

CAP - Planning Commission 7/5/17

0:42 minutes - not to stick to 3 mins but don't repeat

0:43 warrants continuance – will have second opp to express opinion to PC and also BOS.

0:43.45 it's a diff issue\

0:44:20 unanimous we should continue to future date

0:44:52 **Bassayne** – my perspective based on many conversations – diff stakeholder groups plus 800+ pages – critical from all of our perspectives – where wise go in the future – how we select plan and how we measure our behavior in the future. Many issues, inconsistencies need to be addressed. More thought since it is so critical what the future may bring.

0:46 – **Joelle Gallagher** - want to hear from staff and public and hear from public – imp that Cottrell has input as well

0:47:40 – **Morrison** continue to Sept 20.

Take a couple minutes – context important in implementing policy such as this.

Macro context – Paris set global climate stnds –

- 45 countries did not sign the agreement – 20% - 16% of total emissions

- 194 countries signed –

- 46GT total CO2e annual emissions output

- 18% US of total emissions - almost equal to nations not participating in Paris

- 20 states have set GHG targets

- 30 states have not set targets = 65% of the US CO2 emissions

6.6% of total US emissions is California (1.2% of global emissions – quite an extraordinary achievement given Calif is 6th largest economy)

18 counties adopted CAP

40 not adopted CAP (69%) (10 pending)

470 cities in California – 75% do not have CAP

In Napa – 2 cities have CAPs, 3 do not although 2 are pending.

Napa unincorporated emissions represent 9/10,000 of 1% of global emissions or 0.000009 or 9 millionths

So a couple points I'd like to make just to lead out:

Napa alone will not solve global climate change. We are doing something here that only a minority of jurisdictions are doing. Remember, we look to become the 19th county. There are 40 counties in Calif that do not have a CAP. We're one of ten pending, but 30 haven't even started and apparently have no intention to at this point. Not to mention the fact that there are something like 300 cities that don't have a climate action plan. I think we need to be commended for taking on this responsibility that many, many, many states, cities and counties are not yet undertaking. Does that mean that we shouldn't? Because we're such a small problem we shouldn't bother? Of course not. We absolutely should be preparing a CAP that meets AB 32 and SB 375 and the executive orders under both Go Brown and Gov Schwarzenegger.

0:52:40 Of course we should be doing a CAP. It's not state-mandated specifically but it may as well be. Not to mention the fact that Napa is the last county in MTC and ABAG to adopt a CAP. The other 8 already have. So, of course we should be adopting a CAP. But still, it should not be underestimated or underappreciated that

this is still a relatively rare occurrence among cities and counties in the state and across the country and across the world.

The staff's role as I see it is to provide a comprehensive, legally adequate policy and strategy for addressing climate change. I think we have done that. To go beyond that into areas that are still quote/unquote in development or have not yet been ratified or supported by the state, I think would be setting policy, and that's not our role. Our role is not to spend taxpayer dollars and staff resources investigating strategies that may at some point be adopted in the future. Our role is to provide you with a document that addresses the legal structure that exists today.

0:53:50 As the Board and the Commission have both made very clear, the Board sets policy, the Commission and staff implement.

And so I think that just to wrap up, I appreciate all the level of energy and enthusiasm and passion that have been expressed with regards to the County's CAP and I look forward to that being applied to other jurisdictions to make sure that they also exert the same kind of effort that Napa County has done over the last two years. Because, again, if we're the only one doing it and the other hundreds of cities and counties are not, this problem is not going to be solved. It has to be done across the board. And I think that's really the main message here that we are joining the community with jurisdictions that are addressing climate change but there are still a lot of jurisdictions that aren't, and that is where I think the biggest improvements and gains can be made in terms of addressing this global problem. And so, that concludes my remarks and I'll turn it over to Mr. Hade now.

0:54:50 **Terry Scott** - thank you Mr. Morrison that was very informative. And I think very helpful.

0:55:15 **Hade** – [speaking on transparency of process and how we got here today... over two years had 4 public workshops, had what adds up to about 8 hours of discussion on this topic... 45-day review period for the first draft... with help from Ascent we have crafted master responses to about 45 public comment letters received... another 30-day review period on the final draft CAP bringing us to this morning's hearing. So the document wasn't developed in a vacuum or behind closed doors or anything of that sort.

0:56:20 So with that we have Honey Walters and Erik de Kook... experts in the field and a big help to date]

0:56:45 **Erik de Kok**.... Project manager on the CAP

0:58 5-step process for putting together CAP recommended by League of Local Governments for Sustainable Building.... And other organizations

1. Inventory of emissions
2. forecasting those emissions out into the future
3. setting GHG reduction targets consistent with state law and state guidance
4. developing specific GHG reduction measures and adaptation measures to both mitigate emissions as well as prepare the County for CC.
5. lastly and probably one of the most important steps in the process, is implementing the CAP and monitoring it over time.

