Napa County, primarily in the City of Napa. An additional 6 percent of employed St. Helena residents worked in Sonoma and Alameda Counties combined.

Ratio of Jobs to Employed Residents

Table 10 shows that St. Helena has a significantly higher proportion of jobs to employed residents as compared to other incorporated cities in Napa County. Countywide, there was just over one job

per employed resident in 2000. However, the ratio of jobs to employed residents in St. Helena was nearly double the County ratio, with two jobs per employed resident. This means that even if all employed residents worked in St. Helena, the City would still be reliant upon in-commuters to fill approximately half of the local jobs. No other Napa County community exhibited a higher ratio of jobs to employed residents in 2000. While Yountville's ratio of jobs to employed residents approached St. Helena's ratio, this community had a smaller share of employed residents relative to the total population, 0.34, compared to 0.47 countywide and in St. Helena. In addition, other communities, such as American Canyon and the City of Napa had ratios of less than one job per employed resident.

Our Town St. Helena is an advocacy organization working to provide housing opportunities for all members of the St. Helena community. Three important goals outlined in the organization's mission statement include "advocate for low- and moderate-priced housing in St. Helena; partner with others to create that housing; and create a clearinghouse to share information about local housing opportunities."⁹ Mary Stephenson, a founding member of the organization, uses the analogy of a tree to explain the organizations goals, whereby the roots of the tree represent unskilled labor like farmworkers who can only afford rental housing, the trunk is comprised of skilled labor such as wine industry managers, and finally the branches of the tree are the professionals in the community who make a decent living but cannot affordable market rate housing in St. Helena.¹⁰ To improve the housing availability for all members of the community, Ms. Stephenson believes that City should increase its growth rate, albeit in a very managed fashion, that additional funding needs to be made available for affordable housing projects, and the approval process for residential development, especially developments containing affordable housing, should be streamlined.

Population, Household and Employment Projections, 2010-2035

Table 11 reports ABAG projections of the total population, number of households, and number of employed residents. These projections provide information on St. Helena, Napa County, and the Bay Area from 2010 to 2035.

Population

ABAG projects an average annual growth rate of one-tenth of a percent for St. Helena's population between 2010 and 2035, as shown in Table 11. This low growth rate translates into an anticipated net population increase of only 100 persons over this time period. ABAG projects a 0.4 percent annual average population growth rate for Napa County, which translates to approximately 16,400

⁹ Duarte, Jesse "Grass Roots Effort for Upvalley Housing" *Napa Valley Register*. August 23rd, 2008. <http://www.napavalleyregister.com/articles/2008/08/23/news/local/doc48af9582be4f6301775655.txt> Accessed on December 17, 2008

¹⁰ Personal Communication, Mary Stephenson, Our Town St. Helena. December 8, 2008.

new County residents between 2010 and 2035. For the Bay Area, ABAG projects a higher average annual growth rate of 0.6 percent with a net population increase of 1.6 million between 2010 and 2035.

The California Department of Finance (DoF) projects the increase in the population by age and sex in Napa County as a whole in ten-year increments from 2000 to 2050. While the total population of Napa County is expected to increase by about 126,500 persons (a 101 percent increase over the 50 year period, or a 1.4 percent average annual increase), the increase in the total population over the age of 64 is expected to outpace that of the total population. The DoF projects the number of people over 64 will increase 118 percent over the period (a 1.6 percent average annual increase). The increase of 22,700 persons over the age of 64 will include an estimated 10,900 males and 11,800 females. St. Helena can expect to feel the impact of this aging trend as well.

Households

ABAG also anticipates a 0.2 percent annual average growth rate for households in St. Helena between 2010 and 2035. Assuming a similar income distribution of households in St. Helena in 2035 as in 2008, it is projected that approximately eleven percent, or just fewer than 280 households, of the total 2,600 households in St. Helena would be extremely low-income households. Another approximately 230 would be very low-income and 290 would be low-income households.

As reported in Table 11, ABAG projects the number of St. Helena households will rise from 2,450 in 2010 to 2,600 in 2035, a net increase of 150 households. The disparity between ABAG's population and household projection figures for St. Helena indicates an anticipation that, on average, households in the City will decrease in size from the present average. In Napa County, ABAG projects the number of households will rise at an average annual growth rate of 0.6 percent, which is 0.2 percentage points higher than the projected population growth, for a total 8,180 new households by 2035. In the Bay Area, ABAG projects an average annual increase in households of 0.8 percent, which mirrors the anticipated increase in population.

Jobs

ABAG projects that the annual average job growth rate for St. Helena, reported in Table 11, will slightly exceed the City's projected population and household growth rates, meaning that the City's already high ratio of jobs to employed residents may well increase further.¹¹ With an expected 0.4

¹¹ ABAG utilizes the Subarea Allocation Model (SAM) to allocate job projections to the 1,405 Census tracts in the region. According to ABAG's website: "Employment is distributed to Census tracts according to a weighted combination of a tract's share of employment potential and its previous share of its zone's employment. Employment potential is indicated by the amount of land available for development as determined in the ABAG's land use database."

percent average annual growth rate in employment, the number of jobs will increase by nearly 550 between 2010 and 2035. The greatest increases in jobs are projected in the “Health, Education, and Recreational Services” sector, with 250 new jobs by 2035, and the “Financial and Professional Services” sector with 130 jobs by 2035.

In Napa County, ABAG projects an average annual employment growth rate of just over 1 percent, or approximately 23,200 new jobs between 2010 and 2035. The greatest employment increase for the County is anticipated in the “Health, Education and Recreational Services” sector, with 8,700 new jobs, followed by nearly 5,000 new jobs in the “Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation” sector. ABAG expects that employment in the latter industry sector will grow by only 50 jobs in St. Helena between 2005 and 2035.

The projected Bay Area employment growth rate also exceeds the projected population and household growth rates, indicating a possible regional increase in the ratio of jobs to employed residents. As in St. Helena, the largest employment increases are expected in the “Health, Education and Recreational Services” and “Financial and Professional Services” sector through 2035.

Summary

Between 2000 and 2008, St. Helena experienced a small loss in population and modest household growth, with the local population decreasing by 0.4 percent and the number of households increasing by almost 1.5 percent. This is in contrast to the nearly 20 percent and 11 percent increase in population and households, respectively, seen in St. Helena from 1990 to 2000. In Napa County and the Bay Area from 1990 to 2000, and 2000 to 2008, the population and households continually increased. St. Helena’s decrease in population may reflect a trend in purchase of St. Helena homes for use as second homes.

The size of households in St. Helena rose from 1990 to 2000, before a small drop between 2000 and 2008, while in both Napa County and the Bay Area the household size rose over both time periods. St. Helena’s homeownership rate fell between 2000 and 2008, placing St. Helena further behind Napa County and the Bay Area.

By 2008, decreases in the median age in St. Helena coupled with increases in the median ages in Napa County and the Bay Area resulted in only a one year difference between the median age in St. Helena (39.3) and the median age in Napa County and the Bay Area (just over 38 years). St. Helena maintained higher shares of residents in the 55 to 64, and 65 and over age categories than both Napa County and the Bay Area in 2000 and 2008. However, the share and number of residents age 65 and over decreased in St. Helena between 1990 and 2008. Furthermore, the City of St. Helena had a lower percentage of residents in the 25 to 34 and 35 to 44 age categories than

both Napa County and the Bay Area.

St. Helena residents have continually become wealthier. By 2008, while only 30 percent of Napa County, and 35 percent of Bay Area households have incomes of \$100,000 or more, the St. Helena percentage is close to 40 percent. In addition, the percentage of St. Helena households with incomes of less than \$25,000 fell from about 19 percent in 1999 to 14 percent in 2008. St. Helena's inflation-adjusted median income of \$79,200 in 2008 exceeds that of Napa County and the Bay Area, \$67,400 and \$74,300, respectively.

In both 2000 and 2007, St. Helena had a lower unemployment rate than Napa County and the Bay Area. The greatest job concentration in St. Helena was in the "Manufacturing, Wholesale, and Transportation" sector, in both 2000 and 2005. However, the largest increase in jobs within the City between 2000 and 2005 occurred in the "Health, Educational, and Recreational Services" sector, which was nearly as large as the "Manufacturing, Wholesale, and Transportation" employment category in St. Helena in both years.

According to the Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) most people who work in St. Helena commuted in from residences located outside of the City. Furthermore, 57 percent of employed St. Helena residents commuted to jobs outside of the City. The ratio of jobs to employed residents confirms that St. Helena had approximately two jobs per employed resident in 2005. ABAG projects that the number of residents, households, and jobs in St. Helena will continue to grow at a conservative rate through 2035, with the annual average job growth rate slightly outpacing population and household growth rates.

Table 2: Population and Household Trends, 1990, 2000, and 2008

	1990	2000	2008 (est.) (a)	Average Annual Growth 1990-2000	Average Annual Growth 2000-2008
City of St. Helena					
Population	4,990	5,950	5,924	1.8%	-0.1%
Households	2,138	2,380	2,414	1.1%	0.2%
Average Household Size	2.31 (b)	2.48	2.43	0.7%	-0.2%
Household Type					
HH with Children (c)	26.9%	32.6%	32.7%		
HH without Children	73.1%	67.4%	67.3%		
Tenure					
Homeowners	60.3%	56.0%	54.5%		
Renters	39.7%	44.0%	45.5%		
Napa County					
Population	110,765	124,279	136,092	1.2%	1.1%
Households	41,312	45,402	49,403	0.9%	1.1%
Average Household Size	2.54 (b)	2.62	2.65	0.3%	0.1%
Household Type					
HH with Children (c)	33.3%	34.4%	34.3%		
HH without Children	66.7%	65.6%	65.7%		
Tenure					
Homeowners	64.5%	65.1%	66.2%		
Renters	35.5%	34.9%	33.8%		
Bay Area (d)					
Population	6,023,577	6,783,760	7,092,031	1.2%	0.6%
Households	2,246,242	2,466,019	2,556,790	0.9%	0.5%
Average Household Size	2.61 (b)	2.69 (e)	2.72	0.3%	0.1%
Household Type					
HH with Children (c)	33.4%	34.7%	34.9%		
HH without Children	66.6%	65.3%	65.1%		
Tenure					
Homeowners	56.4%	57.7%	57.8%		
Renters	43.6%	42.3%	42.2%		

Notes:

(a) 2008 figures for the City of St. Helena are based on total population and household estimates from the California Department of Finance and household type and tenure distribution estimates from Claritas. 2008 figures for all other areas are based solely on estimates provided by Claritas.

(b) Average household size estimates for 1990 are calculated by dividing the number of households by total population minus population in group quarters.

(c) Households with children have at least one member under the age of 18.

(d) The Bay Area includes the following nine counties encompassed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG): Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma.

(e) The 2000 average household size for the Bay Area is a Claritas estimate.

Sources: Census 1990, 2008; Census 2000, 2008; Department of Finance, 2008; Claritas, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 3: Age Distribution, 1990, 2000, and 2008

City of St. Helena						
Age Distribution	1990		2000		2008 (est.) (a)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Under 18	1,065	21.3%	1,494	25.1%	1,400	23.6%
18-24	325	6.5%	383	6.4%	510	8.6%
25-34	659	13.2%	685	11.5%	723	12.2%
35-44	773	15.5%	877	14.7%	778	13.1%
45-54	546	10.9%	917	15.4%	820	13.8%
55-64	372	7.5%	566	9.5%	753	12.7%
65 and Over	1,250	25.1%	1,028	17.3%	939	15.9%
Total	4,990	100%	5,950	100%	5,924	100%
Median Age	40.8 (b)		39.9		39.3	

Napa County						
Age Distribution	1990		2000		2008 (est.)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Under 18	25,720	23.2%	29,998	24.1%	30,829	22.7%
18-24	10,244	9.2%	10,510	8.5%	12,832	9.4%
25-34	16,830	15.2%	15,562	12.5%	18,263	13.4%
35-44	17,697	16.0%	18,884	15.2%	18,527	13.6%
45-54	12,145	11.0%	18,392	14.8%	19,730	14.5%
55-64	9,790	8.8%	11,847	9.5%	16,234	11.9%
65 and Over	18,339	16.6%	19,086	15.4%	19,677	14.5%
Total	110,765	100%	124,279	100%	136,092	100%
Median Age	36.4 (b)		38.3		38.4	

Bay Area						
Age Distribution	1990		2000		2008 (est.)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Under 18	1,387,341	23.0%	1,601,858	23.6%	1,644,471	23.2%
18-24	620,499	10.3%	595,173	8.8%	610,013	8.6%
25-34	1,177,834	19.6%	1,120,919	16.5%	952,858	13.4%
35-44	1,040,415	17.3%	1,172,570	17.3%	1,117,804	15.8%
45-54	656,003	10.9%	964,638	14.2%	1,093,401	15.4%
55-64	476,007	7.9%	571,095	8.4%	820,904	11.6%
65 and Over	665,478	11.0%	757,507	11.2%	852,580	12.0%
Total	6,023,577	100%	6,783,760	100%	7,092,031	100%
Median Age	33.6 (b)		35.6 (b)		38.1	

Notes:

(a) 2008 figures for the City of St. Helena are based on total population estimates from the California Department of Finance and age distribution estimates from Claritas. 2008 figures for all other areas are based solely on estimates provided by Claritas.
(b) 1990 median age estimates for the City of St. Helena, Napa County and the Bay Area, and the 2000 median age estimate for the Bay Area are Claritas estimates.

Sources: Census 1990, 2008; Census 2000, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2008; Claritas, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 4: Household Income Distribution, 1999 and 2008

Income Range	City of St. Helena				Napa County				Bay Area			
	1999 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)		1999 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)		1999 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Less than \$15,000	273	11.5%	177	7.3%	4,398	9.7%	3,430	6.9%	246,466	10.0%	208,322	8.1%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	184	7.7%	165	6.8%	4,826	10.6%	3,430	6.9%	192,887	7.8%	163,949	6.4%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	220	9.3%	139	5.8%	5,248	11.6%	4,363	8.8%	214,136	8.7%	177,443	6.9%
\$35,000 - \$44,999	219	9.2%	167	6.9%	5,154	11.4%	4,515	9.1%	222,298	9.0%	193,152	7.6%
\$45,000 - \$59,999	311	13.1%	253	10.5%	6,200	13.7%	6,397	12.9%	306,465	12.4%	285,108	11.2%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	254	10.7%	254	10.5%	5,127	11.3%	5,226	10.6%	278,418	11.3%	263,484	10.3%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	386	16.2%	316	13.1%	6,023	13.3%	7,039	14.2%	345,888	14.0%	362,903	14.2%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	261	11.0%	459	19.0%	5,063	11.2%	8,151	16.5%	370,968	15.0%	474,017	18.5%
\$150,000 or more	270	11.4%	485	20.1%	3,365	7.4%	6,852	13.9%	288,492	11.7%	428,412	16.8%
Total Households	2,380	100%	2,414	100%	45,402	100%	49,403	100%	2,466,019	100%	2,556,790	100%
Unadjusted Median Household Income (c)	\$58,902		\$79,208		\$51,738		\$67,367		\$63,056		\$74,256	
Adjusted Median Household Income (d)	\$72,883		\$79,208		\$64,018		\$67,367		\$78,023		\$74,256	

Notes:

(a) 1999 figures are based on Census 2000, Summary File 1 total household figures and Summary File 3 income distribution estimates.

(b) 2008 figures for the City of St. Helena are based on total household estimates from the California Department of Finance and income distribution estimates from Claritas. 2008 figures for all other areas are based solely on estimates provided by Claritas.

(c) 1999 median household income figures are from Census 2000, while figures for 2008 and the 1999 Bay Area are based on Claritas estimates.

(d) The 1999 median household income estimates are adjusted to represent 2008 dollars using the California Department of Finance San Francisco Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) Consumer Price Index (CPI) of 1.237, revised on May 14, 2008.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2008; Claritas, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 5: Household Income Categories, City of St. Helena, 1999 (a)

Income Categories	City of St. Helena						Napa County					
	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total Households		Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total Households	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Extremely Low Income (Less than 30% of AMFI)	80	6.0%	175	16.6%	255	10.7%	1,815	6.1%	2,525	15.9%	4,340	9.6%
Very Low Income (30% to 50% of AMFI)	85	6.4%	125	11.9%	210	8.8%	2,465	8.3%	2,590	16.4%	5,055	11.1%
Low Income (50% to 80% of AMFI)	160	12.0%	199	18.9%	359	15.0%	4,525	15.3%	3,575	22.6%	8,100	17.8%
Moderate Income 80% to 120% of AMFI)	175	13.1%	274	26.0%	449	18.8%	6,195	21.0%	3,745	23.6%	9,940	21.9%
Above Moderate Income (Over 120% of AMFI)	835	62.5%	280	26.6%	1,115	46.7%	14,560	49.3%	3,405	21.5%	17,965	39.6%
Total Households	1,335	100%	1,053	100%	2,388	100%	29,560	100%	15,840	100%	45,400	100%

Note:

(a) Figures reported above are based on the HUD-published CHAS 2000 data, which reports 1999 incomes. CHAS data reflect HUD-defined household income limits, for various household sizes. Total household figures may vary from those reported in Table 2 due to different estimation methodologies.

Sources: CHAS 2000, huduser.org, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 6: Labor Force Trends, 2000 and 2007

	City of St. Helena		Napa County		Bay Area	
	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007
Employed Residents	3,100	3,400	64,200	71,200	3,609,700	3,468,100
Unemployed Residents	100	100	2,400	3,100	126,000	165,700
Labor Force (a)	3,200	3,500	66,600	74,300	3,735,700	3,633,800
Unemployment Rate (b)	3.1%	2.9%	3.6%	4.2%	3.4%	4.6%

Notes:

(a) The labor force consists of the employed and unemployed residents combined.

(b) The unemployment rate is the percentage of the labor force that is unemployed.

Sources: EDD, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 7: Jobs by Industry, 2000 and 2005

Industry (b)	City of St. Helena (a)				Napa County				Bay Area			
	2000		2005		2000		2005		2000		2005	
	Employed Workers	Percent of Total	Employed Workers	Percent of Total	Employed Workers	Percent of Total	Employed Workers	Percent of Total	Employed Workers	Percent of Total	Employed Workers	Percent of Total
Agriculture and Natural Resources Jobs (c)	360	6.4%	380	6.5%	3,090	4.7%	3,460	4.9%	24,470	0.7%	24,170	0.7%
Manufacturing, Wholesale, and Transportation Jobs (d)	1,520	27.1%	1,560	26.9%	14,690	22.1%	15,550	22.0%	863,420	23.0%	709,380	20.6%
Retail Jobs (e)	640	11.4%	670	11.5%	7,020	10.6%	7,450	10.5%	402,670	10.7%	367,680	10.7%
Financial and Professional Service Jobs (f)	880	15.7%	910	15.7%	8,630	13.0%	9,240	13.1%	851,610	22.7%	780,160	22.6%
Health, Educational, and Recreational Service Jobs (g)	1,470	26.3%	1,530	26.3%	24,150	36.4%	25,720	36.4%	1,056,030	28.1%	1,055,010	30.6%
Other Jobs (h)	730	13.0%	760	13.1%	8,780	13.2%	9,270	13.1%	555,260	14.8%	513,240	14.9%
Total	5,600	100%	5,810	100%	66,360	100.0%	70,690	100.0%	3,753,460	100%	3,449,640	100%

Notes:

- (a) ABAG figures for St. Helena are based on the City's sphere of influence.
- (b) Industry employment figures report the number of jobs in each geography, not the number of employed residents.
- (c) Includes North American Industrial Classification System sectors 11 and 21: Agriculture, Fishing, Forestry, and Mining.
- (d) Includes North American Industrial Classification System sectors 22, 31-33, 42, and 48-49: Utilities, Manufacturing, Wholesale, Transportation, and Warehousing.
- (e) Includes North American Industrial Classification System sectors 44 and 45: Retail Trade.
- (f) Includes North American Industrial Classification System sectors 52-56: Finance, and Insurance; Real Estate and Rental and Leasing; Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services; and Management of Companies and Enterprises, as well as Administrative Supports, Waste Management, and Remediation Services.
- (g) Includes North American Industrial Classification System sectors 61, 62, 71, 72, and 81: Educational Services, Health Care and Social Assistance; Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation; Accommodation and Food Services; and Other Services.
- (h) Includes North American Industrial Classification System sectors 23, 51 and 92: Construction, Information, and Public Administration.

Sources: ABAG, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 8: St. Helena Workers by Place of Residence, 2000

	<u>Number of workers</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Workers Employed in St. Helena (a)	5,043	100.0%
Workers Commuting into St. Helena	3,873	76.8%

Detailed Place of Residence for Workers Commuting Into St. Helena (b)

	<u>Number of workers</u>	<u>Percent of workers Employed in St. Helena</u>
Live in Napa County	4,185	83.0%
<i>St. Helena</i>	1,170	23.2%
<i>Napa</i>	1,410	28.0%
<i>Calistoga</i>	245	4.9%
<i>Angwin</i>	165	3.3%
<i>Yountville</i>	85	1.7%
<i>Remainder of County</i>	1,110	22.0%
Live in Sonoma County	263	5.2%
<i>Santa Rosa</i>	80	1.6%
<i>Remainder of County</i>	183	3.6%
Live in Lake County	185	3.7%
<i>Hidden Valley Lake</i>	55	1.1%
<i>Remainder of County</i>	130	2.6%
Live in Solano County	180	3.6%
<i>Vallejo</i>	70	1.4%
<i>Remainder of County</i>	110	2.2%
Live Elsewhere in California	230	4.6%

Notes:

(a) Table excludes a small number of workers who commute into St. Helena from out of the state.

(b) All places reporting 50 or more workers commuting into St. Helena are shown.

Sources: Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package, 2007; BAE, 2008.

Table 9: St. Helena Residents by Place of Work, 2000

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Employed St. Helena Residents (a)	2,703	100.0%
Workers Commuting out of St. Helena	1,533	56.7%

Detailed Place of Work for Workers Commuting Out of St. Helena (b)

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Employed St. Helena Residents</u>
Work in Napa County	2,400	88.8%
<i>St. Helena</i>	1,170	43.3%
<i>Remainder of County</i>	780	28.9%
<i>Napa</i>	300	11.1%
<i>Calistoga</i>	80	3.0%
<i>Yountville</i>	70	2.6%
Work in Sonoma County	88	3.3%
Work in Alameda County	64	2.4%
Work Elsewhere in California	151	5.6%

Notes:

(a) Table excludes a small number of workers who commute out of the state.

(b) All places reporting 50 or more workers commuting out of St. Helena are shown.

Sources: Census 2000 Transportation Planning Package, 2007; BAE, 2008.

