A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Napa County Planning Commission
Board Agenda Letter

TO: Napa County Planning Commission

FROM: Charlene Gallina for Hillary Gitelman - Director
Planning, Building and Environmental Services

REPORT BY: Kirsty Shelton, Planner - 707 253 4417

SUBJECT: Climate Action Plan -- Status Report

RECOMMENDATION

STATUS REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CLIMATE ACTION PLAN (CAP) & DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

CEQA: This is an informational item only and CEQA review is not required.

Request: Provide a status report on the Climate Action Plan, summarize the Board of Supervisors meeting on December 11, 2012, and disuss next steps.

Staff Recommendation: This is an information item only; no action is requested.

Staff Contact: Kirsty Shelton, Planner, 299-1377, Kirsty.shelton@countyofnapa.org

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposed Action: This is a discussion item only; no action is requested.

The Planning Commission considered the proposed Climate Action Plan (CAP) at their meeting of January 18, 2012 and recommended adoption by the Board of Supervisors. After almost a year long trial period, the Board of Supervisors considered adoption of the plan at their meeting of December 11, 2012. At that time, the Board declined to adopt the CAP, instead directing staff to seek additional emission reductions from transportation sources and investigate other issues raised during the hearing. The Board also requested that the Planning Commission develop and apply a list of "best management practices" to reduce green house gas emissions from development projects while the CAP is being revised and reconsidered for possible adoption.

The Board's direction came after a long discussion/deliberation and public comments. The Board observed that

the majority of Napa County's green house gas emissions result from transportation sources, that seeking emission reductions of 38% from new or expanding project may not be financially feasible for all applicants, and that offsets purchased locally would accrue co-benefits (traffic reductions, energy conservation, habitat restoration, land conservation) in Napa County. Other questions addressed the potential benefits of food/wine production and opportunities to require greater energy conservation from large homes as part of the 2013 California Building Code adoption process.

FISCAL IMPACT

  Is there a Fiscal Impact?   No

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

This is an informational item only and CEQA review is not required.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Tackling Transportation Emissions
Staff is working with the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) to undertake a travel behavior survey, which can form the basis for several different planning efforts. A travel behavior survey gathers and analyzes data about how workers and visitors get around the County (e.g. where vehicle trips start and end, what times of the day and week and year are most affected, etc.). Results can be used to determine if there are cost-effective ways to shift a meaningful segment of Napa County workers or visitors to modes of transportation other than the private automobile (for example, expanded transit or paratransit operations), which can inform revisions to the Climate Action Plan.

Results of the travel behavior survey can also help to gauge the potential impact of changes to the hours of operation and other operational characteristics of tourist destinations such as wineries, help refine the Napa-Solano Traffic Model, and form the basis for an update of NCTPA's countywide transportation plan, which will necessarily involve updating the cumulative impacts analysis in the County's General Plan EIR (certified in June 2008).

Planning staff will keep the Commission informed regarding this planning effort and share the scope and schedule when it has been better defined and a contractor is on board.

Current Projects Before the Commission
Planning staff will continue to quantify green house gas emissions associated with projects that come to the Commission for review, so the Commission will continue to see the "Business as Usual" emissions associated with the project, and the emission reductions inherent in the project proposal. Where relevant, we will rely on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's CEQA thresholds of significance and apply mitigation if the project exceeds the thresholds.

Consistent with the Board's direction, the project data request form will be reformatted to provide a list of "best management practices" for applicants to select for use in their proposals. If the Commission has input on green building techniques, alternative energy, or sustainable land use patterns that they would like to see included on this list, it would be helpful to hear those ideas now. Staff will return with a list of the best practices next month, after obtaining input from stakeholders who provided input on the CAP. We envision that the list of "best

management practices" will be a living document that can be continually adjusted and updated by the Commission as it evaluates specific project proposals.

Other Followup Actions
The Board of Supervisors remains interested in a local offset program, since it would offer the advantage of keeping the co-benefits of emission offset projects local (e.g. habitat restoration would happen here instead of elsewhere), and would allow for local monitoring. Staff will continue to research ways to keep the offsets local so that the community can enjoy the co-benefits.

As part of the 2013 California Building Code, staff is going to research high performance building standards similar to Marin County such that the larger the home, the larger the percentage of high efficiency building materials required. Public meetings will be held when a draft of local building code amendments is prepared for adoption by the Board of Supervisors in mid-2013. This new code will become effective on January 1, 2014.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

None

Napa County Planning Commission: Approve

Reviewed By: John McDowell