0:59:00 want to make sure you know SLCP are in the inventory. Several commenters stated that BC is not in the inventory. We understand that concern. We believe the methods for quantification are not mature enough to include in local level CAP at this time.

1:00:20 we strive to maintain consistency w CARB protocol and accounting method.... This plan does its fair share in helping California to meet its goals.

1:02 – 48 measures within 7 strategic focus areas. We believe we have a set of measures that hit the 2030 target. Like most communities in CA it's very difficult for a local level CAP with the technology and policy backing at this time to even come close to hitting a 2050 target which is very much of a long term goal and something we will hopefully achieve as a global community in the future.

So the result of the CAP is the County far exceeds 14% below the 2014 levels by the 2020 target so we're doing way better than we'd hoped in Napa Co with his set of measures. We're on track to hit that 2030 target of 40% below 2014 levels by 2030.

1:02:45 – just quickly I'll go thru the sectors....

1:06:16 – a unique measure for this CAP, this is not done in most CAPs in California - is quantification of the net carbon flux –because of land use change, the conversion of undeveloped lands to other uses like ag or urban development. The series of measures in the CAP focus on the loading order of prioritizing preservation and avoidance first. Then, mitigating when we have to remove vegetation such as trees or other shrubs or grasslands. And then finally replanting and voluntary planting or mitigation replanting as it may be.

So the idea here is kinda moving away from just not thinking about the carbon effects of removing natural vegetation and trying to preserve that vegetation and mitigate the loss where we can, to the best that we can. Also refining guidelines for the loss of riparian woodlands. And then when we are removing biomass

that's typically burned is repurposing that biomass where it's feasible.

1:07:40 In response to public comments did add some measures to the high GWP sector. Refrigerants.... SLCPs.... Primarily regulated by the state and fed govt... However, thee Co can thru certain actions encourage registration in existing state programs... there can be incentives offered perhaps to provide additional encouragement to reduce those emissions. There is one area where theca does have some control and that is where Cal Green and Tier 1 which is a recommended measure already stated in the Building Sector. But there are some compliance reds for new HVAC and commercial refrigeration systems that would help to reduce those emissions.

1:08:30 – Multi Sector – like Napa Green – encourage sustainable practices but difficult to measure. Locally grown food. Local carbon off-set program which would work with other sectors and communities so it's an idea for development.

High temperature events, rain patter change, snow pack 48-68% less, sea level rise,

1:15:20 Implementation and Monitoring – there's a lot of different ways that these measures can be implanted. Some of them can be implemented straight thru regulations, thru code updates. And we've identified those in the table in Chapter 5. Some of those measures are going to be done thru incentives. There's a lot of talk in the plan about matching requirements with incentives so that the burden isn't too high, that we're not raising costs so much that it's infeasible. So we're thinking about financing and incentives. Some of these measures do require further research and further study. And that applies broadly to different components of the plan. We're not necessarily there yet with some of our quantification methods. We're Not always fully

aware at a plan level what a project of a program will take. So some of these programs and measures will take a lot more refinement and development over time. That could be staff-led, that could be done in partnership with other organizations that are on the ground today working in Napa Co.

Partnerships, education and outreach – again, all important components of the plan. You can't have any of this without good education and buy-in, and outreach with affected entities and stakeholder groups. That will need to continue under staff-led efforts into the future.

The staff has committed to a staff report on the status of implementation at least every 2 years. It's best practice to also update your GHG inventory at least every 5 years so the Co is committing to do that thru this plan.

There is a CAP consistency checklist that is now Appendix D of the final draft. We heard concern that wasn't in the public draft and it's now complete and in the final draft and was available for public review. And it does work with the monitoring and implementation section of the plan where we do highlight specific measures that may be listed as voluntary for the general public, meaning that the Co doesn't really have a regulatory reach if someone's not coming in for a permit or really doesn't have the jurisdiction to adopt the code, but some of these measures can be required as mitigation measures which is essentially thru the CAP consistency checklist. So that's the distinction. That's why you're going to see that in the little footnotes in the Table 5. And that checklist does describe some specific performance standards that would apply to discretionary projects thru the CAP checklist.