Table 10: Ratio of Jobs to Employed Residents, 2005

Community	2000 (a)					2005 (a)			
	Population	Employed Residents (b)	Employed Residents/ Population	Jobs (c)	Jobs/Employed Residents	Population (c)	Percent Change 2000-2005	Jobs (c)	Percent Change 2000-2005
Napa County	124,279	58,501	0.47	66,360	1.13	133,700	7.6%	70,690	6.5%
<i>American Canyon</i>	9,813	4,199	0.43	1,940	0.46	14,700	49.8%	2,340	20.6%
<i>Calistoga</i>	5,190	2,374	0.46	2,710	1.14	5,200	0.2%	2,770	2.2%
<i>Napa City</i>	72,781	34,378	0.47	33,290	0.97	80,100	10.1%	35,470	6.5%
<i>St. Helena</i>	5,951	2,797	0.47	5,600	2.00	6,100	2.5%	5,810	3.8%
<i>Yountville</i>	2,916	991	0.34	1,900	1.92	3,400	16.6%	2,120	11.6%

Notes:

(a) 2000 figures report Census estimates. 2005 figures are based on ABAG projection data.

(b) Employed civilian population age 16 and over.

(c) ABAG figures for American Canyon, Calistoga, St. Helena and Yountville are based on each city's sphere of influence. City of Napa ABAG figures are based on the Napa subregional study area defined by ABAG.

(d) Calculated by multiplying the 2000 ratios of employed residents to total population, and 2005 total population estimates.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; ABAG, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 11: ABAG Population, Household, and Employment Projections

	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	Average Annual Percent Change 2010-2035
City of St. Helena (a)							
Population	6,100	6,100	6,100	6,200	6,200	6,200	0.1%
Households	2,450	2,480	2,510	2,540	2,570	2,600	0.2%
Employment	5,850	5,970	6,100	6,190	6,290	6,400	0.4%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	360	370	380	390	400	390	0.3%
Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation	1,560	1,560	1,570	1,580	1,590	1,610	0.1%
Retail	660	670	680	690	700	710	0.3%
Financial and Professional Services	920	950	980	1,000	1,020	1,050	0.5%
Health, Education and Recreational Services	1,590	1,650	1,710	1,750	1,790	1,840	0.6%
Other jobs (b)	760	770	780	780	790	800	0.2%
Napa County							
Population	139,300	144,400	148,100	151,100	153,500	155,700	0.4%
Households	51,470	53,650	55,740	57,210	58,640	59,650	0.6%
Employment	75,360	80,440	85,460	90,090	94,310	98,570	1.1%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	3,740	3,930	4,130	4,340	4,560	4,560	0.8%
Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation	16,530	17,560	18,570	19,580	20,500	21,500	1.1%
Retail	7,920	8,440	8,960	9,480	9,910	10,370	1.1%
Financial and Professional Services	9,900	10,710	11,520	12,230	12,920	13,600	1.3%
Health, Education and Recreational Services	27,440	29,360	31,280	32,950	34,470	36,120	1.1%
Other jobs (b)	9,830	10,440	11,000	11,510	11,950	12,420	0.9%
Bay Area							
Population	7,412,500	7,730,000	8,069,700	8,389,600	8,712,800	9,031,500	0.8%
Households	2,696,580	2,819,030	2,941,760	3,059,130	3,177,440	3,292,530	0.8%
Employment	3,693,920	3,979,200	4,280,700	4,595,170	4,921,680	5,247,780	1.4%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	24,520	24,870	25,070	25,270	25,470	25,490	0.2%
Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation	740,960	780,680	823,110	867,490	913,480	959,120	1.0%
Retail	392,400	422,880	455,450	489,510	524,960	560,730	1.4%
Financial and Professional Services	841,160	913,800	990,550	1,070,460	1,153,760	1,236,590	1.6%
Health, Education and Recreational Services	1,142,400	1,239,920	1,343,550	1,452,070	1,565,430	1,679,070	1.6%
Other jobs (b)	552,480	597,050	642,970	690,370	738,580	786,780	1.4%

Notes:

(a) ABAG figures for St. Helena are based on the City's sphere of influence.

(b) Includes North American Industrial Classification System sectors 23, 51 and 92: Construction, Information, and Public Administration.

Sources: ABAG, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Housing Conditions

The following section details the housing conditions in St. Helena and, where available, compares the data to Napa County and the Bay Area. Data sources include the 2000 Census, 2007 American Community Survey, California Department of Finance (DoF), U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), Claritas Inc., and Dataquick, a private real estate transactions data vendor. Property owners and managers of local residential apartment complexes were also interviewed for information regarding residential rental market conditions.

Existing Housing Conditions

Housing Stock Characteristics

Table 12 reports the distribution of housing units by type for St. Helena, Napa County, and the Bay Area. In St. Helena between 2000 and 2008, the total number of detached single-family units increased by approximately 50 units, while the number of attached single-family units remained relatively constant. Overall, St. Helena had about 40 more units in 2008 than in 2000, due to some losses in mobile homes. The overall increase in housing units represents a 1.4 percent increase in the quantity of housing in St. Helena between 2000 and 2008. In Napa County and the Bay Area, the number of housing units increased by ten percent (4,700 units) and five percent (128,000 units), respectively, over the same time period, greatly surpassing the housing growth rate in St. Helena.

Napa County has a higher share of single-family homes relative to St. Helena, about 74 and 66 percent of total units respectively in 2008, and a higher share of mobile homes; around 9 percent compared to 6 percent. Furthermore, St. Helena exhibits a higher proportion of multifamily units in structures with five or more units (19 percent in 2008) compared to the County's ten percent. This percentage was still low by regional standards, with nearly 25 percent of Bay Area housing stock in structures with five or more units.

Age of Housing Stock

Based on data from the 2000 Census reported in Table 13, Napa County and the Bay Area had slightly older housing stocks relative to St. Helena. Approximately 32 percent of St. Helena's housing units were built between 1980 and 2000, which surpassed the 28 percent in Napa County and 24 percent in the Bay Area. In addition, approximately 54 percent of the housing stock in Napa County and 52 percent in the Bay Area was constructed between 1950 and 1979. In St. Helena, only 44 percent of the housing units were built in that time period. St. Helena and the Bay Area had slightly higher proportions of historic homes, with around 24 percent of housing units in both areas built prior to 1950, compared to 19 percent in Napa County.

Occupancy Rates

In St. Helena, the overall housing vacancy rate reached 12 percent in 2000 according to the 2000 Census.¹² Homes kept for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use accounted for about 114 units, or one-third of total vacant units. These units for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use also represented over 4 percent of all housing units in the City.¹³ In Napa County, units for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use represented approximately 3 percent of total housing units, but nearly one-half of residential vacancies. In the Bay Area, the vacancy rate was significantly lower, at 3.4 percent, with less than one percent of homes vacant because of seasonal, recreational, or occasional use. Overall, after controlling for vacancies due to seasonal, recreational, or occasional uses, the vacancy rate in St. Helena was nearly 8 percent. This was significantly higher than in Napa County or the Bay Area, where the comparable figures were close to 3 percent for both areas.

Vacant for-sale units represented 3.7 percent of total units in St. Helena, which was higher than vacant for-rent units at approximately 1.8 percent of total units. These percentages represent nearly 50 vacant rental units and close to 100 vacant for-sale units in St. Helena. These figures compare to 114 vacant units in the City for seasonal, recreational or occasional use.

A comparison of 2000 Census data with 1990 Census data revealed that the overall vacancy rate in 1990 was about 10 percent, which is about two percent lower than in 2000. One of the major reasons for the lower overall vacancy rate is that in 1990 St. Helena had only 50 vacant units for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, but by 2000, the number had risen to more than 110 vacant units.

DoF also provides overall annual housing vacancy rate estimates, although DoF's data do not detail the composition of vacant units. DoF vacancy estimates for 2008 parallel the 2000 Census figures; with about a 12 percent overall vacancy rate in St. Helena and a 6 percent vacancy rate in Napa County.

In the real estate industry, a five percent residential vacancy rate is considered an indicator of a healthy housing market, with a reasonable balance between supply and demand. The 2000 data indicate that, after setting aside the units held vacant for seasonal or vacation use, St. Helena's vacancy rate was above industry standards. Absent more detailed data, it is difficult to tell if the

¹² The Census Bureau reports that "vacancy status and other characteristics of vacant units were determined by enumerators obtaining information from property owners and managers, neighbors, rental agents, and others." Census 2000 Brief: Housing Characteristics. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-13.pdf>. Accessed on December 12, 2008.

¹³ The census defines seasonal, recreational or occasional use as "housing units including vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons, for weekends, or other occasional use throughout the year. Interval ownership units, sometimes called shared ownership or timesharing condominiums are included in this category." <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/dp1/2kh00.pdf> Accessed on December 17, 2008.

2008 overall vacancy rate is due to a large number of units held vacant for seasonal, recreational or occasional use, or due to other factors affecting demand for permanent housing. Based on anecdotal information, the former may be more likely as City staff and members of the Housing Element Steering Committee think the number of homes for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, i.e. second homes, has increased within the community since 2000.

Overcrowding

The U.S. Census defines overcrowding as more than one person per room in a given housing unit,¹⁴ and Table 15 details overcrowding by income category and tenure. The 2000 Census provides the information on persons per room. As of 2000, more than 93 percent of St. Helena housing units had less than one person per room, leaving slightly over 6.5 percent of the units with overcrowded conditions. Of the 158 households living in overcrowded conditions, only 10 were owner households and the remainder were renters.

Among extremely low-income households, only 4 households (0.2 percent of total households) lived in overcrowded conditions, and they were all renters. In the very low-income category, the number of households living in overcrowded conditions increased to 29 (1.2 percent of total households) and again only represented renters. In the low-income category, owner and renter households endured overcrowded conditions, with 10 owner households (0.4 percent of total households) and 55 renter households (2.3 percent of total households) having more than one person per room. Finally, the moderate and above income category had a total of 60 renter households living in overcrowded conditions (2.5 percent of total households).

Housing Cost Burden

Table 16 presents household income limits, as defined by HCD, and estimates of housing cost burden based on the 2000 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategies (CHAS) database from HUD. Income limits are defined relative to the Area Median Family Income (AMFI) for Napa County. In addition, housing cost burden refers to the share of a household's income spent on housing costs. All households experience some level of housing cost burden, but households paying between 30 and 50 percent of their income for housing experience "excessive" housing cost burden. The housing cost burden qualifies as "severe" at levels above 50 percent of household income.¹⁵

¹⁴ According to the U.S. Census, a room includes all "whole rooms used for living purposes...including living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, finished recreation rooms, enclosed porches suitable for year-round use, and lodgers' rooms. Excluded are strips or pullman kitchens, bathrooms, open porches, balconies, halls or foyers, half-rooms, utility rooms, unfinished attics or basements, or other unfinished space used for storage. A partially divided room is a separate room only if there is a partition from floor to ceiling, but not if the partition consists solely of shelves or cabinets."

¹⁵ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research. "Affordable Housing Needs: A Report to Congress on the Significant Need for Housing." 2003.

In 2000, St. Helena households with a housing cost burden of less than 30 percent of their income represented around 68 percent of all households in St. Helena, meaning these households had a manageable housing cost burden. Of the remaining households, approximately 17 percent had excessive cost burdens and 15 percent had severe housing cost burdens. Overall, the incidence of excessive and severe housing cost burdens was greater among owner households than renter households, but the severity of the housing cost burden varied by income level and among owners versus renters.

Of the 266 extremely low-income households (less than 30 percent AMFI) in St. Helena, around 34 percent have a housing cost burden less than 30 percent, but nine percent and 58 percent, respectively, have excessive and severe housing cost burdens. Of all of the income categories, extremely low-income households are the most likely among renters to experience severe housing cost burden (93 households).

In the case of very low-income households (30 to 50 percent of AMFI), a much higher percentage of households (46 percent), had housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent of household income compared to extremely low-income households. In addition, just over 20 percent and 34 percent of households had excessive and severe housing cost burdens, respectively. More very low-income renter households (almost 80 households) than owner households (40 households) had excessive or severe housing cost burdens.

Among low-income households (50 to 80 percent of AMFI), 60 percent of households had housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent. In 2000, there were 70 low-income renter households and 85 low-income owner households with excessive or severe housing cost burdens.

For households in the moderate and above category, about 79 percent had housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent. While the percentage of renter households with severe or excessive housing cost burdens equaled about 2.5 percent of all moderate and above income households, the percentage of owners with severe or excessive housing cost burdens totaled almost 18.5 percent of this income category. Thus, a very small number of this income category's renter households had excessive (39) or severe (0) housing cost burdens, but among owner households, significantly higher numbers had excessive (225) and severe (65) housing cost burdens.

Overall, as the income category rises from extremely low-income to moderate-income and above, the numbers and percentages of renter households that experienced excessive or severe housing cost burdens fell. The same relationship, however, did not apply to owner households. The number of owner households with excessive and severe housing cost burdens varied with each

<http://www.huduser.org/Publications/pdf/AffHsgNeedsRpt2003.pdf>. Accessed on November 27, 2007.

income category and the highest incidence of excessive and severe housing cost burdens occurred in owner households with moderate and above moderate incomes. Therefore, rental subsidies are most crucial for St. Helena households with the lowest incomes, while the need for assistance among owner households crosses all income categories.

Physical Housing Conditions

City of St. Helena staff, with the assistance of BAE staff, performed a visual survey of all of the housing units in St. Helena in October 2008. City and BAE staff drove by all of the housing units and evaluated the exterior condition of the units. Survey forms based on a model provided by HCD were completed for all of the units in need of repair or replacement. The survey form, available in Appendix F, covers five major components: foundation, roofing, windows, siding/stucco, and electric. Since electrical systems often cannot be fully evaluated from a windshield survey, this part of the evaluation was not completed. The results of the survey indicate that of the 2,745 housing units in St. Helena, 13 units were in need of minor repair and three required major repair. City and BAE staff did not deem any of the units in need of substantial repair. The 16 total units in need of repair represent less than one percent of the housing stock in St. Helena, indicating that any rehabilitation programs undertaken by the City would be very small in scale.

“At Risk” Units

State law requires an analysis of the risk of conversion of affordable housing to market-rate housing within the next ten years. Since at least one St. Helena housing complex was identified as at-risk, this section estimates the costs to preserve this complex as affordable housing, or develop replacement affordable housing.

Inventory of At-Risk Units and Conversion Risk Assessment

HUD’s 2008 inventory of Multifamily Assistance and Section 8 contracts indicates that the 50-unit Woodbridge Apartments are at risk of conversion due to the expiration of their Section 8 contract on May 11, 2018.¹⁶

Replacement and Preservation Costs

Table 18 summarizes the cost to replace or preserve the Woodbridge Apartments. Appendix B, Appendix C and Appendix D provide detailed information on the calculations presented in Table 18.

The net cost per unit of preserving Woodbridge as an affordable complex through acquisition by an affordable housing developer is approximately \$78,300, given that a subsidy of about \$3,960,000

¹⁶ HUD. <http://www.hud.gov/offices/hsg/mfh/exp/mfhdiscl.cfm>. Accessed on September 17, 2008.

would be required to bridge the gap between the total capitalized value of the property (based on market rate rents) and the maximum supportable mortgage of the Woodbridge Apartment Complex (based on affordable rents). This estimate of preservation costs only covers the acquisition costs, and therefore any necessary improvements would require additional subsidy.

If the Woodbridge Apartments convert to market rate, replacement of the complex would cost around \$266,000 per unit, based upon average total cost information from recent affordable housing complexes built in Napa County by Napa Valley Community Housing, Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, and Calistoga Affordable Housing Inc. However, given that the occupants of these units would pay rent that would help to offset the development costs of these units, the net cost to build these affordable units is \$195,900 per unit.

The third option for preserving these units as affordable is through direct rental subsidy commitments whereby the difference between the market rents and affordable rents would be subsidized if Woodbridge Apartments became a market rate complex. Rent subsidies would cost around \$42,000 per unit in 2008 dollars over 20 years. Under current conditions, both preservation options are less expensive than new construction, but a more in-depth analysis will be necessary in 2018 if and when the Woodbridge Apartments decides to opt out of the Section 8 program when its current contract expires. Since conversion will not occur earlier than 2018, after the end of the 2009 Housing Element Update's 5-year planning period, no specific policies, programs or actions are included in the Housing Element Policy Document to address this situation.

Entities Qualified to Preserve At-Risk Units

Appendix E lists the organizations approved by HCD as qualified entities to purchase units at-risk of conversion in Napa County, pursuant to Government Code Section 65863.11.¹⁷ While any organization can purchase an at-risk unit, when a qualified entity makes an offer they "have a right of first refusal to submit a counteroffer that meets the terms and conditions of any other pending offer for an additional 180 days."¹⁸ Therefore, qualified entities have an advantage over other organizations when bidding on affordable housing units at risk of conversion to market rates.

Financing and Subsidy Resources

The County has access to several financial resources that could be leveraged to assist in covering the cost of preservation of affordable housing units. These include local resources like the City of

¹⁷ California Department of Housing and Community Development. <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/tech/presrv/hpd00-01.xls>. Accessed on September 17, 2008.

¹⁸ California Department of Housing and Community Development. "Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements Housing Programs: Preserve Units At-Risk of Conversion to Market Rate Uses" www.hcd.ca.gov/housingelement. Accessed on September 17, 2008.

St. Helena Housing Trust Fund, State and Federal housing grant programs, Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), and HUD Section 8 Vouchers.

Table 12: Housing Stock Characteristics, 2000 and 2008

Units in Structure	St. Helena				Napa County				Bay Area			
	2000		2008 (a)		2000		2008 (est.)		2000		2008 (est.)	
	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total
Detached Single Family	1,644	60.7%	1,691	61.6%	32,569	67.1%	35,723	67.1%	1,376,911	53.9%	1,438,127	53.7%
Attached Single Family	215	7.9%	215	7.8%	3,215	6.6%	3,421	6.4%	224,837	8.8%	236,113	8.8%
2 to 4 units	210	7.8%	216	7.9%	3,637	7.5%	3,798	7.1%	266,321	10.4%	274,628	10.2%
5 or more units	478	17.7%	478	17.4%	5,204	10.7%	5,495	10.3%	623,345	24.4%	662,851	24.7%
Mobile Homes	161	5.9%	145	5.3%	3,832	7.9%	4,672	8.8%	57,129	2.2%	63,712	2.4%
Boats, RV's, Vans, Other	0	0.0%	n.a.	n.a.	97	0.2%	109	0.2%	3,859	0.2%	4,738	0.2%
Total Units (b)	2,708	100%	2,745	100%	48,554	100%	53,218	100%	2,552,402	100%	2,680,169	100%

Notes:

(a) 2008 figures for the City of St. Helena are based on estimates from the California Department of Finance which does not report figures for boats, RVs, vans and other types of housing as reported in the 2000 Census. 2008 figures for all other areas are provided by Claritas.

(b) Figures may differ from those reported in Table 14 due to the use of Census 2000 Summary File 3 versus Summary File 1.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 13: Housing Stock by Year Built, 2000

Year Structure Built	St. Helena		Napa County		Bay Area	
	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total
1999 to 2000 (a)	33	1.2%	807	1.7%	36,332	1.4%
1995 to 1998	272	10.0%	1,826	3.8%	103,607	4.1%
1990 to 1994	155	5.7%	3,665	7.5%	131,962	5.2%
1980 to 1989	394	14.5%	7,129	14.7%	339,335	13.3%
1970 to 1979	611	22.6%	10,722	22.1%	483,380	18.9%
1960 to 1969	326	12.0%	7,545	15.5%	442,075	17.3%
1950 to 1959	265	9.8%	7,854	16.2%	401,120	15.7%
1940 to 1949	191	7.1%	3,839	7.9%	220,559	8.6%
1939 or earlier	461	17.0%	5,167	10.6%	394,032	15.4%
Total Units (b)	2,708	100%	48,554	100%	2,552,402	100%

Notes:

(a) Census 2000 figures report units built through March of 2000.

(b) Figures may differ from those reported in Table 14 due to the use of Census 2000 Summary File 3 versus Summary File 1 data.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 14: Housing Occupancy and Vacancy Status, 2000

Housing Units	St. Helena		Napa County		Bay Area	
	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total
Occupied Housing Units	2,380	87.9%	45,402	93.5%	2,466,019	96.6%
Vacant Housing Units	327	12.1%	3,152	6.5%	86,383	3.4%
<i>For rent</i>	48	1.8%	450	0.9%	25,272	1.0%
<i>For sale only</i>	99	3.7%	390	0.8%	9,469	0.4%
<i>Rented or sold, not occupied</i>	36	1.3%	267	0.5%	9,471	0.4%
<i>For seasonal, recreational or occasional use</i>	114	4.2%	1,574	3.2%	21,211	0.8%
<i>Migrant Labor Housing</i>	0	0.0%	8	0.0%	415	0.0%
<i>Other Vacant (a)</i>	30	1.1%	463	1.0%	20,545	0.8%
Total Units (b)	2,707	100%	48,554	100%	2,552,402	100%

Notes:

(a) If a vacant unit does not fall into any of the classifications specified above, it is classified as "other vacant." For example, this category includes units held for occupancy by a caretaker or janitor, and units held by the owner for personal reasons.

(b) Figures may differ from those reported in Tables 12 and 13 due to the use of Census 2000 Summary File 1 versus Summary File 3 data.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 15: Overcrowding by Income Category and Tenure, St. Helena, 2000

	All Income Levels		Extremely Low Income (Less than 30% of AMFI)		Very Low Income (30% to 50% of AMFI)		Low Income (50% to 80% of AMFI)		Moderate and Above (Over 80% of AMFI)	
	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households
Persons Per Room (a)										
Owner Occupied										
1.00 Person or less	1,325	55.5%	80	3.4%	85	3.6%	150	6.3%	1,010	42.3%
1.01 - 1.50 Persons	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1.51 Persons or More	10	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	0.4%	0	0.0%
Subtotal: Owner-Occupied	1,335	56%	80	3%	85	4%	160	7%	1,010	42%
Renter Occupied										
1.00 Person or less	905	37.9%	171	7.2%	96	4.0%	144	6.0%	494	20.7%
1.01 - 1.50 Persons	73	3.1%	4	0.2%	4	0.2%	20	0.8%	45	1.9%
1.51 Persons or More	75	3.1%	0	0.0%	25	1.0%	35	1.5%	15	0.6%
Subtotal: Renter Occupied	1,053	44%	175	7%	125	5%	199	8%	554	23%
Total Households (b)	2,388	100%	255	11%	210	9%	359	15%	1,564	65%

Notes:

(a) Overcrowding is defined as more than one person per room.

(b) Figures may differ from those reported in Table 16 due to variances between HUD-based data sets.

Sources: 2000 CHAS dataset, huduser.org, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 16: Housing Cost Burden, City of St. Helena, 1999 (a)

	All Income Levels		Extremely Low-Income (Less than 30% of AMFI)		Very Low-Income (30% to 50% of AMFI)		Low-Income (50% to 80% of AMFI)		Moderate and Above (Over 80% of AMFI)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Owner Households										
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	877	36.0%	20	7.5%	49	22.2%	84	21.9%	724	46.2%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	290	11.9%	20	7.5%	10	4.5%	35	9.1%	225	14.4%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	205	8.4%	60	22.6%	30	13.6%	50	13.1%	65	4.1%
Subtotal: Owner-Occupied Households	1,372	56.3%	100	37.6%	89	40.3%	169	44.1%	1,014	64.7%
Renter Households										
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	780	32.0%	69	26.0%	52	23.5%	144	37.6%	515	32.9%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	128	5.2%	4	1.5%	35	15.8%	50	13.1%	39	2.5%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	158	6.5%	93	34.9%	45	20.4%	20	5.2%	0	0.0%
Subtotal: Renter-Occupied Households	1,066	43.7%	166	62.4%	132	59.7%	214	55.9%	554	35.3%
Total Households	2,438	100%	266	100%	221	100%	383	100%	1,568	100%

Note:

(a) Figures reported above are based on the HUD-published CHAS 2000 data, which reports 1999 incomes. CHAS data reflect HUD-defined household income limits, for various household sizes. Total household figures may vary from those reported in Table 2 due to different estimation methodologies. Figures may differ from those reported in Table 4 due to variances between HUD-based data sets.

