<meta name="robots" content="noindex">

Department of

SOCIAL SERVICES

Community Care Licensing

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION REPORT

Facility Number: 342700579
Report Date: 07/22/2026
Date Signed: 07/22/2026 04:08:04 PM

Unsubstantiated

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY **COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION REPORT**	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES COMMUNITY CARE LICENSING DIVISION SACRAMENTO SOUTH ASC, 9835 GOETHE ROAD, SUITE 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95827

This is an official report of an unannounced visit/investigation of a complaint received in our office on **10/20/2025** and conducted by Evaluator Kimberly Viarella

	COMPLAINT CONTROL NUMBER: 27-AS-20251020154520

FACILITY NAME:	CHATEAU AT RIVER'S EDGE, THE			**FACILITY NUMBER:**	342700579
ADMINISTRATOR:	MARIANNE R RICHARDSON			**FACILITY TYPE:**	740
ADDRESS:	641 FEATURE DR			**TELEPHONE:**	(916) 921-1970
CITY:	SACRAMENTO	**STATE:** CA		**ZIP CODE:**	95825
CAPACITY:	143	**CENSUS:** 79		**DATE:**	07/22/2026
		UNANNOUNCED		**TIME BEGAN:**	08:30 AM
MET WITH:	Karla Trujillo, Director of Sales and Designee			**TIME COMPLETED:**	04:30 PM

ALLEGATION(S):

1	Facility did unlawful eviction.
2	Facility refused to refund resident after unlawful eviction.
3	Facility did not respond to call light in a timely fashion.
4	Facility not providing incontinent care as needed.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS:

1	On 07/22/26, Licensing Program Analyst (LPA) Kimberly Viarella made an unannounced visit to this
2	facility to deliver the results of this complaint investigation. LPA identified herself upon arrival, stated the
3	purpose of the visit and asked to meet with the Designated Facility Administrator /Executive Director
4	(ED). LPA met with Designee, Karla Trujillo and a brief interview followed.
5	
6	LPA conducted a search of Community Care Licensing's Eviction Log and could find no evidence that
7	Chateau at River's Edge presented R1 or R1's POA with an eviction letter. LPA requested a copy of the
8	eviction letter from the reporting party and received a blank form titled "30 Days Notice of Intent to
9	Vacate." The POA received this form as an attachment from Marianne Richardson, the Executive Director
10	(ED) at the time. In her email dated 10/21/25 at 1:11 PM, it stated that they never wanted R1 to move
11	out, but due to R1's medical condition, per the California Code of Regulations, R1 would have to continue
12	to recover at a skilled nursing facility until they were reassessed and cleared to return to the community.
13	ED Richardson had a history of discussing potential evictions with their LPA and submitting drafts of
	eviction

Unsubstantiated	**Estimated Days of Completion:**

SUPERVISORS NAME: Lisa Rios
LICENSING EVALUATOR NAME: Kimberly Viarella
LICENSING EVALUATOR SIGNATURE:
DATE: 07/22/2026

I acknowledge receipt of this form and understand my licensing appeal rights as explained and received.

FACILITY REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE:
DATE: 07/22/2026

This report must be available at Child Care and Group Home facilities for public review for 3 years.

Control Number 27-AS-20251020154520

FACILITY NAME: CHATEAU AT RIVER'S EDGE, THE **FACILITY NUMBER:** 342700579
VISIT DATE: 07/22/2026

NARRATIVE

letters to Community Care Licensing (CCL) for review to ensure that they contained all of the elements to be legal. No such draft was submitted to CCL. This LPA also interviewed the Regional Nurse Manager (RN) who was present when the Director of Assisted Living (DOAL) contacted the POA with regard to R1's medical condition. According to the RN, the DOAL stated that, "R1 would benefit from treatment at a skilled nursing facility as at the moment, R1's needs required a higher level of care than the facility could provide." Many residents require temporary care at a skilled nursing facility prior to returning home to their assisted living communities after their medical condition has been stabilized. The RN stated that the word eviction was never used because they was no intent to evict R1.

As the POA terminated the admission agreement and moved all of R1's belongings out without offering 30 days' notice, the Executive Director attached the form to be completed by the POA. The standard for the preponderance of evidence was not met and the Department found this allegation to be **UNSUBSTANTIATED,** meaning that the allegation may have happened or is valid, but there was not a preponderance of the evidence to prove that the alleged violation occurred.

Allegation: Facility refused to refund resident after unlawful eviction

As the eviction was not substantiated, no refund was due. The Department found this allegation to be UNSUBSTANTIATED, meaning that the allegation may have happened or is valid, but there was not a preponderance of the evidence to prove that the alleged violation occurred.

Allegation: Facility did not respond to call light in a timely fashion.

LPA reviewed 112 pages of pendant call logs. Out of 42 instances staff responded in less than 20 minutes with the majority or the response times being less than 10 minutes. There was an anomaly on 09/09/25 when it took staff 34 minutes and 54 seconds. The preponderance of evidence seen in this report was that the staff were responsive to R1's needs as R1 consistently pressed their pendant for assistance roughly every 2 hours on some days. The Department found the above allegation to be **UNSUBSTANTIATED**. The allegation may have happened or is valid, but there is not a preponderance of the evidence to prove that the alleged violation occurred.

SUPERVISORS NAME: Lisa Rios
LICENSING EVALUATOR NAME: Kimberly Viarella
LICENSING EVALUATOR SIGNATURE:
DATE: 07/22/2026

I acknowledge receipt of this form and understand my licensing appeal rights as explained and received.

FACILITY REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE:
DATE: 07/22/2026

Control Number 27-AS-20251020154520

NARRATIVE

Allegation: Facility not providing incontinent care as needed.

During the course of this investigation, this LPA conducted 7 staff interviews and reviewed staff schedules for the time period of this complaint. This LPA learned from S1, S2 and S5 that although at times there were call outs, staff would accommodate by working split shifts or picking up extra hours to ensure coverage. This LPA also learned that R1 developed a new behavior during this time period. R1 previously accepted incontinent care from S4, but then R1 began refusing to allow this staff person to assist them. This would cause a delay in care as S4 would have to find another care giver available. Based on the above interviews, the review of schedules and the response time for R1's call log, the standard for the preponderance of evidence was not met and the Department found the allegation above **UNSUBSTANTIATED.**

According to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, no deficiencies were observed or cited during today's visit, a copy of this report was provided along with APPEAL RIGHTS and an exit interview was conducted with the Designee, Trujillo.

SUPERVISORS NAME: Lisa Rios
LICENSING EVALUATOR NAME: Kimberly Viarella
LICENSING EVALUATOR SIGNATURE:
DATE: 07/22/2026

I acknowledge receipt of this form and understand my licensing appeal rights as explained and received.

FACILITY REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE:
DATE: 07/22/2026