1:17:45 – acknowledge and appreciate the great comments and points made by the public. Generally:

1. lot of comments focused on methods and completeness. Some called it outdated science or inaccuracy.
2. Concern about GWP values.
3. How far into the world do we track emissions? Do we go consumption-based or go with what's in the region?
4. Concern about who we're consistent with. What we try to do, we've said over and over, is that our inventory methods and our GWP values – everything we do need to be consistent with CARB accounting methods. So we try to be consistent with that.
5. We understand that CARB does have a new SLCP inventory that uses different values than we used but CARB itself publishes different inventories using different values. So we want to recognize that, that there's no golden rule or golden standard for which GWP values are used in a CAP. It's really up to the local jurisdiction.
6. We wanted to recognize that the SLCP strategy is important, and it is an important emerging area of state policy. We just wanted to reiterate that there are measures in this CAP that are fairly aggressive reductions of 2 of the 3 SLCPs covered in the plan. And we believe that black carbon – there are a lot of reductions that occur as co-benefits of implementing other measures. So we may not have quantified black carbon, but we believe that the reductions are important, that they can be achieved thru other measures that the state is implementing as well as co-benefits of other measures in the CAP.
7. Some are concerned that the measures are too onerous, too costly and maybe infeasible. We have adjusted a number of the measures to account for this. We can't always do this to 100% of every person's satisfaction. But we have tried to do so

in a way that would maintain the enforceability for discretionary review creating a distinction between what's voluntary for some and mandatory for others. We're sorry that's confusing but what we're trying to do here is create a vehicle that gives flexibility for many, but for some it's going to be a requirement. So that's the distinction there.

8. Some of the measures are perceived as too few or too weak. Again, we're trying to maintain the balance between feasibility where the o has some jurisdiction and some stringent measures that will meet the test of the CEQA guidelines that we'll be trying to use for future projects that want to show consistency with the CAP.
9. We do believe that the CAP does include specific and enforceable measures and does have the criteria embedded into the checklist to make sure that any measures that are applicable and feasible for discretionary projects are included in that checklist. We haven't ignored or cherry-picked some measures over others. That checklist is what's feasible to implement that's in the CAP now for proposed projects in the future.

1:21:30 **Joelle** - Thank you for all of the work, obviously this is huge undertaking and we appreciate.

Regarding legislation 2.3.2 legislative reduction – there's the assumption that there will be a federal ban on certain high GWP gases. How much anticipation of fed legislation may have affected the CAP because as we know, the Fed govt seems to be going in the opposite direction. And may loosen up those prior requirements in addition to not moving forward on a federal

ban on certain gases. So how much did your anticipation of federal legislation play into your development of this.

Honey Walters – We were trying to be very conservative when we did legislative reductions. There's a very small portion of this reduction that has to do with federal regs. CARB has and will continue to take care of those.... CARB was planning to go above and beyond the federal regs. CARB will close that gap here in CA.

1:23:24 **Bassayne** – Thank you for your efforts and your presentation today and certainly addressing some of the concerns that have been raised by stakeholders. With regard to the process of implementation and monitoring, we've heard that it's appropriate to evaluate inventory every 5 years. And it's certainly not an easy process nor is it without consumption of time in order to get it done and it's probably costly, certainly to any different number of entities. But how did we come up with the evaluation process being implemented every 5 years for inventory and the reporting of the progress every 2 years.

Honey Walters – There's no strict rule on timing for this. The BAAQMD and another number of air districts haven't said you need to do it every 2 years or every 5 years. A lot of CAPs are taking air district recommendations. There's some CEQA language that says what is an example of timing. Sometimes we get the comment: We should do it every year. Well, that's extremely time consuming and expensive. Even CARB doesn't do it every year, and what you'll see happen in this realm, is for example the IPCC will update the GWP values but it takes so long to do an inventory that the ARB will sometimes continue to use the previous set. So you have to pick a timeframe that isn't too soon, but isn't too far to where you can't keep track. One good idea about reporting back every 2 years or updating every 5 years is that the CARB and other

entities have been very active in reducing emissions that affect us locally here in Napa, so you want to take advantage of those. You want to make sure that if the Green Building standards are updated you may have had an action in your CAP to implement that and now it's already taken care of for you. It just seems to be a reasonable time frame based on recommendations from reputable agencies.

Bassayne - There are certainly dynamics in play with regard to any actual item that may impact the inventory, so it's quite possible we could accelerate that process based on an action.

Honey – one thing that happens is sometimes we don't see the amount of growth that's projected in a CAP. Sometimes those projections need to be changed, so you are going above and beyond what you're required by legislation. And if growth is not realized as projected in the CAP, you can't get the associated reduction mathematically from that measure, so it is important to do some updating, but a CAP is a plan. It's not a PhD thesis per se, so it needs to be looked over at a level that makes sense at the level of the document.