Sources: CHAS 2000, huduser.org, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 17: Housing Condition Survey Results for St. Helena, October 2008 (a)

Housing Problems	Units
Minor (b)	13
Moderate (c)	3
Substantial (d)	0
Dilapidated (e)	0
Total	16

Total Housing Units in St. Helena (f) **2,745**

% of Units in Need of Repair or Replacement **0.6%**

Notes:

(a) Appendix F contains a copy of the survey instrument, which evaluated the condition of the foundation, roofing, siding/stucco and windows for each unit, assigning points for observed defects.

(b) Units in need of "minor" repairs received a survey score between 10 and 15

(c) Units in need of "moderate" repairs received a survey score of 16 to 39.

(d) Units in need of "substantial" received a score of 40 to 55.

(e) "Dilapidated" units received a survey score of 56 and over.

(f) Total units in St. Helena in 2008 according to the Department of Finance.

Sources: HCD, 2008; Department of Finance, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 18: Costs of Replacement and Preservation (a)

	<u>Cost per Unit (b)</u>	<u>Cost for the 50 units in the Woodbridge Apartments (b)</u>
Preservation (as an affordable complex)	\$78,331	\$3,916,542
Replacement (construction of a new affordable complex)	\$195,880	\$9,794,024 (c)
Preservation (through rental subsidies over 20 years)	\$42,034	\$2,101,680

Notes:

(a) See Appendices B, C, D and E for detailed information on preservation and replacement costs, as well as a list of entities qualified by HCD to purchase at-risk units in Napa County.

(b) Reported in 2008 dollars.

(c) Construction of affordable units minus the supportable mortgage.

Sources: Personal communication Napa Valley Community Housing, Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, and Calistoga Affordable Housing Inc., 2008; HCD income limits for Napa County, 2008; Marcus & Millichap, 2nd Quarter 2008; HCD, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Housing Market Conditions

This section provides information on the private housing market in St. Helena and assesses the market's ability to accommodate the housing needs of local residents. Data on recent home sales and rental rates form the basis of an analysis of the level of income required to afford housing in St. Helena.

For-Sale Housing

Table 19 supplies detailed information on recent single-family home sales in St. Helena, as well as estimates of household income levels required to afford units at the reported minimum sales prices. Of the 39 reported sales between August 2007 and August 2008, 14 (about 36 percent) involved sale prices over \$1,000,000. Furthermore, only one home sold for a price below \$600,000 during that time period. Overall, the median housing price over the past year was \$872,500 in St. Helena.

Table 19 also shows that in order to afford the lowest-priced home in St. Helena, a household must typically have a minimum income of approximately \$107,200. This is far more than the St. Helena median income of \$79,200 reported in Table 4. The minimum annual household income requirement estimates are based on the assumption of a standard 30-year fixed rate mortgage with a 20 percent downpayment, a six percent interest rate, annual property tax rate of 1.16 percent, and an annual hazard insurance cost of 0.22 percent of the home value. These values represent the market conditions at one given point in time and will change as local and national economic conditions fluctuate.¹⁹

Affordable Home Purchase Prices

Table 20 examines affordability in a different way. Instead of presenting the income required to buy a market rate house in St. Helena, Table 20 examines how much very low-, low-, and moderate-income households in St. Helena could afford to pay for housing, along with the corresponding maximum affordable home price. The assumptions align with those from Table 19 except for the downpayment percentage, which is five percent, modeling a situation that is more typical of first-time homebuyers who have not amassed sufficient financial resources to make a larger downpayment. These buyers are more likely to be in need of affordable housing options than the typical buyers of market rate housing in St. Helena. The lower downpayment amount requires the owner to buy mortgage insurance.

Given this set of assumptions, in the case of a three-person household, the affordable home price varies from approximately \$110,100 for very low-income, to \$171,600 for low-income, and

¹⁹ Note that some of the assumptions used here by BAE differ from the assumptions used by the City of Napa Housing Authority. Assumptions used for this analysis were collected to represent conditions for a property in the City of St. Helena specifically. This analysis allows for a maximum of 30 percent of income to be allocated to housing costs, to be consistent with the definition of affordability used in State housing element guidelines.

\$266,500 for moderate-income households. The income limits increase with household size, and a five-person household with very low, low, or moderate income can afford to buy a home priced at \$133,300 \$205,800, and \$319,600, respectively. Therefore, home prices that are significantly lower than current market levels would be necessary for even moderate-income St. Helena households to purchase a home.

Rental Housing

Table 21 contains a list of rental complexes containing 497 rental apartments in St. Helena. This includes substantially all of the existing multifamily complexes within the City. Table 22 then provides a list of the current apartment rental rates for three of the larger market rate complexes in St. Helena. The Grandview Apartments is a historic complex located in downtown St. Helena with studio and one-bedroom apartments. The monthly rent for a studio is between \$650 and \$850 and for a one-bedroom the rent rises to between \$700 and \$1,100. The monthly rental rate for the two bedroom/two bath Cottages at Stonebridge is \$1,475, and the rates for the Tripoli apartments are \$650 and \$850 per month for two bedroom/one bath and three bedroom/one bath apartments, respectively.

In addition to apartment complexes, there are also single-family homes for rent in St. Helena. The St. Helena Star online classified adds listed six single-family homes for rent between July 25, 2008, and September 17, 2008. Four of the units for rent were three bedroom/two bath units with a monthly rent ranging from \$2,100 to \$6,000 per month. The classifieds also listed a two bedroom/two bath unit for \$2,450 per month and a home on 76 acres with a private garden for \$30,000 per month.

Affordable Rental Rates

Based on Napa County 2008 income limits published by HCD, Table 23 calculates affordable rental rates for households in each income category by household size. These estimates take into account utility costs provided by the Housing Authority of the City of Napa. Affordable rents for extremely low-income households range from around \$370 to \$490 per month, depending on both household and unit size. The maximum rent affordable to a very low-income four-person household is approximately \$890 per month. A one-bedroom unit renting for \$900 per month is both affordable and appropriately sized for two-person low-income and moderate-income households, though market-rate rental housing is not affordable to most extremely low-, and very low-income households.

While the studio, one-bedroom, and some of the two-bedroom market rate apartments in St. Helena are affordable to low-income and a portion of very low-income households, they are in limited supply. The Grandview Apartment complex has only 23 units with their own kitchens as opposed to communal kitchen facilities, and the Tripoli apartments only 18 units. The units in the Cottages

at Stonebridge are significantly more expensive, making them affordable to only households with moderate incomes and above. In addition, the single-family rental units listed in the last three months have all been significantly more expensive.

Affordable Housing Complexes

Table 24 lists the six affordable housing complexes in St. Helena. These include three rental complexes and three for-sale subdivisions that increase the supply of housing and focus on meeting the housing needs unmet by the private housing market. The three rental complexes, Hunt's Grove, Stonebridge, and Woodbridge, provide 186 units of affordable housing to St. Helena residents. The three for-sale subdivisions (Marietta Townhomes, Wallis Subdivision, and Vintner's Village) provide 31 affordable for-sale units with deed restrictions. The City of St. Helena contributed funds to the Marietta townhomes in 1997, including \$130,000 in silent second mortgages and \$12,500 in building fees.

In addition, mobile home parks like Vineyard Valley, although not officially regulated as affordable housing, do represent a housing option in St. Helena that is affordable to moderate income households.

Summary

The number of housing units in St. Helena increased by around 40 units between 2000 and 2008, driven by an increase in the number of single-family units. However, the number of mobile homes, a more affordable housing option than many market-rate units, has declined over the same period due to acquisition of property to construct a flood project. Single-family units constituted 66 percent of the total housing units in St. Helena, followed by complexes containing five or more units, which represent approximately 19 percent of total units. The housing stock in St. Helena is relatively new with a higher percentage of homes built between 1980 and 2000 than in Napa County or the Bay Area.

The housing market in St. Helena exhibited an above average vacancy rate. The high rate is partially attributable to the inclusion of homes held vacant for seasonal, recreational, and occasional use, but even after controlling for such homes, the vacancy rate in 2000 was still higher than in Napa County or the Bay Area. Of occupied homes, only 6.5 percent were overcrowded while the majority of incidences of overcrowding occurred among renter households.

The incidence of excessive or severe housing cost burdens varies among owner and renter households. For renters, the share of households with excessive or severe housing cost burden was higher in the lower income categories. However, significant portions of owner households in all income categories faced high housing cost burdens.

The current market conditions in St. Helena enable only above moderate-income households to purchase homes. The median price of a St. Helena home between August 2007 and August 2008 was \$872,500. While some of the market rate apartment units are affordable to low-income and a portion of very-low income households, the limited supply of market rate units affordable to very low-income households and below means that affordable units are necessary to meet the needs households at the lowest income levels. Three affordable rental and three for-sale housing complexes in St. Helena provide 217 units of affordable housing. With the Woodbridge Apartments' Section 8 contract set to expire in 2018, an analysis of preservation and replacement costs found that preservation of the units, assuming that the apartments are in good condition, presents a less expensive option as compared to constructing new replacement units. There are a number of qualified entities that the City could seek to engage in the process of developing a viable plan to maintain the supply of affordable units. The City will need to pay particular attention to this situation in the next Housing Element Update cycle, when the Section 8 contract will expire.

Table 19: Single-Family Housing Sales Prices, St. Helena, August 2007 to August 2008

Unit Sales Price	Units (a)		Minimum Unit Price	Down Payment	Annual Principal & Interest	Property Insurance	Property Taxes	Total Annual Payment	Minimum Annual Household Income Requirement (b)
	Number	Percent Total							
Under \$600,000	1	2.6%	\$450,000	\$90,000	\$26,154	\$796	\$5,220	\$32,170	\$107,233
\$600,000 - \$649,999	1	2.6%	\$600,000	\$120,000	\$34,871	\$1,062	\$6,960	\$42,893	\$142,978
\$650,000 - \$699,999	5	12.8%	\$650,000	\$130,000	\$37,777	\$1,150	\$7,540	\$46,468	\$154,892
\$700,000 - \$749,999	4	10.3%	\$700,000	\$140,000	\$40,683	\$1,239	\$8,120	\$50,042	\$166,807
\$750,000 - \$799,999	5	12.8%	\$750,000	\$150,000	\$43,589	\$1,327	\$8,700	\$53,617	\$178,722
\$800,000 - \$849,999	2	5.1%	\$800,000	\$160,000	\$46,495	\$1,416	\$9,280	\$57,191	\$190,637
\$850,000 - \$899,999	2	5.1%	\$850,000	\$170,000	\$49,401	\$1,504	\$9,860	\$60,765	\$202,551
\$900,000 - \$949,999	1	2.6%	\$900,000	\$180,000	\$52,307	\$1,593	\$10,440	\$64,340	\$214,466
\$950,000 - \$999,999	4	10.3%	\$950,000	\$190,000	\$55,213	\$1,681	\$11,020	\$67,914	\$226,381
Over \$1,000,000	14	35.9%	\$1,000,000	\$200,000	\$58,119	\$1,770	\$11,600	\$71,489	\$238,296
Total	39	100%							

Median Single-Family Home Price \$872,500

Notes:

(a) Number of single-family units sold in St. Helena between August 2007 and August 2008.

(b) Based upon the minimum unit price with the following ownership cost assumptions:

Percent of Income for Housing Costs

(Principal, Interest, Taxes, and Insurance) 30% of gross annual income

Mortgage Terms

Down Payment 20% of home value

Annual Interest Rate 6% fixed

Loan Term 30 years

Annual Property Tax Rate 1.16% of home value

Annual Hazard Insurance 0.22% of home value (c)

(c) Hazard Insurance includes the basic premium for hazard insurance plus an additional payment for flood insurance.

Sources: Dataquick.com, 2008; HCD, 2008; personal communication, State Farm Insurance, 2008; www.bankrate.com, 2008; Karen Scalabrini, Finance Director, City of St. Helena, 2007; BAE, 2008.

Table 20: Affordable For-Sale Housing Prices, Napa County, 2008

2008 Income Limits (a)	Household Size 3-Persons	Household Size 4-Persons	Household Size 5-Persons						
Very Low-Income	\$35,800	\$39,800	\$43,000						
Low-Income	\$55,350	\$61,500	\$66,400						
Moderate-Income	\$86,000	\$95,500	\$103,100						
3-Person Household									
	Amount Avail. for Housing	Principal & Interest	Property Insurance	Property Taxes	Mortgage Insurance	Total Monthly Payment	Down- Payment	Maximum Affordable Home Price	
Very Low-Income	\$895	\$632	\$20	\$107	\$135	\$895	\$5,547	\$110,943	
Low-Income	\$1,384	\$977	\$32	\$166	\$209	\$1,384	\$8,578	\$171,559	
Moderate-Income	\$2,150	\$1,518	\$49	\$258	\$325	\$2,150	\$13,326	\$266,511	
4-Person Household									
	Amount Avail. for Housing	Principal & Interest	Property Insurance	Property Taxes	Mortgage Insurance	Total Monthly Payment	Down- Payment	Maximum Affordable Home Price	
Very Low-Income	\$995	\$703	\$23	\$119	\$151	\$995	\$6,167	\$123,339	
Low-Income	\$1,538	\$1,086	\$35	\$184	\$233	\$1,538	\$9,532	\$190,648	
Moderate-Income	\$2,388	\$1,686	\$55	\$286	\$361	\$2,388	\$14,801	\$296,013	
5-Person Household									
	Amount Avail. for Housing	Principal & Interest	Property Insurance	Property Taxes	Mortgage Insurance	Total Monthly Payment	Down- Payment	Maximum Affordable Home Price	
Very Low-Income	\$1,075	\$759	\$25	\$129	\$163	\$1,075	\$6,663	\$133,255	
Low-Income	\$1,660	\$1,172	\$38	\$199	\$251	\$1,660	\$10,289	\$205,771	
Moderate-Income	\$2,578	\$1,820	\$59	\$309	\$390	\$2,578	\$15,978	\$319,565	
Ownership Cost Assumptions									
% of Income for Housing Costs	30% of gross annual income								
Mortgage Terms									
Down Payment	5% of home value								
Annual Interest Rate	6% fixed								
Loan Term	30 years								
Annual Mortgage Insurance	1.54% of mortgage								
Annual property tax rate	1.16% of home value								
Annual Hazard Insurance	0.22% of home value								

Note:

(a) Income limits defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development for Napa County.

Sources: Dataquick.com, 2008; HCD, 2008; personal communication, State Farm Insurance, 2008; personal communication, Umpqua Bank, 2008; www.bankrate.com, 2008; Keren Scalabrini, Finance Director, City of St. Helena, 2007; BAE, 2008.

Table 21: Multi-Family Housing Survey Results for St. Helena, October 2008 (a)

Complex Name	Address	Year Built/ Renovated	Number of Units	Zoning (b)
Woodbridge Apts.	727 Hunt Ave	Unknown	50	HR
Unknown	957 Hunt	1880	8	MR
Christine Apartments	723 Hunt	1971	4	MR
Hunts Grove Apartments	548 Hunt St.	1992	56	HR
Unknown	933 Brown St.	Unknown	4	HR
Cottages at Southbridge	1000 Brown St.	1997	17	HR
Charter House	1026 Charter Oak	Unknown	5	MR
Stonebridge Apartments	990 College Ave	1993	80	HR
Unknown	1332 Main St.	Unknown	12	CB
Tripoli Court Apartments	1600 Main St.	Unknown	18	MR
Grandview Apartments	1915 Main St	1901-1965	48	MR
Unknown	1520/1536 Main St.	1976	8	MR
Unknown	1650 Main	Unknown	5	MR
Unknown	1095 Crinella	1972	7	MR
Unknown	825 Allison	Unknown	4	MR
Unknown	1018 Allison	1965	12	HR
Silverado Orchards	601 Pope	Unknown	94	HR
Unknown	911 Pope	Unknown	5	MR
Ogletree Apartments	1005 Pope	Unknown	5	HR
Ogletree Apartments	999 Pope	Unknown	28	HR
Unknown	1043 Pope	Unknown	5	MR
Unknown	1112 Edwards	1940	4	MR
Unknown	1133 Edwards	1888	6	MR
Unknown	1145 Edwards	Unknown	4	MR
Unknown	1313 Monte Vista	1969	6	MR
Unknown	1327 Monte Vista	Unknown	6	MR
Unknown	1328 Monte Vista	1980	4	MR
Unknown	1336 Monte Vista	Unknown	6	MR
Unknown	1337 Monte Vista	1973	8	MR
Unknown	1346 Monte Vista	Unknown	4	MR
Unknown	1347 Monte Vista	1972	6	MR
Unknown	1356 Monte Vista	Unknown	6	MR
Unknown	1357 Monte Vista	1972	6	MR
Unknown	1366 Monte Vista	1972	6	MR

TOTAL UNITS**547**

Note:

(a) MR = Medium Density Residential, HR = High Density Residential, CB = Central Business.

Sources: City of St. Helena, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 22: Market-Rate Apartment Rental Rates, St. Helena, 2008

<u>Complex Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Year Built/ Renovated</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>	<u>Bedrooms/ Bathrooms</u>	<u>Monthly Rent</u>	<u>Square Footage</u>
Grandview Apartments	1915 Main St.	1901-1965	41 7	Studio 1 Bdrm/1 Bath	\$650-\$850 \$700-\$1,100	Unknown
Cottages at Stonebridge	1000 Brown St	1993	17	2 Bdrm/2 Bath	\$1,475	960
Tripoli Court Apartments	1600 Main St.	Mid to late 1950's	18 1	2 Bdrm/1 Bath 3 Bdrm/1 Bath (a)	\$650 \$850	1,000 +/- 1,500 +/-

Note:

(a) This unit is a house on site.

Sources: Respective Property Owners and Managers, 2008; Bay Area Economics, 2008.

Table 23: Affordable Rents, Napa County, 2008

Year/Income Category (a)	Income Limits/Household Size							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6 Person	7 Person	8 Person
2008: Median \$79,600								
Extremely Low-Income	\$16,750	\$19,100	\$21,500	\$23,900	\$25,800	\$27,700	\$29,650	\$31,550
Very Low-Income	\$27,850	\$31,850	\$35,800	\$39,800	\$43,000	\$46,150	\$49,350	\$52,550
Low-Income	\$43,050	\$49,200	\$55,350	\$61,500	\$66,400	\$71,350	\$76,250	\$81,200
Median Income	\$55,700	\$63,700	\$71,600	\$79,600	\$86,000	\$92,300	\$98,700	\$105,100
Moderate-Income	\$66,900	\$76,400	\$86,000	\$95,500	\$103,100	\$110,800	\$118,400	\$126,100

Affordable Rents (b)	Unit Size					
	Studio	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	3-Bedroom	4-Bedroom	5-Bedroom
Extremely Low-Income						
1-Person	\$365	\$351				
2-Person		\$410	\$389			
3-Person			\$449	\$430		
4-Person				\$490	\$458	
5-Person					\$505	\$494
Very Low-Income						
1-Person	\$642	\$628				
2-Person		\$728	\$707			
3-Person			\$806	\$787		
4-Person				\$887	\$855	
5-Person					\$935	\$924
Low-Income						
1-Person	\$1,022	\$1,008				
2-Person		\$1,162	\$1,141			
3-Person			\$1,295	\$1,276		
4-Person				\$1,430	\$1,398	
5-Person					\$1,520	\$1,509
Moderate-Income						
1-Person	\$1,619	\$1,605				
2-Person		\$1,842	\$1,821			
3-Person			\$2,061	\$2,042		
4-Person				\$2,280	\$2,248	
5-Person					\$2,438	\$2,427
Included Utilities (c)	\$59	\$60	\$68	\$76	\$85	\$87

Notes:

- (a) Income limits are 2008 California Department of Housing and Community Development income limits for Napa County.
- (b) Affordable rents equal 30 percent of gross monthly income minus a utility allowance derived from figures released by the City of Napa Housing Division in January 2007. Allowances include electricity for heating, cooking, water heating and other electric.
- (c) Included utilities represents utility costs normally included in rent. These are water, sewer and trash collection.

Sources: HCD, 2008; HUD, 2008; City of Napa Housing Division, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 24: Affordable Housing Developments, St. Helena

Project Name	Address	Affordable Units	Bedrooms/ Bathrooms Units	Special Needs	Current Owner	Funding Sources	Status	Affordability Requirement	Earliest Date of Expiration
Rental Housing									
Hunts Grove	548 Hunt Ave.	56	14- 1Bdr/ 1 Bath 28 - 2 Bdr/1 Bath 14 - 3 Bdr/2 Bath	n.a.	Bridge Housing	9% Tax Credit Equity; Residential Housing Construction Program; Bank of America, First Nationwide Bank, City of St. Helena, First Financial Management.	Active	Low and Very-Low Income Households	2022
Stonebridge Apts.	990 College Ave.	80	8 - 1Bdr/1Bath 36 - 2 Bdr/1 Bath 28 - 3 Bdr/2 Bath 8 - 4 Bdr/2 Bath	n.a.	EAH Nonprofit Housing Corporation	9% Tax Credit Equity; HCD; Residential Housing Construction Program; City of St. Helena; Federal Home Loan Bank, Affordable Housing Program.	Active	Low and Very-Low Income Households	2023
Woodbridge Apts.	727 Hunt Ave.	50	48-1Bdr/1 Bath 2 - 2Bdr/1 Bath	Senior Citizens	Woodbridge Guild	CHFA, Section 8	Active	Very Low-Income Households	May, 2018
For-Sale									
Wallis Subdivision		20	Unknown	n.a.	n.a.	Developer Financed	Active	Moderate Income	n.a.
Marietta Townhomes		10	Unknown	n.a.	n.a.	Napa Valley Community; City of St. Helena	Active	Moderate Income	n.a.
Vintner's Village	1012 Allison Ave.	1	5-bedroom	n.a.	n.a.	Developer Finance	Active	Moderate Income	n.a.

Sources: City of St. Helena, Planning Department, 2008; Bridge Housing website, 2008; EAH Nonprofit Housing Corporation website, 2008; HUD Multifamily Affordable Housing and Section 8 Contracts database, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Special Needs Populations

California Government Code Section 65583 (a) (7) requires an analysis of any special housing needs, “such as those of the elderly, persons with disabilities, large families, farm workers, families with female heads of household and families and persons in need of emergency shelter.”²⁰ This section provides estimates of the prevalence of each of these special needs populations, discusses special housing concerns, and analyzes their housing cost burdens within St. Helena to the extent that available data allows. Data sources include the 2000 Census, Claritas Inc., the California Department of Finance (DoF), the HUD CHAS data set, California Employment Development Department (EDD), as well as the Napa County Continuum of Care.

Persons with Disabilities

Disabilities can take many forms and have numerous implications for housing needs. Many disabled people can live in conventional housing without any modifications, or with only minor modifications, while some disabled people require substantial modifications and/or on-site care to facilitate everyday living. Accessible units can be more expensive to build, due to features such as ramps, extra wide doors, handrails, lowered counters, raised toilets, and a variety of other accessibility elements. Compared to the general population, disabled persons are more likely to live alone, earn less, and be homeless.²¹

Table 25 presents data on the estimated number of disabled persons in St. Helena, Napa County, and the Bay Area. The 2008 estimates were derived by applying the Census 2000 distribution of disabled persons to DoF and Claritas 2008 population estimates. As the total populations of St. Helena, Napa County, and the Bay Area rose from 2000 to 2008, the data assume that the number of disabled persons increased proportionately. Around 800 disabled persons over the age of five lived in St. Helena in both 2000 and 2008. In 2008, this includes approximately 97 persons between the ages of 5 and 20, 288 between the ages of 21 and 64, and 424 persons age 65 and older. St. Helena and Napa County have almost the same percentage of disabled persons (around 15 to 16 percent of the total population). This represents a significantly higher percentage of disabled persons relative to the five percent of Bay Area residents that are disabled.

In St. Helena and Napa County, a concentration of disabled persons exists among persons in the 21 to 64 age bracket, and the 65 and over category, relative to the Bay Area. About 13 and 15 percent of the population over the age of 21 in St. Helena and Napa are disabled, compared to less than four percent in the Bay Area. In St. Helena, the 21-64 age group features a concentration of

²⁰ California Government Code Section 65583 (a)(7)

²¹ Tootelian, Dennis, and Gaedeke, Ralph. “The Impact of Housing Availability, Accessibility, and Affordability on People with Disabilities”. Sacramento, CA: State Independent Living Council. April, 1999. As cited in the Analysis of Senate Bill 1025.

sensory disabilities, employment disabilities, and those individuals with two or more disabilities. Furthermore, high rates of sensory, physical, and two or more disabilities account for a large part of the 21 to 64, and 65 and over disabled population.

Elderly

The elderly population often requires special housing to accommodate part-time or full time care. Meanwhile, the elderly are also more likely to have lower incomes than the population in general. Other requirements can include modifications to doors and steps to improve accessibility and installation of hand rails and grab bars to make bathing, toileting, and other daily activities safer. Housing types such as apartments or condominiums that do not entail high maintenance requirements can also be beneficial as the elderly continue to age and become less able to perform extensive home maintenance work on their own. The elderly are also commonly on fixed incomes while expending more of their income on medical care, which can result in a need for affordable housing.

Elderly Households

Table 26 presents data for 2000 and 2008 for age of householder. Table 26 is different from Table 3 in that Table 3 presents the age of all residents while Table 26 presents the age of the person whose name the unit is owned or rented under.

St. Helena, similar to Napa County, had a higher percentage of residents over the age of 65 compared to the Bay Area. Around 27.5 percent of St. Helena households, 25.5 percent in Napa County, and almost 19 percent of Bay Area households had heads of households over the age of 65 in both 2000 and 2008. Across all three jurisdictions, more elderly households owned rather than rented their homes.

In 2008, among owner-occupied St. Helena households there are 220 households (about 9 percent of total households) with a head of household between the ages of 65 and 74, and 230 households (9.5 percent of total households) with a householder age 75 and older. A smaller number of elderly households in St. Helena live in rental units, with 50 households (2.1 percent of total households) having a householder between ages 65 and 74, and about 160 households (almost seven percent of total households) with a head of household age 75 and older. Napa had a similar percentage of elderly owner-occupied households, with nearly 10 percent of total households with a head of household between the ages of 65 and 74, and 10.6 percent of total households headed by an individual age 75 or older. Napa, however, had a lower percentage of elderly renter households, with 1.7 percent and 2.0 percent of total households headed by a householder aged 65 to 74 or age 75 and older, respectively. The Bay Area had lower percentages of both owner-occupied households with householders aged 65 to 74 (about 7 percent of total households), with householders age 75 or older (6.7 percent of total households) as compared to St. Helena and Napa.

For renter households, the 2.3 percent of total Bay Area households had a head of household between the ages of 65 and 74, and 2.8 percent were headed by a person age 75 or older.

Additional data from the 2000 Census reveal that St. Helena has a somewhat disproportionate number of females over the age of 64. In 2000, there were about 370 males (about 6 percent of the total population) and 660 females (approximately 11 percent of the total population) over the age of 64. In Napa, the population over age 64 is comprised of the 8,200 males (6.6 percent of the total population) and 10,900 females (nearly 9 percent of the total population). Therefore, the percentage of females over the age of 64 is slightly higher in St. Helena than in Napa. Considering that the DoF projects that the number of elderly females will grow more rapidly than the number of elderly males in Napa County through 2050, it appears likely that St. Helena's concentration of elderly females will increase in the coming years.

Elderly Housing Cost Burden

Table 27 contains information from the 2000 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) database. Elderly households, which the CHAS database defines as households with at least one person over the age of 62, are again much more likely to be owner households (72 percent of total elderly households) than renter households (28 percent of total elderly households). The majority of elderly households (62 percent) have housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent, while the remaining households have excessive (17 percent) or severe (21 percent) housing cost burdens.

The 62 percent of elderly households with housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent represent a slightly smaller proportion of this subpopulation relative to the share of total St. Helena households, as shown in Table 16 (68 percent). The share of elderly households with excessive housing cost burdens closely aligned with trends in total St. Helena households. However, the percentage of elderly households with severe housing cost burdens (21 percent) was higher than the share exhibited across all St. Helena households (15 percent).

Across both extremely low-income owner and renter households, about one-half of the households had housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent, nine percent experienced excessive housing cost burdens, and 40 percent had severe housing cost burdens. For elderly extremely low-income households, there were fewer owners (60) than renters (about 90), though the number of owner and renter households experiencing severe housing cost burdens was comparable.

Only 45 percent of elderly very low-income households had housing cost burdens below 30 percent. Elderly very low-income households with an excessive or severe housing cost burdens amounted to 20 and 35 percent, respectively. Of the 100 very low-income elderly households, 65 are owners and 35 are renters. Though the same number of very low-income elderly renter and

owner households experienced excessive housing cost burdens, proportionately fewer owner households compared to renter households had a severe housing cost burden.

Just over one-half of elderly low-income households had housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent, while 16 percent experienced severe housing cost burdens and 28 percent had excessive housing cost burdens. For low-income households, the ratio of owners to renters favors owners, with 95 owner households and only 30 renter households. Unlike very low-income households, severe housing cost burdens were more common among owner than renter households.

Finally, in the moderate-income and above category, 75 percent of elderly households had housing cost burdens below 30 percent, while 20 percent had a excessive and five percent severe housing cost burdens. For moderate-income and above households a higher proportion own their homes, with 270 homeowners relative to the 35 households that rent their homes. Among this income group, owner households represent the majority of those with excessive housing cost burdens. Furthermore, severe housing cost burdens in this income category only occurred in the case of owner households, and not in renter households.

Additional Elderly Housing Needs

Given the high proportion of the St. Helena households that are elderly, especially elderly age 75 and older, it is important to work to address their housing needs. In her work with the Area Agency on Aging serving Napa and Solano Counties, planner Terry Restelli-Deits identified a number of needs of the elderly in St. Helena that are currently being met as well as those needs which St. Helena could help meet during this Housing Element planning period.²² Ms. Restelli-Deits cited the work of the Rianda house, which provides seniors with a meeting place and valuable information on topics ranging from housing and income-assistance to medical referrals, as a welcome and positive resource for the elderly in St. Helena.

There are still many needs of the elderly that are not being met, however, and changes to St. Helena's housing policies could make it easier for the elderly to age in place. Often, when the elderly person are released from a hospital stay and return to their own homes, they have trouble navigating inside the home and getting to neighborhood services like the grocery store and doctor's office. Two possible ways to help remedy this situation within the scope of the Housing Element would be for the City of St. Helena to consider the proximity to public transportation, paratransit routes, and local services when approving senior housing, and to adopt design standards for new residential construction that would ensure accessibility.

Certain design strategies incorporated into the City's policies and programs concerning new and

²² Personal Communication. Terry Restelli-Deits, Planner, Area Agency on Aging. December 15, 2008.

existing housing can help prevent falls. For example, incorporating features detailed in AB 1400 can help reduce falls and accommodate the needs of people of all ages and abilities. Examples include:

- zero-step entrances
- accessible first floor bathrooms
- wider doorways
- no step bathtubs and showers
- grab bars near toilets and bath/shower
- reinforced handrails on stairs and ramps
- accessible kitchen appliances, shelving
- more energy efficient, brighter lighting

Additional policies and programs that the City should consider include zoning that encourages families to use options such as Accessory Dwelling Units to accommodate their aging relatives or caregivers. Such policies could also provide for more elder-friendly neighborhoods, improved lighting to increase visibility, and safe sidewalks and walking paths. For example, sidewalks that allow for safe tree root growth, such as sidewalk materials made of rubber (used in Santa Barbara and other communities) would help improve pedestrian safety.

Large Households

The U.S. Census defines a large family as one containing five or more related members. The California Department of Housing and Community Development recommends using this definition of a large family.²³ As displayed in Table 28, almost all large households in St. Helena are family households. In 2008, only two non-family households have five members or more, while there are over 280 large family households.

As of 2000, St. Helena had about 255 large households, including only one non-family large household, representing close to 11 percent of the total households in St. Helena. The increase of almost 30 large households, to about 285 households, coupled with a decrease in 2-person households led the percent of large family households to increase to nearly 12 percent in 2008. The share of large households in St. Helena in 2008 closely aligns with that of Napa County (just over 12 percent) and the Bay Area (about 13 percent).

Large Family Housing Cost Burden

Table 29 presents the housing cost burdens for large family households in St. Helena by tenure. The total number of large family households in Table 28 (about 240 households) derived from HUD-published CHAS data is slightly below the estimate presented in Table 29, derived from Claritas and DoF data. Across all income levels, the majority of large households (78 percent of large family households) have housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent.

²³ California Department of Housing and Community Development. *Building Blocks for an Effective Housing Element: Special Needs, Large and Female-Headed Households*. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element/index.html. Accessed on Jun 12, 2008.

About 19 percent of large households have excessive housing cost burdens, with the remaining three percent experiencing severe housing cost burdens. A comparison of all the housing cost burdens for all households in St. Helena from Table 16 with the housing cost burdens of large families indicates that a greater share of large family households have housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent relative to the 68 percent of total households experiencing this level of housing cost burden. In addition, 15 percent of total households in St. Helena had severe housing cost burdens in 2000 as compared to only three percent for large families.

Of the 18 extremely low-income large family households in St. Helena, there were ten owner and eight renter households. All of the owners had an excessive housing cost burdens and every renter household had a severe housing cost burdens. In the case of very low-income households, all 22 households rented their housing units. These renters were split almost evenly between those with housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent and those with excessive housing cost burdens.

There were significantly more low-income large family households than either extremely low- or very low-income households. All of the 53 low-income households had housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent. None of the owner households (14) or the renter households (39) had excessive or severe housing cost burdens.

The almost 150 moderate-income and above households represented over 60 percent of total large family households. About 83 percent of the moderate-income and above households had housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent, while around 17 percent had excessive housing cost burdens, and none of these households had severe housing cost burdens. The incidences of excessive housing cost burden are concentrated among owner households, with 25 of the 94 owner households experiencing excessive housing cost burdens. All 55 renter households had housing cost burdens less than 30 percent.

Single Female-Headed Households with Children

Single female-headed households with children tend to have a higher need for affordable housing compared to family households in general. In 1999, the poverty rate of female-householder families nationally stood at a record low of 27.8 percent, but that was still significantly above the poverty rate of all families (9.3 percent) and married couples (4.8 percent).²⁴ In addition, single female-headed households with children are more likely to need childcare since the mother is often the sole source of income and the sole caregiver for children within the family.

²⁴ U.S Department of Commerce News "Poverty Rate Lowest in 20 Years, Household Income at Record High, Census Bureau Reports" September 26, 2000. <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2000/cb00-158.html>. Accessed on June 10, 2008.

In 2000, the percent of single-female headed households with children in St. Helena (6.5 percent of total households) slightly exceeded the percentages calculated in both Napa County (about five percent) and the Bay Area (5.5 percent). Assuming that the percentage of single female-headed households held steady from 2000 to 2008, then the number single female-headed households barely increased given that the total households in the City of St. Helena only rose by 35 households.

Among St. Helena single-female households in 2008, the share of owner households (three percent of total households) is less than the share of renter households (3.5 percent of total households). Napa County and the Bay Area have a lower percentage of owner households (1.7 and 1.8 percent of total households, respectively) and a similar percentage of renter households (3.2 and 3.7 percent of total households, respectively) compared to St. Helena

Farmworkers

Vineyards in and around St. Helena employ both full-time and seasonal farmworkers. Data on the conditions of farmworkers specifically residing in St. Helena are not available; therefore, information regarding farmworkers in Napa County is used to examine the conditions in St. Helena. The housing needs of full-time, permanent farmworkers is very similar to those of other low-income households, however the additional seasonal workers who are only employed during harvest time need short-term affordable housing options.

Two data sources provide statistics on the number of farmworkers in Napa County: the California Employment Development Department (EDD) and a 2007 study by the California Institute for Rural Studies. The EDD provided the information presented in Table 30. EDD data are derived from Current Employment Statistics (CES) data and CES defines employment as “the total number of persons on establishment payrolls employed full or part-time who receive pay for any part of the pay period that includes the 12th day of the month.”²⁵ Seasonal employees may not all be captured in the CES figures. Over the 15 years from 1993 through 2007, Table 31 indicates that Napa County farm employment continually fluctuated, but overall farm employment has risen by 1,700 jobs over the period. In 1993, farm employment was 3,400 and farm employment peaked at 5,300 in 2002. Since 2001, it remained relatively consistent, registering employment of 5,100 in 2007.

The California Institute for Rural Studies completed an extensive assessment of farmworker housing needs in Napa County in 2007. The Institute completed a survey of agricultural employers, interviewed farmworkers and others with knowledge of farmworker housing needs, conducted focus groups, and gathered additional data from secondary data sources. Table 32 presents an estimate of the total farmworkers in Napa County from the assessment. Workers are

²⁵ Bureau of Labor Statistics. <http://www.bls.gov/ces/cesfaq.htm>. Accessed on April 14th, 2008.

categorized by employment period. A “regular worker” works seven months or more, a “seasonal worker” between three and six months, and a “harvest worker” less than three months. As of 2005, Napa County employed almost 6,800 farmworkers, including 3,800 regular workers, 1,300 seasonal workers, and the remaining 1,800 harvest workers.

While the study does not allow for an estimation of the number of farmworkers who work specifically in St. Helena, information is available on the number of farmworkers who live in St. Helena. Part of the study involved face-to-face interviews with 189 farmworkers employed in Napa County during the 2006 wine grape harvest.²⁶ Of the interviewees, 64 percent (121 people) lived in Napa County. Among this subgroup, only five percent (six people) lived in St. Helena. Assuming that the interviewees were representative of the 6,800 farmworkers in Napa County this would indicate that around 217 farmworkers lived in St. Helena in 2005.

The Institute’s face-to-face interviews with farmworkers revealed that during the week, 46 percent of farmworkers stay in apartments, 40 percent in homes, five percent in labor centers, four percent in garages, three percent in motels, and the final two percent in trailers.²⁷ The interview questions also covered the amount of money that farmworkers spend on housing and Table 33 summarizes the results. The majority of farmworkers (87 percent) rent housing units. Accompanied farmworkers, those with a spouse and/or children, reported paying \$319 per adult for rental housing compared to \$218 per adult for unaccompanied adults.²⁸ Among survey respondents living in Napa County, the rent rises to \$345 for accompanied and \$254 for unaccompanied farmworkers. In addition to the rental costs listed above, 55 percent of respondents who live in apartments indicated that they had to pay extra money to cover utilities, which averaged \$66 dollars per month. Those farmworkers who own their own homes (11 percent of survey respondents) reported average monthly mortgage costs of \$2,167 plus an additional \$225 for utilities.

Table 33 also provides additional information on the income of farmworkers, to assess the affordability of housing units. The average income is categorized by farmworker occupation with general laborers annually earning \$15,745, specialized laborers \$26,317, and foremen or supervisors \$37,000. These income levels rise when taking into account the income of other members of farmworker households, with general laborers, specialized laborers, and foreman or supervisors’ reporting average household incomes of \$19,122, \$33,268, and \$50,294, respectively. Given these levels of income, the Institute study calculated “that housing costs represent 23% of

²⁶ California Institute for Rural Studies “An Assessment of the Demand for Farm Worker Housing in Napa County” March, 2007. (Pg. 3).

²⁷ California Institute for Rural Studies “An Assessment of the Demand for Farm Worker Housing in Napa County” March, 2007. (Pg. 15).

²⁸ California Institute for Rural Studies “An Assessment of the Demand for Farm Worker Housing in Napa County” March, 2007. (Pg. 16).

gross annual income. Nonetheless, rental costs are 35% of income when remittances are subtracted from gross household income.”²⁹ This suggests that, at least among the sample of farmworkers surveyed, housing costs are at or above the affordability levels, indicating continued need for additional affordable housing for farmworkers or for other types of assistance to farmworker households.

Families and Persons in Need of Emergency Shelters

As previously mentioned, data are not available on the homeless population of St. Helena specifically. Consequently, data for Napa County inform a discussion of families and persons in need of emergency shelter in St. Helena. The two main sources of data on homeless in Napa County are 2005 Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness and the 2007 annual homelessness plan completed by the Napa County Continuum of Care (CoC). The CoC is a HUD-regulated document that is required to receive federal assistance. The CoC survey, sponsored by homeless organizations and agencies throughout the county, estimates the difference between the demand for emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing and the supply of such facilities.

Exhibit 1 in the Napa CoC presents a point-in-time survey of the homeless persons in Napa County on January 1, 2007. This is not an annual estimate of homeless needs throughout the year, but rather an estimate of the needs of the homeless in Napa County on one particular day. As shown in Table 32, the Napa County survey estimated a need for approximately 430 emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing beds. At present, there are only 274 beds available countywide, leaving an unmet need of approximately 156 beds, including 63 for individuals and 93 for families. The needs of St. Helena residents also appear to be growing. The St. Helena Community Food Pantry run by the Seventh Day Adventist Church serves around 120 families per week, and this is about a 25 percent increase from one year ago.³⁰ This year the Food Pantry had received about 8 to 10 new applications for food each month.

Given the documented need for emergency shelters in Napa County, St. Helena is subject to Government Code Section 65583(a)(4). This code section, which became effective as of January 1, 2008, requires that St. Helena accommodate the development of at least one, year-round, emergency shelter within its jurisdiction and have capacity in either St. Helena or County emergency shelters for homeless residents.^{31 32} St. Helena can meet this requirement in one of two

²⁹ California Institute for Rural Studies “An Assessment of the Demand for Farm Worker Housing in Napa County” March, 2007. (Pg. 26).

³⁰ Personal Communication. Linda Bertoli, Board President of the St. Helena Food Pantry. December 19, 2008.

³¹ Building Block for Effective Housing Elements, “Adequate Sites Inventory and Analysis: Zoning for Emergency Shelters and Transitional Housing”. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element/index.html.

ways, 1) designate zone(s) within one year that allow emergency shelters as a permitted use or 2) “adopting and implementing a multi-jurisdictional agreement, with no more than two adjacent jurisdictions, to develop at least one year-round emergency shelter within two years.”^{33 34}

Therefore, St. Helena must further its efforts to provide emergency shelters by either amending the Municipal Code to allow emergency shelters as a permitted use by State established deadline of August 31, 2010 or by establishing plans with adjacent jurisdictions to build new emergency shelter facilities to meet the bed shortage by August 31, 2011. In relation to unmet transitional and supportive housing needs, State law only requires that there are no undue governmental constraints.

Summary

The disabled population of St. Helena equals around 15 percent of the total population ages five years and above. Napa County has a similar percentage, while the in the Bay Area as a whole, only about five percent of the total population has disabilities. In St. Helena, people in the 65 and older age category represent the greatest number of people with disabilities.

The elderly population of St. Helena represents a higher percentage of the total population, at about 27.5 percent as compared to approximately 25.5 percent in Napa County and almost 19 percent in the Bay Area. Elderly households are less likely to have housing cost burdens of less than 30 percent, and more likely to have severe housing cost burdens compared to the total population of St. Helena.

Large family households in St. Helena constitute almost 12 percent of total households, which closely aligns to the rates in Napa County and the Bay Area. Among these large family households, a higher percentage has housing cost burdens below 30 percent compared to the general population of St. Helena. However, all extremely low- and low-income large families experienced excessive or severe housing cost burdens in 2000.

Single female-headed households with children represent around 6.5 percent of total St. Helena households. Although the number of single female-headed households is small, it is likely that a higher percentage of these types of households relative to the general household population in St. Helena have income below the poverty line.

Finally, St. Helena addresses the needs of both farmworker and homeless needs through

Accessed on April 25, 2008.

³² Senate Bill 2, Chapter 633. Amendment to Acts 655582, 65583 and 65589.5. Approved by Governor on October 13, 2007. Effective January 1, 2008.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*

countywide cooperation. The study by the California Institute for Rural Studies, which examines the housing needs of farmworkers, concluded that farm labor centers only meet the needs of a small subsection of farmworkers. The majority of farmworkers rely on market rate housing, which is often overcrowded. In addition, the current supply of emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing does not meet the demand for each of these housing types. Therefore, St. Helena must work with the County and other incorporated cities to address the unmet demand for emergency shelters in accordance with the provisions outlined in Government Code Section 65583(a)(4).