1:28:35 **Terry Scott** – I would agree. It's fairly obvious we have 3 primary GHG emission sources that's a big chunk of this, representing almost 75%. What changes will take place, based on current knowledge, in each of those arenas since they represent the biggest polluting factors.

Erik de Kok – State has authority to continue implementing clean vehicle program thru 2025. These are embedded in our projections. SB 350 – we've also looked at those reductions – Will

require action by County – but we know the utilities thru the 50% renewable portfolio standard, and thru the doubling of energy efficiency standard will also require local measures to implement. So there's a lot of momentum.

Honey – what I've seen evolve over the past 5 years, when CARB released one of its first scoping lanes (and a scoping plan is essentially the state's CAP) CARB is charged with implementing AB 32 and SB 32, and then they develop this scoping plan. And it's a higher level doc compared to your local CAP. But it really does the same thing. It inventories the emissions, it projects them, it lays out the path, mostly regulations but also incentives and other programs to achieve those goals. But to get back to my main point, the first scoping plan was very focused on transportation. And you've seen some very large reductions from the state due to that sector. The state is now still looking at that sector but they're most recently moving into the energy sector. So you're seeing the proposition of zero net energy. And as we move into the future, and we're faced with more aggressive GHG reduction goals, what we're going to see from the CARB is continuing to etch away at transportation and energy but those 2 sectors re getting a little bit to the point where there's only so much that CARB has regulation over. You're going to start seeing everything-but-the-kitchen-sink concepts, looking at solid waste, waste water, so you'll see those areas that weren't touched before.

1:32:20 - One thing the last scoping plan had – rangelands and sequestration ideas –but those are all qualitative right now and are just there, still being researched, similar to black carbon but the state will continue to look more broad based into all the

sectors and even deeper into all the sectors which again will help Napa Co achieve its goals.

[I am going to transcribe only one item from public comments – they are from Beth Mattei’s son Henry, who received recognition from Michael Bassayne during his closing remarks.]

2:27:50 – **Henry Mattei** – Hello, my name is Henry Mattei, I’m a student at USC, and that’s my mom. She’s awesome. I just wanted to specifically make some comments about land use. There’s a lot of different areas in the CAP, like wastewater... But I think the amount of carbon emissions that are going to be coming from land use changes in Napa Valley are definitely underestimated in this draft CAP. On the chart that they showed earlier that land use was about 13% of GHG emissions in Napa (and I combined that from LU and AG sectors). Globally land use is about 25% of GHG emissions. That’s according to ICPP’s 2014 report. And I would assume that Napa is at least at that global level or higher because agriculture is such a massive part of our economy. And I think there are some specific reasons why these estimates for this amount of carbon is coming from the AG and LU sector is under-reported in this report.

One of the main reasons is in the CAP soil carbon loss was simply not accounted for because they said there wasn’t adequate information of research on this topic. The Quercus report that was put together showed that there research on this and that 25 up to 30% of soil carbon is lost during land use change.

Another area where I think that the carbon emissions were undervalued was deforestation because I was having trouble finding anywhere it said specifically how much carbon emissions there would be coming from specific areas being changed from whether it's old growth oak forest or if it's chaparral or if it's wetlands to vineyards. Instead there is this proposal put forward that we save 30% of the trees but I don't see anywhere where it's estimating how much GHG emissions there will be, and I don't think you can get an accurate idea about it unless you specifically quantify for each parcel what the actual carbon amount is. And in the Quercus report there were also estimates based on acreage of both forest and soil carbon levels.

So I think those estimates should definitely be considered.

Another issue I saw was that wetlands carbon stocks were ignored and wetlands are an extremely carbon rich ecology. And with Napa wetlands it's an extremely important carbon sink and if we lose that, we're creating a lot of emissions.

So one of my concerns is that the CAP doesn't seem to be following CEQA guidelines in reporting accurately how much emissions are going to be created from these activities. I would also echo that point that the BAAQMD's standards be used in the CAP as opposed to the 2007 IPCC standards that were used to calculate GHG emissions.

Basically, there just needs to be more accurate accounting of how much pollutants are going to be caused, or how much pollutants are going to be released, especially from land use change because Napa is seeing so much increases in development and so much vineyards that are possibly moving into foothills that land use is going to make up a huge amount of GHG emissions.

And if we're not accounting for those using modern science or if it seems like we're not even trying to get an accurate picture of what the emissions are then the measures we're putting in place aren't going to be measurable and I highly doubt they'll meet any goal, or actually result in any real reduction in GHG emissions.