Table 25: Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population with Disabilities, 2000 and 2008

Age Range and Disability Type	City of St. Helena				Napa County				Bay Area			
	2000		2008 (est.) (a)		2000		2008 (est.) (a)		2000		2008 (est.) (a)	
	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total
Age 5-15	24	0.4%	24	0.4%	791	0.7%	866	0.7%	42,278	0.7%	44,118	0.7%
Sensory Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	36	0.0%	39	0.0%	3,858	0.1%	4,026	0.1%
Physical Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	30	0.0%	33	0.0%	2,802	0.0%	2,924	0.0%
Mental Disability	18	0.3%	18	0.3%	437	0.4%	478	0.4%	24,611	0.4%	25,682	0.4%
Self-Care disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	0.0%	41	0.0%	1,969	0.0%	2,055	0.0%
Two or More Disabilities (b)	6	0.1%	6	0.1%	251	0.2%	275	0.2%	9,038	0.1%	9,431	0.1%
Age 16-20	74	1.3%	73	1.3%	1,150	1.0%	1,259	1.0%	55,421	0.9%	57,833	0.9%
Sensory Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	38	0.0%	42	0.0%	1,992	0.0%	2,079	0.0%
Physical Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	65	0.1%	71	0.1%	1,729	0.0%	1,804	0.0%
Mental Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	210	0.2%	230	0.2%	7,533	0.1%	7,861	0.1%
Self-Care disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	278	0.0%	290	0.0%
Go-Outside-Home Disability	6	0.1%	6	0.1%	94	0.1%	103	0.1%	8,378	0.1%	8,743	0.1%
Employment Disability	18	0.3%	18	0.3%	315	0.3%	345	0.3%	14,758	0.2%	15,400	0.2%
Two or More Disabilities (b)	50	0.9%	50	0.9%	428	0.4%	469	0.4%	20,753	0.3%	21,656	0.3%
Age 21-64	290	5.2%	288	5.2%	10,006	8.6%	10,955	8.6%	164,364	2.6%	171,519	2.6%
Sensory Disability	15	0.3%	15	0.3%	945	0.8%	1,035	0.8%	7,650	0.1%	7,983	0.1%
Physical Disability	10	0.2%	10	0.2%	1,421	1.2%	1,556	1.2%	15,931	0.3%	16,624	0.3%
Mental Disability	3	0.1%	3	0.1%	354	0.3%	388	0.3%	6,788	0.1%	7,083	0.1%
Self-Care disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	0.0%	18	0.0%	349	0.0%	364	0.0%
Go-Outside-Home Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	416	0.4%	455	0.4%	8,878	0.1%	9,264	0.1%
Employment Disability	61	1.1%	61	1.1%	3,398	2.9%	3,720	2.9%	45,414	0.7%	47,391	0.7%
Two or More Disabilities (b)	201	3.6%	200	3.6%	3,456	3.0%	3,784	3.0%	79,354	1.3%	82,808	1.3%
Age 65 and Over	427	7.6%	424	7.6%	7,147	6.1%	7,825	6.1%	61,895	1.0%	64,589	1.0%
Sensory Disability	79	1.4%	78	1.4%	913	0.8%	1,000	0.8%	5,002	0.1%	5,220	0.1%
Physical Disability	71	1.3%	71	1.3%	1,758	1.5%	1,925	1.5%	12,921	0.2%	13,483	0.2%
Mental Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	188	0.2%	206	0.2%	1,762	0.0%	1,839	0.0%
Self-Care disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	0.0%	14	0.0%	256	0.0%	267	0.0%
Go-Outside-Home Disability	39	0.7%	39	0.7%	747	0.6%	818	0.6%	8,428	0.1%	8,795	0.1%
Two or More Disabilities (b)	238	4.3%	236	4.3%	3,528	3.0%	3,863	3.0%	33,526	0.5%	34,985	0.5%
Total Disabled Population	815	15%	809	15%	19,094	16%	20,904	16%	323,958	5%	338,060	5%
Total Population 5 Years and Over	5,591		5,553		116,716		127,783		6,345,489		6,621,706	

Notes:

(a) 2008 figures were derived using California Department of Finance and Claritas population estimates with Census 2000 disability distribution figures.

(b) Not counted in individual categories listed above.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2008; Claritas, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 26: Household Tenure by Age of Householder, 2000 and 2008

Age of Householder	City of St. Helena				Napa County				Bay Area			
	2000 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)		2000 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)		2000 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Owner-Occupied												
15-24	9	0.4%	9	0.4%	152	0.3%	168	0.3%	8,496	0.3%	8,810	0.3%
25-34	25	1.1%	25	1.0%	1,943	4.3%	2,151	4.4%	134,030	5.4%	138,990	5.4%
35-54	542	22.8%	536	22.2%	12,934	28.5%	14,314	29.0%	695,711	28.2%	721,458	28.2%
55-64	301	12.7%	298	12.3%	5,365	11.8%	5,938	12.0%	245,606	10.0%	254,695	10.0%
65-74	221	9.3%	218	9.1%	4,426	9.7%	4,898	9.9%	174,781	7.1%	181,249	7.1%
75 and older	233	9.8%	230	9.5%	4,734	10.4%	5,240	10.6%	165,335	6.7%	171,454	6.7%
Subtotal: Owner-Occupied	1,332	56%	1,316	55%	29,554	65%	32,708	66%	1,423,958	58%	1,476,657	58%
Renter-Occupied												
15-24	21	0.9%	22	0.9%	1,030	2.3%	1,085	2.2%	78,151	3.2%	81,006	3.2%
25-34	241	10.1%	252	10.4%	3,927	8.7%	4,137	8.4%	316,675	12.8%	328,245	12.8%
35-54	489	20.5%	513	21.2%	7,083	15.6%	7,462	15.1%	437,577	17.7%	453,564	17.7%
55-64	93	3.9%	97	4.0%	1,369	3.0%	1,442	2.9%	83,920	3.4%	86,986	3.4%
65-74	48	2.0%	50	2.1%	799	1.8%	841	1.7%	56,975	2.3%	59,056	2.3%
75 and older	157	6.6%	164	6.8%	1,640	3.6%	1,728	3.5%	68,763	2.8%	71,276	2.8%
Subtotal: Renter-Occupied	1,048	44%	1,098	45%	15,848	35%	16,695	34%	1,042,061	42%	1,080,133	42%
Total Households	2,380	100%	2,414	100%	45,402	100%	49,403	100%	2,466,019	100%	2,556,790	100%

Notes:

(a) 2000 figures were derived using Census Summary File 1 total household figures, and Census Summary File 3 households by age of householder and tenure distribution figures.

(b) 2008 figures were estimated by applying a calculation of the Census 2000 age of householder percentage allocation for each tenure subcategory to the 2008 California Department of Finance and Claritas total households estimates.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2008; Claritas, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 27: Elderly Households and Housing Cost Burden, City of St. Helena, 1999 (a)

	All Income Levels		Extremely Low-Income (Less than 30% of AMFI)		Very Low-Income (30% to 50% of AMFI)		Low-Income (50% to 80% of AMFI)		Moderate and Above (Over 80% of AMFI)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Owner Households										
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	320	47.1%	20	13.4%	45	45.0%	50	40.0%	205	67.2%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	90	13.3%	10	6.7%	10	10.0%	20	16.0%	50	16.4%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	80	11.8%	30	20.1%	10	10.0%	25	20.0%	15	5.0%
Subtotal: Owner-Occupied Households	490	72.2%	60	40.3%	65	65.0%	95	76.0%	270	88.5%
Renter Households										
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	100	14.7%	55	36.9%	0	0.0%	20	16.0%	25	8.2%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	24	3.5%	4	2.7%	10	10.0%	0	0.0%	10	3.3%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	65	9.6%	30	20.1%	25	25.0%	10	8.0%	0	0.0%
Subtotal: Renter-Occupied Households	189	27.8%	89	59.7%	35	35.0%	30	24.0%	35	11.5%
Total Households	679	100%	149	100%	100	100%	125	100%	305	100%

Note:

(a) Figures reported above are based on the HUD-published CHAS 2000 data, which reports 1999 incomes. CHAS data reflect HUD-defined household income limits, for various household sizes. Total household figures may vary from those reported in Table 2 due to different estimation methodologies. Figures may differ from those reported in Table 4 due to variances between HUD-based data sets.

Sources: 2000 CHAS, huduser.org, 2008; Claritas Inc., 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 28: Family and Non-Family Households by Size, 2000 and 2008

Household Type and Size	City of St. Helena				Napa County				Bay Area			
	2000		2008 (est.) (a)		2000		2008 (est.)		2000		2008 (est.)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Family Households (b)												
2-person Household	652	27.4%	628	26.0%	13,309	29.3%	14,192	28.7%	593,764	24.1%	606,959	23.7%
3-person Household	281	11.8%	289	12.0%	6,323	13.9%	7,010	14.2%	362,953	14.7%	379,966	14.9%
4-person Household	294	12.4%	292	12.1%	5,785	12.7%	6,213	12.6%	335,693	13.6%	344,081	13.5%
5+ -person Household	255	10.7%	282	11.7%	5,277	11.6%	5,984	12.1%	302,060	12.2%	325,879	12.7%
Subtotal: Family Households	1,482	62%	1,491	62%	30,694	68%	33,399	68%	1,594,470	65%	1,656,885	65%
Non-Family Households (b)												
1-person Household	752	31.6%	757	31.4%	11,733	25.8%	12,748	25.8%	637,575	25.9%	660,906	25.8%
2-person Household	126	5.3%	138	5.7%	2,384	5.3%	2,544	5.1%	179,385	7.3%	181,456	7.1%
3-person Household	17	0.7%	24	1.0%	373	0.8%	452	0.9%	34,379	1.4%	36,347	1.4%
4-person Household	2	0.1%	2	0.1%	105	0.2%	112	0.2%	12,364	0.5%	12,169	0.5%
5+ -person Household	1	0.0%	2	0.1%	113	0.2%	148	0.3%	7,846	0.3%	9,027	0.4%
Subtotal: Non-Family Households	898	38%	923	38%	14,708	32%	16,004	32%	871,549	35%	899,905	35%
Total Households	2,380	100%	2,414	100%	45,402	100%	49,403	100%	2,466,019	100%	2,556,790	100%

Notes:

- (a) 2008 figures for the City of St. Helena are based on total household estimates from the California Department of Finance and family type by size distribution estimates from Claritas.
- (b) A "family" household is two or more related people living together. Non-family households are single people living alone, or two or more unrelated people living together.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2008; Claritas, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 29: Large Family Households and Housing Cost Burden, City of St. Helena, 1999 (a)

	All Income Levels		Extremely Low-Income (Less than 30% of AMFI)		Very Low-Income (30% to 50% of AMFI)		Low-Income (50% to 80% of AMFI)		Moderate and Above (Over 80% of AMFI)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Owner Households										
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	83	34.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	26.4%	69	46.3%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	35	14.5%	10	55.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	25	16.8%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Subtotal: Owner-Occupied Households	118	48.8%	10	55.6%	0	0.0%	14	26.4%	94	63.1%
Renter Households										
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	106	43.8%	0	0.0%	12	54.5%	39	73.6%	55	36.9%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	10	4.1%	0	0.0%	10	45.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	8	3.3%	8	44.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Subtotal: Renter-Occupied Households	124	51.2%	8	44.4%	22	100.0%	39	73.6%	55	36.9%
Total Households	242	100%	18	100%	22	100%	53	100%	149	100%

Note:

(a) Figures reported above are based on the HUD-published CHAS 2000 data, which reports 1999 incomes. CHAS data reflect HUD-defined household income limits, for various household sizes. Total household figures may vary from those reported in Table 2 due to different estimation methodologies. Figures may differ from those reported in Table 4 due to variances between HUD-based data sets.

Sources: 2000 CHAS, huduser.org, 2008; Claritas Inc., 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 30: Single Female-Headed Households with Children, 2000 and 2008

	City of St. Helena				Napa County				Bay Area			
	2000 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)		2000 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)		2000 (a)		2008 (est.) (b)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Single Female-Headed Households with Children (c)												
Owner	71	3.0%	72	3.0%	771	1.7%	839	1.7%	44,170	1.8%	45,796	1.8%
Renter	83	3.5%	84	3.5%	1,468	3.2%	1,597	3.2%	90,138	3.7%	93,456	3.7%
Total: Single Female-Headed Households with Children	154	6.5%	156	6.5%	2,239	4.9%	2,436	4.9%	134,308	5.4%	139,252	5.4%
Total Households	2,380		2,414		45,402		49,403		2,466,019		2,556,790	

Notes:

(a) 2000 figures were derived using Census 2000 Summary File 1 total households estimates and Summary File 3 single female-headed households by tenure distribution estimates.

(b) 2008 figures were derived using California Department of Finance and Claritas total households estimates and Census 2000 single female-headed households by tenure distribution estimates.

(c) Family household with a female head of household, no husband present, and one or more household members under the age of 18, as defined by the U.S. Census.

Sources: Census 2000, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2008; Claritas, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 31: Farm Employment, Napa County, 1993 - 2007

Year	Farm Employment	Annual Percent Change
1993	3,400	n.a.
1994	3,300	-2.9%
1995	3,600	9.1%
1996	3,800	5.6%
1997	4,200	10.5%
1998	4,400	4.8%
1999	4,400	0.0%
2000	4,900	11.4%
2001	5,300	8.2%
2002	5,300	0.0%
2003	4,900	-7.5%
2004	4,700	-4.1%
2005	4,600	-2.1%
2006	4,700	2.2%
2007	5,100	8.5%
Total Change 1993 - 2007	1,700	50.0%

Note:

(a) EDD data are derived from Current Employment Statistics (CES) data and the CES defines employment as “the total number of persons on establishment payrolls employed full or part-time who receive pay for any part of the pay period that includes the 12th day of the month.”

Sources: EDD, 2008; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 32: Farmworkers, Napa County, 2005 (a)

Employment Period	Total Farmworker Estimates
Regular Workers (worked more than 7 months a year)	3,744
Seasonal Workers (worked between 3 and 6 months a year)	1,258
Harvest Only Workers (worked less than 3 months a year)	1,788
Total Farmworkers	6,790

Note:

(a) Research methods "included a survey of 158 agricultural employers in Napa County, face-to-face interviews with 200 farmworkers during wine grape harvest, key informant interview with 20 individuals familiar with the housing needs of farmworkers in Napa County, focus groups with three sets of farmworkers, secondary data analysis and a review of relevant documents."

Sources: An Assessment of the Demand for Farm Worker Housing in Napa County, California Institute for Rural Studies, March, 2007; BAE, 2008.

Table 33: Farmworker Rents and Incomes, Napa County, 2005 (a)

<u>Monthly Housing Costs (b)</u>	<u>Surveyed Farmworkers</u>	<u>Farmworkers Residing in Napa County</u>
Renters		
Average Rent per Adult	\$252	n.a.
Respondents with a spouse and/or children	\$319	\$345
Respondents, unaccompanied	\$218	\$254
Utilities (c)	\$66	n.a.
Homeowners		
Average Mortgage Payment	\$2,167	n.a.
Utilities	\$225	n.a.

<u>Farmworker Occupations</u>	<u>Surveyed Farmworkers</u>	<u>Reported Mean Annual Earnings</u>	<u>Total Household Income</u>
General Laborers	159	\$15,745	\$19,122
Specialized Laborers	19	\$26,317	\$33,268
Foreman or Supervisor	11	\$37,000	\$50,294

Notes:

(a) The data reported above are from a farmworker survey of 189 respondents who worked in any part of Napa County between September and November 2006. The interviewees were selected based on place of employment. A stratified random sample came from registered farm labor contractors, vineyard properties with unique site identification assigned by the Napa County Agricultural commissioner, and one large nursery farm. Three workers from each selected crew were interviewed.

(b) 87 percent of survey respondents rent, 11 percent own, and the remaining two percent report receiving free housing from their employer.

(c) Only 55 percent of renter respondents reported paying for utilities, with \$66 being the average reported by respondents who pay rent.

Sources: An Assessment of the Demand for Farm Worker Housing in Napa County, California Institute for Rural Studies, March, 2007; BAE, 2008.

Table 34: Emergency, Transitional, and Permanent Supportive Housing, Napa County, 2007

	Emergency Shelter		Transitional Housing		Permanent Supportive Housing		Total
	Individuals	Families	Individuals	Families	Individuals	Families	
Estimated Need	84	45	85	50	91	75	430
Current Inventory	74	32	77	35	46	10	274
Unmet Need/Gap	10	13	8	15	45	65	156

Sources: Napa County Continuum of Care, Exhibit 1, 2007; BAE, 2008.

Non-governmental and Governmental Constraints

Constraints on the development of housing are divided into non-governmental constraints and governmental constraints. Non-governmental constraints include the price of land, cost of construction, availability of financing, and overall housing production costs. Governmental constraints include land use controls, codes and enforcements, on and off site improvements, fees and exactions, processing and permit procedures, and regulations affecting housing for persons with disabilities.

Non-governmental Constraints

Price of Land

According to Dataquick, a private data vendor, there were approximately six sales of vacant residential land between January 2006 and October 2008. Of these, three have no reported sales price. The remaining three sales records include one parcel on Hunt Avenue that sold for \$525,000 in early 2006, and two parcels on College Avenue that sold for around \$885,000 in early 2007 and 2008. On a per acre basis, using the existing sales records, the price range for vacant land in St. Helena ranges between approximately \$1.8 million and \$2.5 million per acre.

Cost of Construction

The following section contains construction cost estimates for three projects in varying stages of development within St. Helena: Vineland Station, Magnolia Oaks, and a proposed housing project by Mercy Housing.

Market Rate Housing

Vineland Station is a mixed-use development on 8.5 acres in St. Helena being developed by the Friedrich Company. To date, two commercial buildings have been completed with 63,000 square feet of retail, office, and restaurant space. Another building containing 19,000 square feet is currently under construction, with commercial space on the first level and ten one-bedroom apartments on the second floor.³⁵ The apartments will each be about 700 square feet in size and one unit will be affordable to a very low-income household and 1 unit will be affordable to a low-income household.³⁶ Rodney Friedrich of the Friedrich Company provided information on the construction costs for the 19,000 square foot building containing both residential and commercial uses. Since the project is not yet complete, Mr. Friedrich could only provide estimates of costs based upon bids received, impact fees paid to the City, and his own experience. The estimated

³⁵ Personal Communication with Rodney Friedrich, Friedrich Company, December 4, 2008.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

construction costs of the building, with no tenant improvement allowances and no contingencies, will be about \$3.2 million or \$168 per square foot. Additional costs include \$0.5 million in site improvement costs, \$860,000 in impact fees already charged by the City, construction loan fees, and soft costs such as advertising, legal, and architecture and engineering fees. The estimated total cost, excluding the costs of land and the time spent by Mr. Friedrich, amounts to around \$6.05 million or \$318 per square foot.

The cost of the land for this particular project is hard to factor in, considering it is a piece of a larger 34-acre parcel purchased in 1981, although Mr. Friedrich estimates that the raw 8.5 acres containing the Vineland Station development would sell for between \$12 and \$15 million, or between \$1.4 million and \$1.8 million per acre.

[Additional information from Rossi Development will be included, pending the approval of the final map for the Magnolia Oaks development.]

Affordable Housing

Mercy Housing has filed a pre-application and proposed to build a 112-unit mixed-income housing development on a 10-acre parcel located on Pope Street in St. Helena. The preliminary plan, which may change as the project progresses, includes:

- 30 apartments
- 20 small lot, single-family homes
- 30 detached single-family homes
- 47 townhomes³⁷

The 30 apartments will all be affordable to households with incomes of 30 to 60 percent of area median income (AMI). Six for-sale units will be targeted for households at 80 percent of AMI; 11 for-sale units will be affordable for households at 100 percent of AMI; 14 at 120 percent of AMI; 9 at 150 percent of AMI; 8 at 180 percent of AMI; and, 34 units will be market rate units.³⁸ These unit counts mirror the income distribution in St. Helena. Paul Ainger, Senior Project Developer at Mercy Housing, estimates that the site improvement costs, including bio swales and gray-water piping will be about \$10 per square foot, and that building construction cost will be around \$100 per square foot. These site improvement costs are slightly below the site improvement costs of other recently completed affordable housing projects in Napa County, including Vineyards Crossing (about \$12 per square foot), and the Magnolia Park Townhomes (around \$14 per square

³⁷ Pope Street Mixed Income Housing Concept. Received December, 16, 2008

³⁸ Personal Communication. Paul Ainger, Senior Project Developer, Mercy Housing December 8, 2008

foot).³⁹ The construction cost estimates are significantly below the construction costs per square foot for other projects, with Vineyards Crossing at about \$150 per square foot, and the Magnolia Park townhomes at around \$166 per livable square foot.

Overall Housing Production Costs

[[Section will be completed after factoring in the costs of the Magnolia Oaks Development.].]

Availability of Financing

St. Helena is affected by the conditions in the national credit market. High national foreclosure rates, climbing interest rates, and failing banks have tightened the credit market and made it hard for developers to obtain construction and permanent loans to build units. The credit crisis has seriously curtailed the availability of nontraditional mortgage products like adjustable rate mortgages and subprime mortgages.

Quality credit scores, documentable income, and a significant down payment are now crucial to obtaining a home loan, thereby limiting the number of households able to obtain financing to purchase homes. This will exclude certain households who previously could have qualified to buy homes forcing them into the rental market. The high overall production costs coupled with the decrease in the availability of credit indicates that St. Helena may have to increase the number of rental units available to provide these households displaced from the for-sale market households with adequate rental housing options.

In addition, current market conditions make it difficult to obtain financing for new housing developments. Capital availability is very limited and reserved only for projects that pose the least risk and the highest chance of return. For example, the Vineland Station Development received financing for about half of the project a year ago prior to the tightening of the credit market, but there is concern about how to obtain the financing necessary to complete the project.⁴⁰

Napa River Flooding

The Napa River flooded lands along the northeast border of St. Helena in both 1986 and 1995, damaging the Vineyard Valley Mobile Home Park and other single family homes along Pratt Ave. In 1995 the Hunt's Grove Apartments were also flooded. Floods cost the City \$50 million.⁴¹ The Comprehensive Flood Protection Study revealed that the lands between Pratt Street and the Pope

³⁹ Personal communication with Napa Valley Community Housing, and Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, June 2008.

⁴⁰ Personal Communication with Rodney, Friedrich Company, December 4, 2008.

⁴¹ *St. Helena Comprehensive Flood Protection Project: 2006 Plan Project Description* July, 2006. (Pg. 3)

Street Bridge in St. Helena face the highest risk of flooding.⁴² Consequently, land in this section of St. Helena is not available for new development until the Flood Protection Project is complete. St. Helena is in the process of completing the Comprehensive Flood Protection Project to mitigate the effects of the flooding on both current and future residential development in the flood plain. Details regarding the City of St. Helena's flood projects are included in the Governmental constraints section of this report.

Governmental Constraints

Local government can directly influence housing production cost through land use controls, building codes, on and off site improvement standards, fees and exactions, processing and permit procedures, regulations affecting housing for persons with disabilities, and with government codes and enforcement. This section discusses each of these topics and identifies the governmental controls that may adversely effect housing production.

Land-Use Controls

The St. Helena Zoning Ordinance and General Plan can affect housing production because they determine the location, amount of land, and also the density of housing.

Zoning Ordinance

Title 17 of the St. Helena Municipal Code outlines both the residential and nonresidential zoning designations. Table 35 provides a list of all of the residential zoning districts as well as information on the rights and requirements associated with each district. Residential uses are permitted by right in the following zones: Twenty-Acre Agriculture (A-20), Winery (W), Woodland Watershed (WW), Agricultural Preserve (AP), Low Density Residential One Acre Minimum (LR-1A), Low Density Residential (LR), Medium Density Residential (MR), and High Density Residential (HR).

In terms of units per acre, the lowest allowable density is the AP district. The AP district only permits, by right, one single-family unit per 40-acre lot. With a conditional use permit, farmworker and seasonal farmworker camps can be built at higher densities in this zone. The A-20 and W zones allow one single-family dwelling and one second unit by right on 20 acres of land. With a conditional use permit, this zone can accommodate more than one second unit, as well as farm labor housing above the initially permitted density.

Both the LR and LR-1A zones permit by right not only single-family dwellings, but also permanent mobilehomes, and intermediate care, residential, developmentally disabled, and nursing facilities for six or fewer persons. The LR-1A allows one unit per acre; however, the LR zone sets a

⁴² *St. Helena Comprehensive Flood Protection Project: 2006 Plan Project Description* July, 2006.

minimum of one unit per acre, and applies a maximum at five units per acre. In addition, both zones permit as a conditional use single-family dwellings at less than one unit per acre and all of the aforementioned types of facilities for seven or more persons.

The MR zone allows the same uses by right and with a conditional use permit as the LR district and also allows small lot developments, condominium, or townhomes with a conditional use permit. Minimum and maximum densities for the MR zone range from 5.1 to 16 DUA. Finally, the HR zone, in addition to allowing the same residential uses by right as the LR and MR zones, permits multifamily dwellings, apartments, and dwelling groups containing four units or less. The allowable density for the HR zone is between 16.1 to 28 DUA. With a conditional use permit, buildings with more than four units, multifamily dwellings, apartments, and dwelling groups are permitted. The conditional use permit requirements for multifamily dwellings of more than four units does not place an undue burden on development because the Magnolia Oaks and Vineland Station development, which both contain apartments, were approved by the City of St. Helena in 2007 without creating unreasonable timeframes for approval and without imposing unreasonable conditions of approval.⁴³

In addition to the residential zones described above, some overlay districts can affect the type and amount of housing that can actually be built, including the Planned Development, Rural-Residential, Specific Plan, Flood Plain, Historic Preservation, and Mobile Home Park overlay district. An overlay district expands upon the regulations already set by the underlying zoning district. For example, the Planned Development Overlay District (PD) allows for a wider variety of development, including mixed-use development not otherwise allowed in the zoning code. The PD zone is often applied to large pieces of land and requires approval of a rezoning and a conditional use permit application.

General Plan

While St. Helena is in the process of updating the City's General Plan, the currently valid General Plan was completed in 1993 and dictates land use through 2010.⁴⁴ The City of St. Helena consists of approximately 3,150 acres, and roughly 1,130 acres are already developed. Not all of the 3,150 acres within the City of St. Helena are available for development,⁴⁵ rather only about 1,500 acres within the Urban Limit Line (ULL) are eligible for development.⁴⁶ The remaining acreage consists

⁴³ City of St. Helena. *City of St. Helena Annual Report for Compliance with Housing Element*. June, 2008.

⁴⁴ City of St. Helena. http://www.sthelena2030.com/global/pdf_files/2_lu.pdf. Accessed September 19, 2008.

⁴⁵ City of St. Helena General Plan Update 2030 "Natural Environment Background Working Paper. (Page NE-21). <http://www.sthelena2030.com>. Accessed on September 19, 2008.

⁴⁶ City of St. Helena Request for Qualifications and Proposal "Community Visioning Process, General Plan Update, and Environmental Impact Report. May 19, 2006. <http://city.ci-st-helena.ca.us/images/city/Community%20Visioning%20Process/General%20Plan%20Update%20RFP.pdf>

of 1,300 acres of agricultural cropland and additional open space. Thirteen land use designations cover the land in St. Helena.⁴⁷

The ULL contains land use designations including Low, Medium, and High Density Residential, Central Business, Service Commercial, Industrial, Business and Professional Office, Parks and Recreation, Public/Quasi-Public, Open Space and Agriculture. The Low, Medium, and High Density Residential land use correspond to the zoning district of the same names presented in Table 35. Some land outside, yet contiguous to the ULL has a General Plan designation of Urban Reserve (UR) indicating that it should be considered first if land outside the ULL is needed for development. All lands with a UR land use designation are zoned A-20.

Residential Growth Management System

The residential growth management system (GMS) first went into effect in 1979, but has been revised most recently in 2002 in conjunction with the 2002 Housing Element Update.⁴⁸ The stated purpose of the system is “to regulate the residential growth of the city to approximately two percent per year, while providing for both market rate and affordable housing units.”⁴⁹ The current GMS will not allow any more than 2,800 units by 2010. In 2008, DoF estimates the existence of 2,745 housing units in St. Helena. This is an increase of five units per year given that the 2000 Census housing count stood at 2,707.⁵⁰ Not all new residential development is subject to this restriction of nine permits per year. The relevant exemptions include affordable housing, and second dwelling units. The City Council had the power to decide on the number of permits issued for affordable housing units. The Growth Management System has not prevented housing development that would have occurred otherwise. The City has not issued all nine permits each year and puts the excess permits into a bank that “shall only be available for allocation for the construction of market rate units in development projects that include a minimum of forty percent affordable units.”⁵¹

Design Review

Chapter 17.164 of the St. Helena Municipal Code outlines the City’s Design Review policies. The purpose of the policy is to go beyond the controls inherent in the land use controls and building codes and examine individual project proposals for the “general form of the land before and after development, the spatial relationships of the structures and open spaces to proximate land uses and

⁴⁷ City of St. Helena General Plan, 1993. “Chapter 2.0 Land Use and Growth Management” http://www.sthelena2030.com/global/pdf_files/2_lu.pdf Accessed on September 19, 2008.

⁴⁸ City of St. Helena Municipal Code. Chapter 17.152. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelena/>. Accessed on September 25, 2008.

⁴⁹ City of St. Helena Municipal Code. Chapter 17.152. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelena/>. Accessed on September 25, 2008.

⁵⁰ City of St. Helena, Housing Element Update. 2002 (Pg. 39)

⁵¹ St. Helena Municipal Code. 17.152 Residential Growth Management System

the appearances of building and open spaces as they contribute to an area as it is being developed.”⁵² The Municipal Code lists 17 specific design criteria considered by the Planning Commission and a summary of these points follows:

- Compatibility with the general plan, current site, and surrounding properties.
- Physical characteristics of the buildings and surrounding landscaping
- Employment of green building practices into the design.

The Planning Commission examines all proposed new buildings and structures and exterior additions in relation to the design criteria and arrives at one of three recommendations, approve, approve with minor modifications, or disapprove.⁵³ The City staff had noted that the complex and subjective nature of the design review process can be cumbersome for the Planning Commission, and therefore this process may need to be streamlined to facilitate housing development.

The limitations to the design review processes are expressly stated in the Municipal Code, and the one limitation that directly impacts affordable housing states that “the commission is not to use design review intentionally or inadvertently to exclude housing for minority groups or housing for low and moderate income persons.”⁵⁴ Presumably, then, the Planning Commission would take the 17 design criteria into consideration when reviewing affordable housing projects, but not disapprove a project strictly because it is a low cost structure.

Implementation of new Design Review guidelines could commence after the new General Plan is adopted. Assuming that architecturally distinct neighborhoods are identified in the General Plan Community Design element, a consultant would be hired to identify design themes and develop design guidelines for new construction within each of the neighborhoods. The target adoption date for the new General Plan is June 2010. Approximately one additional year (to June 2011) will be required for budget adoption, consultant selection, and finalization of design guidelines.

Housing Trust Fund, Housing Impact Fee, and Inclusionary/In-Lieu Fee Requirements

In September 2004, the City Council passed Ordinance 2004-7 adding Chapter 17.146 Housing Trust Fund, Housing Impact Fee, and Inclusionary/In-Lieu Fee Requirements to the St. Helena Municipal Code. The regulations are designed so that new non-residential developments and additions are required to pay a housing impact fee and new residential developments containing five units or more are required to include 20 percent of their units as affordable housing, and

⁵² St. Helena Municipal Code. 17.165 Design Review.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

developments with less than five units pay an in-lieu fee. The fees collected from the nonresidential and residential development then go into a Housing Trust Fund. The use of Housing Trust Fund monies is directed exclusively to “increase and improve the supply of housing affordable to households of moderate, low and very low income” including costs such as land, construction, financing, and reimbursements to the City.⁵⁵ The monies are available for both ownership and rental projects and services.

These affordable housing requirements do add additional cost to market rate residential development in the process of creating additional affordable housing in St. Helena. To minimize the impact on the price of market rate housing, the Municipal Code allows developers to submit an “alternative equivalent proposal” and offers a series of concessions or incentives.⁵⁶ An “alternative equivalent proposal” enables developers to meet the affordable housing requirements through alternative means like dedicating vacant land as long as the proposed alternative aligns with the purpose of the Municipal Code and is approved by the City Council. Concessions and incentives that are automatically available to residential developers who construct inclusionary units include the opportunity to submit a preliminary development proposal, priority in the City application process, and fee deferment. In addition, the City council can grant additional concessions and incentives including extra density bonuses, changes to City standards, and monetary assistance. The automatic and discretionary concessions and incentives help expedite the process of building affordable housing and therefore minimize the cost to developers.

The City is currently considering changing the Municipal Code policies in relation to nonresidential development housing impact fees. The City council is considering the option because of the high number of jobs in St. Helena compared with the housing available and the fact that between September 2005 and July 2007, the housing impact fee only generated \$270,000 for the Housing Trust Fund.⁵⁷ The City will consider implementing one of three alternative options as part of the General Plan update.⁵⁸ These three options include 1) raising fees or requiring that developers build housing units based upon building commercial square footage 2) a mixed-use or residential overlay zone to encourage additional residential development, or 3) additional incentives to encourage the construction of housing units.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ St. Helena Municipal Code. 17.146.030

⁵⁶ St. Helena Municipal Code 17.146.050

⁵⁷ City of St. Helena Staff Report. *Re: Keyser Marston Analysis of Requiring Affordable Housing in Non-Residential Projects*. July 24, 2007.

⁵⁸ City of St. Helena City Council Minutes. January 8, 2008.

⁵⁹ City of St. Helena City Council Minutes. July 24, 2007.

On/Offsite Improvement Standards

The St. Helena Municipal Code lists requirements for new development related to sewer and water connections, parking, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, fire hydrants, and street trees.

Sewer

While in the past the City of St. Helena has had limited sewer capacity and had to place a moratorium on development,⁶⁰ currently the daily dry-weather demand for sewer is approximately 0.48 million gallons. The permitted dry-weather capacity of the current sewer system is about 0.50 million gallons. In addition, the recently expanded capacity due to aeration should allow an increase in the permitted capacity (pending approval of the Regional Water Quality Control Board) to 0.62 million gallons, which will meet the needs of the additional development in St. Helena.⁶¹ The City charges a sewer impact fee of \$4.57 per square foot for single-family residential and \$3.64 for multifamily residential.⁶²

Water

The 2002 Housing Element identified water capacity as a possible constraint to development after 2006, and consequently the City of St. Helena made a commitment back in 2002 that “if the situation arises where the City of St. Helena is unable to provide sewer and water services to all requested new development, the City will give highest priority to provision of services to the 87 affordable housing units [needed for the City to meet the 1999-2006 RHNA].”⁶³ In a normal year, the total supply of water is 2,600 acre feet while the actual water demand in 2006 equaled 2,126 acre feet. In the year 2010, the projected total water demand equals 2,195 acre feet, which remains below the water supply in a normal year. St. Helena could experience a water shortage; however, in dry year when the water supply is 2,100-acre feet, which is below the both the 2006 and 2010 total water demand. The City charges a nominal one-time water meter fee and a water impact fee of \$5.67 per square foot for single-family residential and \$2.46 for multifamily residential.⁶⁴

Parking

Residential parking requirements vary according to the number of dwelling units, as follows:

- One to two dwelling units: Minimum of two spaces per unit, with one of the spaces in a

⁶⁰ St. Helena Municipal Code. 3.32.080 Sewer Impact Fees.

⁶¹ Local Agency Formation Committee of Napa County. *Final Report City of St. Helena Municipal Service Review*. May, 2008. (Pg. 14)

⁶² City of St. Helena. *Development Fees*. July 2008. <http://city.ci.st-helena.ca.us/images/city/Building/Building%20Development%20Fee%27s.pdf>. Accessed September 29, 2008.

⁶³ City of St. Helena, Housing Element Update. 2002 (Pg. 37)

⁶⁴ City of St. Helena. *Development Fees*. July 2008. <http://city.ci.st-helena.ca.us/images/city/Building/Building%20Development%20Fee%27s.pdf>. Accessed September 29, 2008.

garage or carport.

- Three or more dwelling units: Minimum of one space under cover per unit, plus either a half space or one additional whole space depending the number of bedrooms in the units.
- Rooming, boarding, or lodging house: Minimum of one space per room, and two spaces for the owner-occupied unit.
- Mobile home: Minimum of two spaces per unit plus centralized space for guest parking.⁶⁵

The one exception to these requirements is housing built for senior citizens, with funding from the Federal or State government, which is affordable to low- and moderate-income households.⁶⁶ For all other uses not covered in the Municipal Code, the Planning Commission has the power to set the parking requirements based upon the general parking guidelines of the City.

Other

Other miscellaneous improvements required by the City of St. Helena include curb, gutter and sidewalk treatments, fire hydrants, and street trees. Whenever new development fronts a public street, the developers are required to provide curb, gutter, and sidewalk treatments to the specifications supplied by the Public Works director.⁶⁷ If the Fire Chief or Public Works director decides that there is not sufficient supply of fire hydrants nearby, new development would cover the cost of additional hydrants as necessary.⁶⁸ Finally, if a new development fronts a planting strip, then the owner must care for and maintain the trees and other vegetation in the strip.

The water, parking, and other miscellaneous on-and-off site improvements standards do not constrain residential development in St. Helena. Although the City does not currently have sufficient sewer treatment capacity to accommodate all of its RHNA housing units, wastewater treatment plant upgrades scheduled for completion will accommodate the full RHNA; therefore, wastewater treatment capacity will not be a constraint given the need to accommodate the RHNA by June 30, 2014.

Building Codes and Enforcement

The current St. Helena Building code has been adapted from the 2007 California Building Standards Code, also known as Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. These regulations include the 2007 California Fire Code, 2005 Energy Code, 2005 National Electrical Code, 2006 Uniform Mechanical Code, and 2006 Uniform Plumbing Code. The major local amendments included the continuation of St. Helena's program for the seismic retrofit of unreinforced buildings

⁶⁵ Municipal Code 17.124.030 Minimum on-site parking requirements

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Municipal Code 12.08.090 Plans and specifications.

⁶⁸ Municipal Code 16.32.110 Fire protection.

and the requirement that all new construction install an approved automatic fire-suppression sprinkler system. This includes all new residential structures with space for sleeping, and structures that exceed 400 square feet of gross floor area. Existing residential structures that undergo additions or repairs equal to at least 50 percent of the existing floor area, and units experiencing a change in occupancy to a more hazardous use, also require the installation of an approved sprinkler system.⁶⁹ Otherwise, Title 15 of the St. Helena Municipal Code closely adheres to the 2007 California Building Standards Code and places no greater constraints on housing development than any other jurisdiction in the State that follows this model code.

The enforcement of building codes within the City of St. Helena is centered on the inspection of new construction and remodels or renovations requiring building permits. The City has the power to inspect and declare unsafe any structure or piece of equipment, be it existing or under-construction that does not meet specific municipal code standards. These include, but are not limited to, structures with insufficient modes of egress; structures that are unsafe or that have been made structurally unsound due to fire, earthquake, or other natural disaster; buildings that are deemed a public nuisance; and, buildings that have been constructed or maintained in violation of local or state law. Once a building has been declared unsafe, the building official may issue notice that the structure be repaired, vacated, or demolished within a reasonable amount of time and with the appropriate permits.⁷⁰

Building and Development Impact Fees

The City's building department fee schedule is designed to directly offset the costs incurred by the City when processing and reviewing development applications, and to inspect new construction. Fees are charged when a building permit is issued and are based on building plans and estimated construction costs.

Development impact fees are charged to new projects in order to offset costs for the construction, expansion, and maintenance of off-site improvements that either were built for the purposes of the new project or were existing improvements from which the new developments will benefit. In the case of St. Helena, impact fees are charged for public safety, civic improvements, water services, and water meter installation, sewer services, storm drainage, traffic mitigation, housing impacts, and schools. For the purpose of comparison with the 2002 Housing Element, the single-family fee calculations are based on the same development prototype, a 2,300 square foot single-family residence with three-bedrooms, two-bathrooms and a total inflation adjusted construction cost

⁶⁹ City of St. Helena. *St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 15*. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelenal/>. Accessed September 29, 2008.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

estimate of approximately \$292,290.⁷¹ The fee calculations for the multifamily project use the conceptual plan for the 112-unit mixed income project proposed by Mercy Housing.

Unadjusted for inflation, City of St. Helena single-family development fees have increased approximately 84 percent, or over \$25,000 dollars since 2002. Once adjusted for inflation, the increase is approximately 59 percent or just under \$21,000. When developing new residential units, this increased cost for city fees is added on top of recent increases in the estimated costs for residential construction.

Figure 1: Building Permit and Development Impact Fees, Single-Family Home, 2008

Building Department Fees:	\$3,860
Public Safety fee:	\$2,530
Civic Improvement Fee:	\$5,497
Water Impact Fee:	\$13,041
Water Meter Installation Fee:	\$163
Sewer Impact Fee:	\$10,511
Storm Drainage Impact Fee:	\$23
Traffic Mitigation Impact Fee:	\$8,303
School District Fee:	\$5,152
Housing Impact Fee:	\$7,307
Total:	\$56,387

Sources: City of St. Helena, 2008; BAE, 2008.

To facilitate the comparison of existing single-family fees, the following figures refer to a comparison between the 2002 development impact fees reported in the previous housing element and the current City fee schedule as reported above. The largest change is the addition of a housing impact fee that is calculated as 2.5 percent of the total estimated cost of construction. While not controlled by the City, the school district fee shows a sizable increase of 36 percent, or nearly \$1,360. The largest increase is in the traffic mitigation impact fee that has risen by nearly 760 percent, or over \$7,300. Increases in water impact fees (87 percent), sewer impact fees (71 percent), building development fees (81 percent), and civic improvement fees (14 percent) contribute to the overall sum. The fee for water meter installation remains unchanged since 2002. Fees for public safety have decreased by 50 percent. Storm drainage impact fees for the majority of the community were significantly reduced from nearly \$600 to only \$23, representing a 96 percent drop.

⁷¹ City of St. Helena. *Development Fees*. July 2008. <http://city.ci.st-helena.ca.us/images/city/Building/Building%20Development%20Fee%27s.pdf>. Accessed September 29, 2008.

The fees are different for a multifamily development. Using the 112-unit Mercy Housing development as a prototype, the total development fee for all for phases of the project comes to approximately \$2.5 million. Of the \$2.5 million, about \$1.4 million is for the 78 units that are deed restricted for affordability and \$1.04 million would be for the 34 market rate units. The total \$2.5 million in fees is divided across the four phases of development as shown below.

Phase 1

Total Fees = \$600,000

11 deed restricted (55 percent) = \$330,000

9 market rate (45 percent) = \$270,000

- 20 single-family detached homes at 1,528 square feet (small lot homes) = 30,560 square feet.
- Assume 1.76 acres at 30 percent impermeable surface for building footprints and walkways = 23,000 square feet

Phase 2

Total Fees = \$437,735

30 deed restricted (100%)

- 30 apartments at 1,020 square feet = 30,600 square feet.
- Assume 1.19 acres at 30 percent impermeable = 15,551 square feet.

Phase 3

Total Fees = \$590,000

15 market rate (100%)

- 15 single family detached at 2,006 sq. ft. =30,090 square feet
- Assume 1.69 acres at 30 percent impermeable surface = 22,085 square feet

Phase 4

Total Fees = \$856,575.

37 deed restricted (79 percent) = \$676,695

10 market rate (21 percent) = \$179,

- 47 townhouses at 1,274 square feet = 59,878 square feet
- Assume 2.45 acres at 30 percent impermeable surface = 32,017 square feet

The single-family and multifamily fees have increased to reflect the costs of the improvements necessary to serve residential development. Without the money collected through the fees, the City could not afford to make the necessary improvements in infrastructure, and thus the fees do not represent an undue governmental constraint to housing development. In addition, fee reductions and adjustments for affordable and other housing projects are permitted on a case by case basis, as approved by City Council under Section 3, Chapter 3.32 of the St. Helena Municipal Code.

Comprehensive Flood Protection Project

Given that some of the land in St. Helena is within the 100-year flood plain of the Napa River, the City of Helena began planning a flood protection strategy in conjunction with the Napa County Board of Supervisors and Napa County Flood Control District and after significant flooding occurred in 1986 and 1995. In 1998 County residents approved Measure A placing a countywide sales tax of 0.5 cents therefore enabling the flood protection work to begin.⁷² After a series of delays due to litigation, funding shortages, and archaeological excavation work, in July 2006 the City released a *2006 Plan Project Description*. The project involves flood control measures ranging from “widening the floodplain and constructing new floodwalls and levee, to relocating homes.”⁷³ As of June 18, 2008, the City had secured the necessary additional funding from the Flood Protection Corridor Program (FPCP) totaling \$3.1 million.⁷⁴ Construction, however, had not yet begun due to the fact that an agreement between the City and the Vineyard Valley Mobile Home Park owner for the City to purchase a portion of the mobilehome park land for use in the flood protection project had not yet been completed.⁷⁵ Construction will begin, pending the City’s purchase of the necessary land in the mobilehome park. At that time, the City will remove 17 mobile homes and provide benefits to both owners and renter forced to relocate.⁷⁶ Once the flood protection project is complete, additional land in St. Helena will be safe for development.

Processing and Permit Procedures

The processing and permitting procedures in St. Helena are described below using examples of a multifamily affordable housing development and a market rate single-family development. The prototype multifamily housing project contains 60 units on land zoned high-density residential.⁷⁷ Since it is a multifamily dwelling, it requires a conditional use permit from the City. The processing time for the development would amount to around 9 months, with an allowance of 60

⁷² *St. Helena Comprehensive Flood Protection Project: 2006 Plan Project Description* July, 2006. (Pg. 3)

⁷³ *Ibid.* (Pg. 1).

⁷⁴ City of St. Helena. *Flood Protection Project Update*. June 18, 2008. <http://city.ci.st-helena.ca.us/section.cfm?id=117>. Accessed November 4, 2008.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *St. Helena Comprehensive Flood Protection Project: 2006 Plan Project Description* July, 2006. (Pg. 7)

⁷⁷ Personal Communication with City staff, December 17, 2008 and December 22, 2008.

days for application submittal, staff review and response to comments, an additional 90 to 135 days for the CEQA review processing including the applicant hiring a consultant and the preparation of an Initial Study and mitigation measures, 60 days for comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and, finally, about 30 days for Design Review. The process for a multifamily affordable housing development would take longer than 9 months if a complete EIR is necessary.

In comparison, a 60-unit, market rate single-family development would take about 90 days, an additional month for staff review and response to comments, since single-family developments are not given priority processing. In addition, a market rate single-family development of around 60 units would actually take years to build since the Building Department only issues 9 building permits per year under the Growth Management System.