I just think that in Napa we do – I think the gentleman over here was talking about... Mr. Morrison... was talking about how a lot of counties are not following these guidelines or they haven't put forward a CAP, a lot of states, a lot of countries are not following it, and that's the problem with these international climate action plans, is that they are often not enforced or implemented. And here, there's actually an opportunity to implement a real one, and rather than saying that no one else is doing it, so let's just back up and also not do anything substantial. Let's actually use these accounting techniques to figure out how much we're emitting, and actually reduce it by 80% and not just do a skim over what we may be emitting and then propose measures that don't have any measurable way to measure how much we actually reduce.

2:48 – **Morrison** – any issues PC would like staff to prepare for Sept 20 public hearing?

Bassayne – Thank you very much for your thoughtful comments. I absolutely appreciate them. The issue of climate change is very real and it's upon us and we have to address it thoughtfully and equitably. The County realizes this. In an effort to follow state guidelines and law. And I believe staff has been transparent and collaborative heretofore in finding a solution in this process or solutions. While the Ascent Group has done an excellent job I

believe given the recommendations we've heard today we can improve upon what we've done. And paraphrasing young USC student Henry Mattei, we have an opportunity to model the way, and make that choice moving forward.

In terms of specifics, we've heard a lot of specifics today and I would ask that staff take a step back and digest some of these recommendations. Is the best available science being used to assess the programs? Are the time lines correct? Should BAAQMD and IPCC standards be used and incorporated? I agree with David Graves' assertion that perhaps we need to collaborate more. Again this is what I was reading between the lines with some of the cities within the county here that have already adopted these measures. And certainly with regard to Michelle Novi's points the applications must be feasible. Some tweaking needs to occur and I think we can drill deeper with regard to some issues of vagueness. To Eve Kahn's point I believe we should look at the validity of more Napa-specific numbers. And indeed will there be funds to support any of these initiatives? Certainly we always have to consider the economics and I'd like to see perhaps some commentary addressed to that issue. I really like Chris Benz's recommendation to segregate the trifectas and I think it's something we perhaps need to ponder and consider a bit more deeply, segregating then quantitative from the qualitative, and the mandatory from the controversial. Perhaps that's something we can work towards at any rate. And I also think we can continue to work respectfully and collaboratively to address these issues to find a better outcome.

2:51:50 **Joelle Gallagher** – I Like Chris Benz's idea about pulling apart those that are mandatory and quantifiable and feasible. I'd actually like to see more measures that have these three. I have an awful lot of concern about the fact we use the words support, encourage, and promote. And that so much of this is really not

quantifiable. I think that makes it very very difficult to really ascertain what the impacts are going to be.

I'd be curious to know the difference between how and when and how much we will hit our target when measures are voluntary vs. mandatory. What if the bulk of the measures were mandatory? What would our outcome be? Although there are still so many areas we can't really quantify, again, the support, encourage and promote... even words like increase or decrease are very nebulous because if there's not a target, increase by x%, or decrease by x%, what does success look like? A little bit of increase or decrease – is that success? I don't know. It's hard to determine because the language is somewhat vague.

I have a lot of other comments – I don't know if they would give direction necessarily. But I do like the idea of maybe pulling this apart a little bit and also looking at what Calistoga and Napa are doing. (Morrison: they're more of municipal inventories than CAPs) Would be interesting to see their data and what they've done... but it sounds like they haven't got very far. But definitely we need to work with them, I don't know that it should necessarily preclude the county from moving forward. Because someone needs to take the lead and it makes sense that it would be the County taking the lead and then bring the cities in.

2:54:20 **Terry Scott** – Thank everyone for their input. I found this to be very informative and I'm pleased and impressed with the level of concern that has been expressed and from multiple age groups – I am happy to see that. I think today's meeting is a good first step. But it is not a conclusive first step at all. I think our goal is relatively simple. To reduce our GHGs. But the methods and process to

achieve that are frankly I think highly complex and more complicated than we may have initially realized. And I think that this is a challenge that must be addressed properly and fully and we need to be correct to the extent that we can be. Because it's a fluid science as we've been advised and if things change in the future we need to be able to change with that.

We've gotten some good input from various members of our community. And David, it's always good to see you back. David did a marvelous job as a planning commissioner for many years. But this is a challenging task before us, and I'm impressed with the effort not only by our consultants but also by our own staff. We can do this. And we will do this to the best of our ability. It is important that we set an example. We're one of the first, as Director Morrison has pointed out. And we need to set an example for our fellow counties, and the state to set an example for the rest of the country, and for the country to set an example for the rest of the world. And, one step at a time, and ours is the first one, but thank you for participating in it and we look forward to working with you in the future.