Constraints to Housing for Persons with Disabilities

On January 1, 2002, SB 520 went into effect, requiring local jurisdictions to analyze potential governmental constraints to the development, improvement, and maintenance of housing for persons with disabilities as part of a jurisdiction's housing element update. Under SB 520, housing elements must also include one of the following 1) a program to remove constraints, or 2) provide reasonable accommodations for, "housing designed for occupancy by, or with supportive services for, persons with disabilities." A jurisdiction can fulfill this second clause in a variety of ways including establishing policies that facilitate the provision of housing that is physically accessible to people with mobility impairments, residential care facilities for individuals with Alzheimer's, housing for persons with AIDS/HIV, and transitional housing that serves homeless with disabilities.

Senate Bill 520 Analysis

The City of St. Helena does not have a formal process of granting reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities within the City's zoning, permit processing or building codes. Overall, although the City does not have a reasonable accommodations ordinance, the City does already comply with certain zoning regulations for group homes, and has already established a local process for retrofitting homes for the disabled. In addition, the City makes its zoning, permit processing, and building laws easily accessible on the City website.

Zoning and Land Use

The zoning code and land use designations for the City of St. Helena have a mixed record of accomplishments in regards to SB 520 regulations. The City of St. Helena allows an intermediate care facility, and residential or developmentally disabled nursing facilities serving six or fewer persons as a right in the LR-1A, LR, MR, and HR zones, as required by SB520.⁷⁸ Therefore, small

⁷⁸ City of St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17.

group homes are permitted by right in the majority of residential zones in the City, and these same districts allow larger group homes of more than six persons with a conditional use permit (CUP) as required by SB 520. No other regulations in the zoning code or land use designations restrict the siting of either group homes or housing for other special needs populations, including disabled persons.⁷⁹

The City's parking and loading requirements do not have specific provisions related to persons with disabilities, but there is a provision stating that "rest homes, convalescent hospitals, residential care and similar group care facilities" require only one space for each four beds, which is a reduced requirement compared to the two parking spaces required for typical "one-and two-family dwelling units."⁸⁰ Consequently, the reduced parking requirements for group care facilities decrease the parking requirements for some disabled persons, but parking requirements for residential development need to serve all disabled persons. In addition, federally subsidized senior citizen housing for low- and moderate-income residents is subject to reduced off-street parking requirements.

The City appears to comply with Fair Housing Laws in respect to occupancy standards since the City does not make a distinction between families and unrelated adults of less than six persons.⁸¹

The remaining requirements under SB 520 may not have been met by the City of St. Helena because the City of St. Helena has not conducted a complete review of the City's compliance with Fair Housing Law.

Permits and Processing

The majority of the City of St. Helena permitting and processing procedures do not appear to negatively affect the ability to design or retrofit homes that will be accessible for the disabled, or, to constrain the siting of group homes. The City, however, applies the same process required for other renovations to retrofitting homes and the City does not have a special process for such

⁷⁹ Government Section Code 12926 defined physical disability as including, "but is not limited to, all of the following: (1) Having any physiological disease, disorder, condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss that does both of the following: (A) Affects one or more of the following body systems: neurological, immunological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory, including speech organs, cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genitourinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine."

⁸⁰ City of St. Helena Municipal Code, Chapter 17.124: Parking and Loading Requirements

⁸¹ City of St. Helena Municipal Code, Chapter 17.04 defines family as follows Family" means any of the following groups living together in the same dwelling unit as a single housekeeping unit:

1. Any number of persons related by blood, marriage or legal adoption;
2. A nuclear family identified by extended cohabitation;
3. A group not exceeding five persons whose interpersonal relationships relating to shared household expenses, duties and private lives are indistinguishable from groups listed in subsections 1 and 2 above.

retrofits.

As discussed above, group homes with fewer than six persons are permitted by right, and group homes with more than six persons are permitted with a CUP in the residential zones, and no additional permits are required. This is consistent with the City's requirements for other larger group quarters such as condominiums, townhomes, apartments, and dwelling groups containing more than four units, which also require a CUP.

There are no additional requirements placed on group homes providing on-site services because they fall under the definition of intermediate care and nursing facilities, which allow for on-site care.⁸²

Building Codes

The City of St. Helena adopted the California Uniform Building Code in January 2008, and the changes made to this Code by the City, enumerated in the Governmental Constraints section of this document, do not unfairly treat group homes differently than other residential uses. Nevertheless, no specific exemptions to the Uniform Building Code exist for housing for disabled persons. The City of St. Helena does not have local universal design requirements, and there are no established City policies to grant reasonable accommodations related to building codes and the issuance of building permits at this time.

Conclusion

The City of St. Helena will need to adopt a Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance in this Housing Element Planning period in order to ensure that its zoning, land use procedures, building codes, and occupancy standards comply with SB 520. In addition, the new Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance must allow for parking exemption for all disabled persons.

Summary

The possible non-governmental constraints discussed above include the price of land, the cost of construction, the availability of financing, and the flooding of the Napa River. Land costs represent a significant component of the cost of housing development in St. Helena because the price per acre of recent vacant residential land sales amounted to between \$1.8 million to \$2.5 million. The cost of construction in St. Helena does not appear to constrain development and is in line with construction costs seen throughout the region. Obtaining financing for development projects can be hard given that the availability of capital is decreasing nationwide, and once a

⁸² The State of California Department of Developmental Services defines an intermediate care facility as "are health facilities licensed by the Licensing and Certification Division of the California Department of Public Health to provide 24-hour-per-day services." <http://www.dds.ca.gov/ICF/Home.cfm> Accessed December 17, 2008

development is complete it is hard for potential residents to qualify for mortgages.

The governmental controls analyzed in this section were land use controls, codes and enforcements, on-and off-site improvements, fees and exactions, processing and permit procedures, and regulations affecting housing for persons with disabilities. The land use controls including zoning and current General Plan land use designations do not constrain residential development; however, some changes are necessary to streamline the Design Review process. The St. Helena zoning code allows development of up to 20 dwelling units per acre in the HR zone and the density can be even higher if a developer chooses to utilize the City's density bonus. In addition, the zoning code sets mandatory minimums on the densities so that land zoned MR, for example cannot be built at less than 2 dwelling units per acre. The Growth Management System does not appear to place an undue burden on market rate development, since there has never been a year when the demand for residential building permits has exceed the number of available permits. Furthermore, housing projects affordable to households at up to 120 percent of AMI are exempt from the GMS. One General Plan policy that may need revision is the Design Review process, because the criteria are subjective in nature and may add a significant amount of time to the development process. Changes to the Design Review process are being explored as part of St. Helena's current General Plan update, scheduled for completion in 2010.

The on- and off- site improvement standards related to water, sewer, parking and other miscellaneous regulations impact housing development in a variety of different ways. The sewer capacity will be sufficient to support additional development pending the approval of a capacity increase by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The water capacity during a normal year is sufficient and is expected to remain sufficient through 2010, but there will always be water shortages in dry years. The remaining parking and miscellaneous requirements do not place an undue burden on housing development.

Neither the building codes nor the building fees represent a governmental constraint to development. St. Helena adopted the 20007 California Building Codes Standards, and although they have made some changes to the Code such as seismic control measures, these changes were necessary for safety and so not unduly affect housing production. The fee structure for both single-family and multifamily development reflects the costs of the development to the City, and therefore facilitates development.

The fact that the Flood Protection project has not been completed as anticipated in the 2002 Housing Element has limited the housing development on some of the sites identified in the 2002 housing sites inventory. It is important for the City to continue to progress towards the completion of the project to make development feasible along the Napa River.

The time it takes for a developer to complete the City's permitting and processing procedures for single-family detached subdivisions is manageable. In addition, the City's estimation that it will take eight months for the approval of the proposed Mercy Housing project is also reasonable, however, in reality of the process may take longer and should be closely monitored.

Finally, the City will need to adopt a Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance to comply with SB 520 and provide a formal process through which a disabled person can request changes in City policies to meet their housing needs.

Table 35: St. Helena Residential Zoning Districts (Page 1 of 2)

Zoning District	Residential Uses Permitted as of Right	Conditionally Permitted Uses or Special Requirements	Minimum Lot Area		Minimum and Maximum Units per Acre	Minimum Lot Width (feet)	Setback (feet)		Yard (feet) (a)		Maximum Bldg. Height (feet)	FAR (b)
			Acres	Square Feet			Front	Side	Rear	Side		
Agricultural Preserve (AP)	One single-family dwelling	Farmworker housing and seasonal farm labor camps	40	0	0.03	n.a.	20	20	20	20	35	n.a.
Twenty-Acre Agriculture (A-20)	One single-family dwelling; one second unit	More than one single-family dwelling and farm labor housing	20	0	0.2	n.a.	50	50	20	20	30	n.a.
Winery (W)	One single-family dwelling; one second unit	More than one single-family dwelling; owner and caretaker dwellings; Farm labor housing above allowed densities	20	0	0.2	300	100	50	75	50	45	n.a.
Woodland Watershed (WW)	One single-family dwelling	One second unit under certain environmental conditions	5 to 40	217,800 to 1,742,400	0.03 to 0.2	20	20 to 50	20 to 50 (c)	20 to 50	20 to 50 (c)	36	
Low Density Residential One Acre Minimum (LR-1A)	One single-family dwelling; Intermediate care, residential or developmentally disabled, and nursing facilities serving six or fewer persons; permanent mobile home; one second unit	One single-family dwelling below the minimum density; Intermediate care facility, residential or developmentally disabled nursing facility serving seven or more persons	1	(d) 0	1	70	20 to 30	20 to 30 (e)	20 to 30	20 to 30 (e)	30	n.a.
Low Density Residential (LR)	One single-family dwelling; Intermediate care, residential or developmentally disabled, and nursing facilities serving six or fewer persons; permanent mobile home; one second unit	One single-family below the minimum density; Intermediate care facility, residential or developmentally disabled nursing facility serving seven or more persons	1	(d) 0	1 to 5	70	20 to 30	20 to 30 (e)	20 to 30	20 to 30 (e)	30	n.a.

Notes:

(a) A yard is defined as open space inside the established interior lot lines.

(b) Floor Area Ratio.

(c) Setback and yard requirements in the Woodland Watershed (WW) district may vary and are dependent upon the effect of certain health and safety considerations.

(d) Parcels can be less than one acre if created as a result of lot line adjustments, so long as the number of parcels existing prior to the lot line adjustment does not increase and that no lots are less than 7,000 square feet.

(e) Setback and yard requirements in the Low Density Residential One Acre Minimum (LR-1A), Low Density Residential (LR) and Medium Density Residential (MR) districts vary and are dependent upon the height of the structure.

(f) Floor area ratios (FARs) in the Medium Density Residential (MR) and High Density Residential (HD) districts vary and dependent upon the net parcel area.

Sources: City of St. Helena, Municipal Code Title 17, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 35: St. Helena Residential Zoning Districts (Page 2 of 2)

Zoning District	Residential Uses Permitted as of Right	Conditionally Permitted Uses or Special Requirements	Minimum Lot Area		Minimum and Maximum Units per Acre	Minimum Lot Width (feet)	Setback (feet)		Yard (feet) (a)		Maximum Bldg. Height (feet)	FAR (b)
			Acres	Square Feet			Front	Side	Rear	Side		
Medium Density Residential (MR)	One single-family dwelling; Intermediate care facility, residential or developmentally disabled nursing facility serving six or fewer persons; permanent mobile home; one second unit	One single-family below the minimum density; Intermediate care facility, residential or developmentally disabled nursing facility serving seven or more persons; small lot development; condominium or townhouse	0.16	7,000	5.1 to 16	70	20 to 30	20 to 30	(e) 20 to 30	(e) 20 to 30	30	.21 to (f) .36
High Density Residential (HR)	One single-family dwelling; Intermediate care facility, residential or developmentally disabled nursing facility serving six or fewer persons; permanent mobile home; one second unit Multiple-family dwellings, apartments and dwelling groups containing four units or less	One single-family dwelling below the minimum density; Intermediate care facility, residential or developmentally disabled nursing facility serving seven or more persons; small lot development; condominium or townhouse; Multiple-family dwellings, apartments and dwelling groups containing more than four units	0.16	7,000	16.1 to 28	70	20	20	10	20	30 to 35	.21 to (f) .36

Notes:

- (a) A yard is defined as open space inside the established interior lot lines.
- (b) Floor Area Ratio.
- (c) Setback and yard requirements in the Woodland Watershed (WW) district may vary and are dependent upon the effect of certain health and safety considerations.
- (d) Parcels can be less than one acre if created as a result of lot line adjustments, so long as the number of parcels existing prior to the lot line adjustment does not increase and that no lots are less than 7,000 square feet.
- (e) Setback and yard requirements in the Low Density Residential One Acre Minimum (LR-1A), Low Density Residential (LR) and Medium Density Residential (MR) districts vary and are dependent upon the height of the structure.
- (f) Floor area ratios (FARs) in the Medium Density Residential (MR) and High Density Residential (HD) districts vary and dependent upon the net parcel area.

Sources: City of St. Helena, Municipal Code Title 17, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Opportunities for Energy Conservation

Government Code Section 65583(a)(7) requires the “analysis of opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development.”⁸³ This is important due to the key role played by energy efficiency in determining the relative affordability of housing. As long as design, installation, and equipment costs do not exceed potential energy savings, lower rates of energy usage decrease utility costs for residents, making a housing unit more affordable. The discussion that follows outlines current State policies and development standards along with local City policies that promote energy conservation for new and existing development in the City of St. Helena. Additionally, increasing attention is being paid to the role of the design and location of residential development in addressing greenhouse gas emissions at the local and regional levels.

Instituted by legislative action in 1978 to reduce overall energy consumption statewide, the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards set thresholds and guidelines for energy efficiency for both residential and nonresidential construction. The revised standards for 2008 will go into effect August 1, 2009 under Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations. Title 24 is otherwise known as the California Building Standards Code. All construction initiated after this date will be required to comply with the new energy efficiency standards.⁸⁴ At the current time, the City of St. Helena implements the 2007 version of Title 24, the California Building Standards Code, which includes the most recent version of the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards.

In addition to the Building Energy Efficiency Standards, Part 11 of Title 24 outlines California’s new Green Building Standards Code. Adopted by the California Building Standards Commission on July 17, 2008, the Standards are currently voluntary but will become mandatory for all new construction, both residential and nonresidential, in 2010. The 2010 grace period is intended to allow local governments time to adopt the new building codes in a way that is appropriate for their needs.^{85 86} St. Helena will need to adopt these Standards within this Housing Element planning period (July 12009 through June 30, 2014).

⁸³ HCD Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements, “Opportunities for Energy Conservation.” Accessed September 24, 2008. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element/index.html.

⁸⁴ California Energy Commission. “Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations: California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings.” Accessed September 24, 2008. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/>.

⁸⁵ Associated Press. “California Adopts Statewide Green Building Code.” *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 17, 2008. Accessed August 22, 2008. <http://www.sfgate.com>.

⁸⁶ California Building Standards Commission. “California Green Building Standards Code, Part 11, Title 24.” Accessed September 24, 2008. http://www.bsc.ca.gov/prpsd_stds/approvedstandards07.htm.

On a local level, the 1993 City of St. Helena General Plan Land Use and Growth Management Element addresses energy conservation for residential development by including goals and policies geared toward compact urban development and increased residential densities which support walkable communities and reduce energy usage and greenhouse gas emissions related to transportation between residential areas and shopping or employment centers. These goals and policies align well with the intent of recently enacted State legislation dealing with reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, including AB 32 and SB 375. The typical reduction in the size of individual residential units associated with higher density development also leads to reductions in energy usage and costs for heating and cooling. Finally, an emphasis on providing housing for all income levels increases the likelihood that persons employed in St. Helena will find the opportunity to live in the City, and reduce costs and greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation.^{87 88}

The 2002 City of St. Helena Housing Element, in accordance with State mandated guidelines, sets goals for efficient land use, higher density and mixed-use development, and residential design standards. In addition, the 2002 Housing Element established two specific policies that encourage the use of solar and alternative energy technologies and encourage energy conservation. Policy 5A promotes alternative energy use, suggests the adoption of a “solar access ordinance,”⁸⁹ and requires the City to provide information to the public regarding alternative energy technologies.⁹⁰ Policy 5B requires the City to promote energy conservation in new and rehabilitated housing, to require cost-effective energy conservation techniques that promote long-term affordability for new housing, to offer low-interest energy conservation loans, and to make information available to the public on potential energy conservation measures.

As of January 2007, the City of St. Helena had begun implementation of 2002 Housing Element Policy 5A by reducing building permit and inspection fees for photovoltaic system installation. The City also participated in the Climate Protection Task Force, initiated in 2006, and the Build It Green Public Agency Council. By June 2008, the City had passed a fee waiver policy for photovoltaic systems and was in the process of drafting a green building ordinance, expected to reach public hearing by mid-2008. Policy 5B, from the 2002 Housing Element had yet to be implemented beyond what was already required by the most recent adoption of the Building Code,

⁸⁷ City of St. Helena. “General Plan: Land Use and Growth Management Element.” 1993. Accessed September 24, 2008. http://www.sthelena2030.com/global/pdf_files/2_lu.pdf.

⁸⁸ City of St. Helena. “General Plan Update Working Paper: Sustainability.” October, 2007. Accessed September 24, 2008. <http://www.sthelena2030.com/documents/>.

⁸⁹ City of St. Helena. “General Plan: Housing Element.” 2002. Accessed September 25, 2008. <http://www.sthelena2030.com/documents/>

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

however, a local Green Building Ordinance has been developed and will be presented to the Board of Supervisors for adoption.

According to the October 2007 General Plan Update Working Paper on Sustainability, there are four main issue areas under consideration for the current General Plan Update process relating to how sustainability may impact the potential for energy conservation in residential developments. Issue S-1 directly addresses issues of energy and energy usage by acknowledging that the City has limited control over its energy sources. The City may decide to support local energy generation through requirements to incorporate photovoltaic systems into new developments, provide incentives for local solar and wind power generation, and continue to waive fees for installation of photovoltaic power systems. In addition, the City may pursue incentives to increase the use of energy efficient appliances.⁹¹

Issues S-2 and S-4 pertain to development patterns, transportation, and the jobs/housing balance, which generally correspond with the intent and direction of the previous General Plan and Housing Element. Issue S-3 presents the possibility of a new City policy highlighting the potential to increase use of green building practices for new residential and nonresidential development within the City of St. Helena. In particular, the working paper suggests policies related to Issue S-3 that mandate or encourage the use of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) or Energy Star design standards.⁹²

Overall, the City is in compliance with State standards and once the local Green Building Ordinance is adopted St. Helena may even exceed these minimum standards.

⁹¹ City of St. Helena. "General Plan Update Working Paper: Sustainability." October, 2007. Accessed September 24, 2008. http://www.sthelenahelena2030.com/global/pdf_files/working_paper_sustainability.pdf.

⁹² *Ibid.*

Sites Inventory and Analysis and Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types

State law requires that a Housing Element include an inventory of available land that is appropriately zoned and suitable for housing development to accommodate the City's regional housing needs allocation.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) identifies the supply of housing necessary to meet the existing and projected growth in population and households in California. Each of the 38 Councils of Governments (CoGs) in the State receives a RHNA from HCD that specifies the number of units, by affordability level, that the CoG region must plan to accommodate during their Housing Element planning period. Each CoG then distributes the allocations throughout the cities and counties pursuant to article 65584 of the California Government Code. The allocation must be consistent with the following objectives:

- 65584(d)(1) "Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low and very low-income households"
- 65584(d)(2) "Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns."
- 65584(d)(3) "Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing."
- 65584(d)(4) "Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent decennial United States census."⁹³

HCD determined the RHNA for the ABAG region, consistent with the objectives above.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation, 2007-2014

Table 26 shows that the City received a Regional Housing Needs Allocation of 121 units for the compliance period of January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2014. From January 1, 2007 through June, 2008 developers built or the City issued building permits for five units. The City also approved 47 additional units for development. This equates seven very low-income, five low-income, eight

¹⁶ California Government Code Section 65584.

moderate-income, and 27 above moderate-income units in St. Helena that have at least received City approvals and have been either completed or are expected to be completed by June 30, 2014. Consequently, accommodate its remaining unmet RHNA, the City must provide land suitably zoned, which could be feasibly developed with an additional 23 very low-income, 16 low-income, 17 moderate-income, and 18 above moderate-income units by June 30, 2014.

Housing Sites Inventory

The process of identifying sites for the development of housing to accommodate the City's regional housing need allocation is on-going as part of the public participation process for the Housing Element Update and the General Plan Update, and will be completed as the Draft Housing Element Update nears completion in mid-January, 2009.

Preliminary Sites Inventory Process

The initial step in developing a housing sites inventory for the Housing Element Update was to start with the housing sites inventory in the 2002 Housing Element. The 2002 Housing Element identified approximately 45 housing development sites. BAE and City staff reviewed that list of sites and then, based on a review of zoning maps, aerial maps, and staff's general knowledge of sites within the City, developed an updated and expanded list of sites for consideration as possible housing development sites for the updated Housing Element. In total, this inventory included approximately 27 residential sites scattered throughout the City, and distributed among the various residential zones. In addition, the inventory included approximately 11 sites that do not currently have residential zoning, but which might be considered for re-zoning in order to accommodate residential development during the 2007 to 2014 Housing Element planning period.

Housing Element Subcommittee Review of Preliminary Sites

BAE and City staff reviewed the preliminary list of housing sites with Housing Element Subcommittee (HESC) members at their second meeting, on November 20, 2008. Discussions involved the practicability of developing the various sites for different types of housing. Sites that were deemed to have a low likelihood of being developed for housing were removed, and other sites with potential for housing development were added to the list. Based on input from the HES, BAE and City staff refined the list of potential sites.

Housing Sites Exercise at Housing Element Public Workshop #1

The first housing element public workshop on December 1, 2008 provided an opportunity to obtain broad-based community input on potential housing sites. Housing sites were the topic of one work station at the workshop, at which participants were provided with a large blow-up map of the various housing sites, as well as a survey form that allowed them to provide input on the list of preliminary sites. Participants were asked to provide comments on the suitability of sites on the list for housing development and/or to provide suggestions for additional sites that should be

considered for housing development.

Review of Housing Sites at Joint GPUSC/HESC Meeting

On December 17, 2008, the General Plan Update Steering Committee (GPUSC) and the HESC were scheduled to hold a joint public meeting. One topic of the meeting was housing sites. This public discussion provided further input from the full GPUSC as well as the HESC on the confirmation of the inventory of housing development sites to include in the Draft Housing Element Update, as well as confirmation of the specific types of housing development to target for the various sites.

BAE and City staff will review the outcome of the December 17th meeting discussions on housing sites and prepare a final housing sites inventory for inclusion in the Draft Housing Element Update. BAE will then conduct an analysis of the constraints to housing development, infrastructure availability, likely housing unit carrying capacity, and suitability of the various sites to accommodate housing that could be affordable to the different income categories. This analysis will determine the City's ability to accommodate its Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) for the 2007 to 2014 time period. If necessary, this analysis will identify recommended Housing Element policies and/or programs that would ensure that the City can fully accommodate its RHNA, either through existing sites that are zoned and available for housing development, or through Housing Element implementation actions that can make additional sites available for housing development to accommodate through June 30, 2014, to accommodate RHNA needs.

Zoning to Accommodate the Development of Affordable Housing to Lower Income Households

Government Code Section 65583(2) sets default minimum allowable densities for zoning presumed to accommodate housing affordable for lower-income households. The Government Code classifies jurisdictions in four different categories; all cities in Napa County are categorized as suburban jurisdictions, where the default minimum density necessary to provide affordable housing is at least 20 dwelling units per acre.⁹⁴ The City of St. Helena Municipal Code already allows for residential development of 20 dwelling units per acre in the high-density residential zone.

Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types

Multifamily Rental Housing

Zoning for multifamily housing has been updated as recommended by Policy 1C-2 of the 2002 Housing Element. Now the St. Helena Municipal Code permits multifamily dwellings, apartments,

⁹⁴ Department of Housing and Community Development, Division of Housing Policy Development, "Amendment of State Housing Element Law – AB 2348" June 9, 2005.

and dwelling groups with fewer than five units, by right in the High Density Residential (HR) zoning district. Projects permitted by right require only routine approvals and are subject to a design review by the Planning Commission. Multifamily projects with five or more proposed units require a conditional use permit and must undergo a public review process. In addition, the Medium Density Residential (MR) district was also revised to permit the construction of attached duplex or triplex units with a conditional use permit.^{95 96} As discussed previously, the City of St. Helena's approval of two apartment complexes as part of the Magnolia Oaks and Vineland Station developments indicates that the conditional use permit requirement does not represent a constraint on the development of multifamily rental housing in St. Helena

Housing for Permanent and Seasonal Agricultural Employees

Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6 of the California Health and Safety Code establish specific requirements for the permitting of agricultural employee housing in a jurisdiction's zoning code. Specifically, Section 17021.5 mandates that "employee housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees shall be deemed a single-family structure with a residential land use."⁹⁷ Furthermore, designated employee housing, as defined above, cannot be subject to conditional use permit requirements, zoning variance, fees, taxes, or any other requirement other than those pertaining to a traditional single-family structure. Section 17021.6 pertains to larger employee housing facilities featuring a maximum of 36 beds in group quarters, or 12 single-family units. Under this legislation, such units are deemed an agricultural land use and cannot be subject to any restrictions, conditional use requirements, zoning variance, fees, taxes, or other requirements not imposed on other agricultural uses in the same zone.

At present, the City of St. Helena Municipal Code does not directly identify agricultural employee housing as a use permitted by right under Sections 17021.5 or 17021.6 of the California Health and Safety Code. However, the City of St. Helena Municipal Code does permit "farm labor housing for transient labor or agricultural employees in excess of the density limitations of the district"⁹⁸ as a conditional use in the Twenty Acre Agriculture (A-20) and Winery (W) zoning districts. Thus, farmworker housing constructed in compliance with the maximum density requirements for the above zones (one unit per five acres) is assumed to be a permitted use. Under the Agricultural Preserve (AP) zone, farmworker housing and seasonal farm labor camps are again considered a conditional use and are not clearly permitted as an agricultural use as required under Section 17021.6 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, the City may wish to consider amending the

⁹⁵ City of St. Helena. Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element. June 2008.

⁹⁶ City of St. Helena. St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17. Accessed October 2, 2008. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelenal/>.

⁹⁷ California Government Health and Safety Code 17021.5 (b)

⁹⁸ City of St. Helena. St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17. Accessed October 2, 2008. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelenal/>.

Municipal Code to expressly state that agricultural employee housing for six or fewer employees is permitted by right in all zones that allow single-family residential development by right, and permit by right agricultural employee housing of up to 12 units in zones where agriculture is permitted by right, in order to comply with the California Health and Safety Code.

Zoning for Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, and Supportive Housing

Government Code Section 65583(a)(4) requires that St. Helena identify one or more zoning districts that permit the development of at least one, year-round, emergency shelter, without conditional use permit, and with capacity to accommodate the jurisdictions homeless and transitional housing needs.^{99 100} In addition, recent amendments to state housing element law that came into effect January 1, 2008 as part of SB2 require cities to designate zoning where emergency shelters are permitted by right within one year of the adoption of the housing element or enter into a multijurisdictional agreement with neighboring jurisdictions to for development an emergency shelter to address the unmet needs within two years of the adoption of the housing element.

Currently, the Low Density Residential (LR), Low Density Residential One Acre Minimum (LR-1A), Medium Density Residential (MR) and High Density Residential (HR) zoning districts permit by right any residential facility serving six or fewer persons. Residential facilities serving more than six persons are permitted with a conditional use permit. Under the City's zoning code, a residential facility is defined as "any family home, group-care facility, or similar facility determined pursuant to state law, for 24-hour nonmedical care of persons in need of personal service, supervision, or assistance essential for sustaining the activities of daily living or for the protection of the individual."¹⁰¹ Thus, the City allows for supportive or transitional housing in the form of residential facilities, but does not directly identify transitional housing as a permitted use in any zoning district.

Policy 1E-1 of the 2002 Housing Element required the City to define "emergency shelters" and "transitional housing facilities" as part of the zoning code in addition to permitting these uses with conditional permit in the Central Business (CB), Service Commercial (SC), Business and Professional Office (BPO), and Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) zoning districts. However, as of June 2008, no steps had been taken to implement this 2002 Housing Element policy, and the City has

⁹⁹ Building Block for Effective Housing Elements, "Adequate Sites Inventory and Analysis: Zoning for Emergency Shelters and Transitional Housing". http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element/index.html. Accessed on June 13, 2008.

¹⁰⁰ Senate Bill 2, Chapter 633. Amendment to Acts 655582, 65583 and 65589.5. Approved by the Governor on October 13, 2007. Effective January 1, 2008.

¹⁰¹ City of St. Helena. St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17. Accessed October 2, 2008. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelenal/>.

not yet taken steps to comply with SB 2 regulations.¹⁰²

Single Room Occupancy (SRO)

Single-room occupancy residential units are a traditional form of affordable housing for low-income individuals consisting of a single room, often between 80 and 250 square feet in size, with or without cooking and sanitary facilities, that is rented out, often on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis. The St. Helena Municipal Code currently permits single-room occupancy type units in the form of Lodging Houses serving up to two paying occupants in an owner occupied dwelling, as an accessory use in the Low Density Residential (LR), Medium Density Residential (MR) and High Density Residential (HR) zoning districts. As defined under Chapter 17.04 of the Municipal Code, lodging houses are buildings other than hotels, motels or bed and breakfast inns, where individuals can pay a rent in exchange for accommodations, including room and board, or board alone. Lodging houses serving more than two and up to five occupants require a use permit. Accessory structures featuring cooking and sanitation facilities are required to meet design and building standards similar to those of standard single-family and second units. Units without such facilities are subject to significantly fewer requirements and are more likely to address low-income housing needs.¹⁰³

Factory Built Housing and Mobile Homes

Government Code Section 65852.3(a) requires that manufactured and mobile homes, including the lots on which they are installed, meeting certain standards of construction and be subject to the same development standards that apply to conventional, stick built, single-family homes.¹⁰⁴ In accordance with this legislation, the St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17, defines a single-family dwelling to include a “mobilehome constructed to meet 1976 HUD standards, when placed on a permanent foundation, which is designed or used exclusively as a residence, including only one dwelling unit.”¹⁰⁵ Thus, mobile units meeting the above definition are permitted under single-family site development standards in all zones that allow single-family housing units by right.

In addition, the Low Density Residential (LR), Low Density Residential One Acre Minimum (LR-1A), Medium Density Residential (MR) and High Density Residential (HR) districts specifically permit as an allowed use, permanent mobile homes constructed in accordance with the 1974 safety

¹⁰² City of St. Helena. Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element. June 2008.

¹⁰³ City of St. Helena. St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17. Accessed October 2, 2008. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelenal/>.

¹⁰⁴ GCS 65852.3(a) standards include the constructed or purchased after October 1976, certified under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, and installed on a foundation system pursuant to Section 18551 of the Health and Safety Code.

¹⁰⁵ City of St. Helena. St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17. Accessed October 2, 2008. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelenal/>.

standards and installed on a permanent foundation. Chapter 17.100 of the Municipal Code sets forth requirements for the Mobilehome Park Overlay (MHP) zoning district that applies the State Mobilehome Parks Act to the establishment and operation of mobilehome parks within the boundaries of the City of St. Helena.^{106 107} Under these provisions of the Municipal Code, St. Helena fully adheres to the State standards regarding manufactured and mobile homes, and mobile home parks.

Second Units

The St. Helena Municipal Code defines a second unit as “an attached or detached residential dwelling unit which provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel as a single-family dwelling is situated.”¹⁰⁸ A second unit may also be an efficiency unit or manufactured home, as defined by the California Health and Safety Code. In compliance with State law, the St. Helena Municipal Code permits the construction of second units in all residential zoning districts. Units within the Woodlands and Watershed (WW) district are held to a higher standard due to potential environmental issues that would require mitigation. Second units meeting specified standards are permitted and others require a conditional use permit.

Since the previous housing element, the maximum size limit for second units increased from 600 square feet to 850 square feet. This amendment was intended to encourage full-time occupancy of units while maintaining affordability to moderate-income households. Additional incentives have been added, including increasing the potential floor area up to 400 square feet for primary dwelling units that include a second unit.

Summary

[Pending the completion of the Housing Sites Inventory a map of the sites will also be included]

¹⁰⁶ Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements. Adequate Sites Inventory and Analysis: Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types. Accessed October 2, 2008. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element/index.html.

¹⁰⁷ City of St. Helena. St. Helena Municipal Code, Title 17. <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/sthelen/>. Accessed October 2, 2008.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

Table 36: St. Helena Regional Housing Needs Allocation, 2007 - 2014

	<u>Very Low- Income</u>	<u>Low- Income</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Above Moderate</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Original ABAG Allocation	30	21	25	45	121
<i>Less Built or Building Permits Issued to Date (a)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Less Units Approved to Date (a)</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>47</i>
Remaining Balance	23	16	17	18	74

Note:

(a) January 1, 2007 through June 2008.

Sources: ABAG, 2008; City of St. Helena Annual Report of Compliance with Housing Element, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Table 37: Available Land Inventory Summary

[Pending the completion of the sites inventory analysis]

Appendix A: Definitions

Terms Related to Geography

Bay Area: For the purpose of this Housing Element, the Bay Area is defined to include the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Sonoma, and Solano.

Terms Related to Households

Average Household Size: Average household size equals the number of people living in households divided by the number of occupied housing units in a given area.

Disabled: “A long-lasting physical, mental, or emotional condition. This condition can make it difficult for a person to do activities such as walking, climbing stairs, dressing, bathing, learning, or remembering. This condition can also impede a person from being able to go outside the home alone or to work at a job or business.”¹⁰⁹

Elderly: Persons 65 years of age or older according to the 2000 Census. However, the Comprehensive housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data set, published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development defines elderly as ages 62 and over.

Family Household: Two or more related persons occupying a dwelling unit.

Household: A person or group of persons occupying a single dwelling unit. This does not include persons living in group quarters, such as dormitories, convalescent homes, or prisons.

Large Family: A family of five (5) or more persons.

Non-Family Household: A single person living alone, or two or more unrelated persons sharing a dwelling unit.

Overcrowding: More than one person per room. Also see *Room*.

Terms Related to Income Levels

Extremely-Low Income Household: A household whose income, with adjustments for household size, does not exceed 30 percent of the Area Median Family Income (AMFI), as published annually

¹⁰⁹ American Factfinder. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=DEC&_sbmenuId=&_lang=en&_ts=. Accessed June 12, 2008.

by the State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development.

Very Low-Income Household: A household whose income, with adjustments for household size, does not exceed 50 percent of the Area Median Family Income (AMFI), as published annually by the State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development.

Low-Income Household: A household whose income, with adjustments for household size, does not exceed 80 percent of the Area Median Family Income (AMFI), as published annually by the State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development.

Moderate-Income Household: A household whose income, with adjustment for household size, falls between 80 percent and 120 percent of the Area Median Family Income (AMFI), as published annually by the State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development.

Above Moderate-Income Household: A household whose income, with adjustment for household size, is greater than 120% of the Area Median Family Income (AMFI), as published annually by the State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development.

Terms Related to Housing Units

Affordable Housing: As defined by federal guidelines, a housing unit is affordable if the household spends less than 30 percent of its total gross income on the costs of housing, including rent or mortgage payments.

Room: The 2000 Census defines a room as “whole rooms used for living purposes...including living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, finished recreation rooms, enclosed porches suitable for year-round use, and lodgers' rooms. Excluded are strips or pullman kitchens, bathrooms, open porches, balconies, halls or foyers, half-rooms, utility rooms, unfinished attics or basements, or other unfinished space used for storage. A partially divided room is a separate room only if there is a partition from floor to ceiling, but not if the partition consists solely of shelves or cabinets.”

Transitional Housing: “A [housing] project that has as its purpose facilitating the movement of homeless individuals to permanent housing within a reasonable amount of time (usually 24 months). Transitional housing includes housing primarily designed to serve deinstitutionalized homeless individuals and other homeless individuals with mental or physical disabilities and homeless families with children.”¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ Department of Housing and Urban Development. <http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/library/glossary/t/>. Accessed June 12, 2008.

Terms Related to Employment

Employed Residents: Employed residents equals the number of local area residents who are currently working. This is not the same as employment, as some residents may commute to work outside the jurisdiction where they live.

Employment: Area employment equals the number of jobs in an area for which employers pay workers wages or salaries. This is not the same as employed residents, since some workers may commute from outside the jurisdiction in which they work.

Terms Related to Government

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG): ABAG is the official comprehensive planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area region. ABAG's mission is to strengthen cooperation and coordination among local governments located in the nine Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma.¹¹¹

California Building Standards Code: Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, contains the regulations that govern the construction of buildings, residential or nonresidential, in the State of California.

California Code of Regulations: The California Code of Regulations is the official publication of regulations adopted, amended or repealed by California State agencies under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). Regulations that have been properly adopted and filed with the Secretary of State are considered to have the force of law.

California Energy Code: Section 6 under Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the 2005 Edition of the California Energy Code (CEC), sometimes referred to as "Title 24", contains energy conservation standards applicable to all residential and nonresidential buildings in the State of California.

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo): LAFCos are responsible for administering California Government Code Section 56000 et seq., also known as the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000. LAFCos are charged with encouraging orderly formation and development of local governmental agencies, promoting the efficient management of municipal services, and preserving agricultural lands and open space through municipal service reviews, annexations, and the establishment of spheres of influence. The Napa County LAFCO is comprised of two members of the Board of Supervisors, two city council members, and one

¹¹¹ Association of Bay Area Governments, 2008. <http://www.abag.ca.gov/>. Accessed June 6, 2008.

member of the public.¹¹²

Napa County League of Governments (NCLOG): Established in early 2002, the purpose of the NCLOG is to address of common concern, such as transportation, housing, economic development, agricultural preservation, environmental protection, and social equity. The NCLOG consists of the cities of American Canyon, Calistoga, Napa, St. Helena and the Town of Yountville, along with the Unincorporated Area.¹¹³

Senate Bill 1087: Effective January 1, 2006, this California State Senate Bill “requires local governments to provide a copy of the adopted housing element to water and sewer providers. In addition, water and sewer providers must grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower-income households.”¹¹⁴

Senate Bills 221 and 610: These companion measures became effective January 1, 2002. “Under SB 610, water assessments must be furnished to local governments for inclusion in any environmental documentation for certain projects (as defined in Water Code 10912(a)) subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. Under SB221, approval by a city or county of certain residential subdivisions requires an affirmative written verification of sufficient water supply.”¹¹⁵

Title 24: See California Building Standards Code, and California Energy Code.

¹¹² LAFCO of Napa County. 2008. <http://www.napa.lafco.ca.gov/>. Accessed June 6, 2008.

¹¹³ Napa County League of Governments, 2003. <http://www.nclog.org/>. Accessed June 6, 2008.

¹¹⁴ Cathy E. Creswell. “Memo to Planning Directors, Public Works Directors, Water and Sewer Service Providers, Interested Parties, Department of Housing and Community Development”, Sacramento, CA. May 22, 2006. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/memo_sb1087.pdf. Accessed June 6, 2008.

¹¹⁵ Office of Water Use Efficiency. “Draft Guidebook for Implementation of Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221 of 2001 to assist water suppliers, cities, and counties in integrating water and land use planning, California Department of Water Resources”. September 25, 2002.

Appendix B: Acquisition and Preservation Costs for Affordable Housing

<u>Market Rate Value</u>		<u>Value Supported by Affordable Rents</u>	
Units		Units	
1-bedroom	48	1-bedroom	48
2-bedroom	2	2-bedroom	2
Median Market Rents for St. Helena Apartments		Affordable Rents for St. Helena Apartments	
1-bedroom	\$900	1-bedroom (a)	\$728
2-bedroom	\$1,063 (b)	2-bedroom (a)	\$806
Gross Potential Annual Leasing Revenue	\$543,900	Gross Potential Annual Leasing Revenue	\$438,816
Less five percent vacancy	\$27,195	Less five percent vacancy	\$21,941
Less operating expenses	\$163,170	Less operating expenses	\$163,170
NOI	\$353,535	NOI	\$253,705
Cap Rate	4.8%	Amount Available for Monthly Payments	\$21,142
Total Capitalized Value	\$7,442,842	Maximum Supportable Mortgage (c)	\$3,526,300
		Necessary Subsidy	\$3,916,542

Notes:

- (a) Assumes units are all affordable to very low-income households since Woodbridge is affordable to very-low income households.
 (b) This figure is an estimate based on rents for existing 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units in St. Helena.
 (c) Interest Rate, Annual 6%
 Loan Period, Years 30

Sources: HCD Income limits for Napa County, 2008; Marcus & Millichap, 2nd Quarter 2008; HCD, 2008; Respective property owners and managers, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Appendix C: Construction Costs, Recent Affordable Housing Projects

Affordable Housing Projects	Year Built	Address	Units	Units by Type	Average Unit Size	Total Cost	Cost per unit
Vineyard Crossing Apartments	2007	202 Tapestry Ln. American Canyon, CA	145	24, 1-bedroom; 63, 2-bedroom; 55, 3-bedroom; and 3, 4-bedroom	957	\$40,102,129	\$276,566
Magnolia Park Townhomes	2005	2000 Imola Ave. Napa, CA	29	4, studios; 4, 1-bedroom; 5, 2-bedroom; 12, 3-bedroom; and 4, 4-bedroom	956	\$9,141,931	\$315,239
Jefferson Street Senior Housing	2004	3400 Jefferson St. Napa, CA	78	77, 1-bedroom; and 1, 2-bedroom	554	\$11,354,616	\$145,572 (a)
Palisades	2008	40 and 42 Brannan St. Calistoga, CA	23	14, 1-bedroom; and 9, 2-bedroom	Unknown	\$7,549,715	\$328,248
Average Cost per unit		\$266,406					
Median Cost per unit		\$295,903					

Note:

(a) Note the land for this development was purchased back in 2000 for a relatively low price.

Sources: Personal communication with Napa Valley Community Housing, Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, and Calistoga Affordable Housing Inc., 2008; BAE, 2008.

Appendix D: Rental Subsidy Costs for Affordable housing

Rents for a 2-Person Households	1-bedroom	2-bedroom
Units in the Woodbridge Apartments	48	2
Affordable Rents (a) Very Low-Income	\$728	\$806
Median Market Rent in St. Helena	\$900 (b)	\$1,063 (c)
Monthly Difference Very Low-Income	\$172	\$257
Annual Subsidy Required for each Very Low-Income Unit	\$2,061	\$3,078
Annual Subsidy for Woodbridge Apartments (d)	\$98,928	\$6,156

Notes:

- (a) Based on HUD defined income limits for a 2-person household living in a 1-bedroom or 2-bedroom unit. See Table 23 for further details.
(b) Based on information from local apartment managers. See Table 22 for further details.
(c) This figure is an estimate based on rents for existing 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units in St. Helena.
(d) Woodbridge features 50 total units including one and two bedroom apartments. Figures assume that units are all affordable to very-low income households.

Sources: HCD, 2008; HUD, 2008; City of Napa Housing Division, 2008; Respective Property Owners and Managers, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Appendix E: List of Entities Qualified to Assist with Preservation of Affordable Housing

Organization (a)	Date Added to List
Affordable Housing Foundation	12/24/98
BRIDGE Housing Corporation	12/28/98
Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc.	2/6/01
Housing Corporation of America	6/10/99
Nehemiah Progressive Housing Dev. Corp.	12/24/98
Petaluma Ecumenical Properties Inc.	8/19/03
Rural California Housing Corp	12/28/98
Senior Housing Foundation	12/24/98
Solano Affordable Housing Foundation	1/21/99
Vallejo Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.	1/13/99

Note:

(a) All listed entities have filed an application with HCD and have met all of the requirements pursuant to Government Code Section 65863.11, thus establishing them as a qualified entity to purchase units at-risk of conversion.

Sources: HCD Building Blocks to an Effective Housing Element, 2008; BAE, 2008.

Appendix **F**
CDBG HOUSING CONDITION SURVEY (Sample)

MAP # _____ ADDRESS _____
 Vacant (---Yes/---No) _____
 For Sale (---Yes/---No) _____ CITY _____

CONSTRUCTION TYPE STRUCTURE TYPE
 Wood Frame _____ Single Family with Detached Garage _____
 Masonry _____ Single Family with Attached Garage _____
 Mobile _____ Duplex _____
 Modular _____ Multi-Family _____ # of Units _____
 Other _____ Other _____

FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS IF APPLICABLE:
 _____ CURBS _____ PAVED STREET
 (---Yes/---No) (---Yes/---No)
 _____ GUTTERS _____ SIDEWALKS
 (---Yes/---No) (---Yes/---No)
 _____ ADEQUATE SITE DRAINAGE _____ Driveway
 (---Yes/---No) (---Yes/---No)

#1 - FOUNDATION:
 0 Existing foundation in good condition.
 10 Repairs needed
 15 Needs a partial foundation
 25 No foundation or needs a complete foundation.

#4 - WINDOWS:
 0 No repair needed.
 1 Broken window panes
 5 In need of repair.
 10 In need of replacement.

#2 - ROOFING:
 0 Does not need repair
 5 Shingles missing
 5 Chimney needs repair
 10 Needs re-roofing
 25 Roof structure needs replacement and re-roofing.

#5 - ELECTRICAL:
 0 No repair needed.
 5 Minor repair.
 10 Replace main panel.

#3 - SIDING/STUCCO:
 0 Does not need repair.
 1 Needs re-painting.
 5 Needs to be patched and re-painted.
 10 Needs replacement and painting.
 10 Asbestos/Lead-Based.

Sound 9 or less
 Minor 10 - 15
 Moderate 16 - 39
 Substantial 40 - 55
 Dilapidated 56 and over

56 Dilapidated-a unit suffering from excessive neglect, where the building appears structurally unsound and maintenance is nonexistent, not fit for human habitation in its current condition, may be considered for demolition or at a minimum, major rehabilitation will be required.

#1 Foundation	#2 Roofing	#3 Siding/ Stucco	#4 Windows	#5 Electrical	TOTAL
Points					

Comments:

Surveyor _____ Date _____