



August 24, 2022

The Honorable Victoria Wood
Superior Court of Napa County
825 Brown Street
Napa, CA 94559

Subject: City of Napa Response to the Napa County Grand Jury Report entitled “Napa County’s Climate Action Committee: Where’s the Action?” dated June 13, 2022.

Dear Judge Wood,

The City of Napa has received and carefully reviewed the Napa County Grand Jury Report entitled “Napa County’s Climate Action Committee: Where’s the Action?” dated June 13, 2022. Pursuant to California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05, this letter documents the City’s response to each finding and recommendation in the Grand Jury Report (hereinafter “City Response”). The City Response was prepared by City staff and presented to the City Council for their consideration. At the public meeting on August 23, 2022, the City Council approved this City Response and directed the City manager to submit this respond on behalf of the City Council.

FINDINGS

Grand Jury Report Finding 1- *The CAC has not been effective in developing and implementing actions for county-wide programs to combat climate change.*

City Response- The City of Napa respectfully disagrees with this finding.

Developing countywide programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is a process. The Climate Action Committee (hereinafter “Committee”) is following the same process as that taken by the Sonoma Regional Climate Protection Authority (hereinafter “Authority”), which is cited several times by the Grand Jury as the model that should be followed. The Authority prepared an updated greenhouse gas emission, considered a range of action items to achieve the target goals, and assisted member agencies in implementing those action items. The Committee is at an earlier stage than the Authority, which was formed in 2009. In contrast, the Committee only began meeting less than three years ago.

Within the short time of the Committee’s operation, much has been done to lay down the foundation for effective climate action. The individual members of the Committee have all adopted Climate Emergency Resolutions, and all members have adopted or are in the process of preparing Climate Action Plans. The municipalities participating in the Committee have adopted a Joint Powers Agreement, establishing the composition and operations for the Committee, as well as an ongoing funding commitment. The Committee has secured a grant and is in the final process of updating the 2009 regional greenhouse gas emission inventory, which will include specific actions that can be taken by member agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Committee has also directed

staff to begin work on an Electric Vehicle Charging Station plan, to determine how the member agencies will meet the goals established by the California Energy Commission Assembly Bill 2127 Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Assessment.

The Committee has been meeting for a total of 33 months, during a time when the community experienced two major wildfires, a pandemic, and a continuing severe drought. The City of Napa acknowledges that there is still work to be done and is committed to continuing that work as a member of the Committee, and while considering city-specific actions.

The Napa City Council identified Climate Change policies and initiatives during the City Council's Annual Workshop. As part of the Fiscal Year 2022-23 budget process, the City Manager designated the coordination of the City's climate change goals and programs to a Deputy City Manager. The City Council also approved a Management Analyst position that will be dedicated to facilitating climate related policies and initiatives within the City of Napa as well as participating regionally at the staff level. The application period for the Management Analyst is currently open and the City hopes to have this position filled in October 2022. These two positions will provide the support structure to advance City climate related initiatives.

Grand Jury Report Finding 2- *Interviews of Napa CAC members confirmed that the Napa County CAC has decided not to take any major steps toward greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction until the GHG study is released.*

City Response- The City of Napa agrees with this finding.

The Committee will consider a range of potential climate change actions as a part of the regional greenhouse gas inventory update. Once the Committee has determined the current levels of greenhouse gas emissions (both regionally and by individual jurisdiction as well as source sector) and the targets needed to comply with future milestones, then it will have the information needed to consider actions tailored to address the specific sources and where they occur. To act absent this information would be regulating based on anecdote. Any implementation of actions developed without this scientific framework would be subject to legal challenge and would not be accepted as adequate evidence if used in environmental analysis by member agencies.

As previously stated, the Committee is following the same path as that taken by the Sonoma Regional Climate Protection Authority: prepare an updated greenhouse gas emission, consider a range of action items to achieve the target goals, and assist member agencies in implementing those action items. The Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority adopted its Climate Mobilization Strategy in 2021, three years after updating its regional greenhouse gas emission inventory in 2018. The Strategy did not borrow from other neighboring jurisdictions but studied and utilized the best available science in determining its status and how best to reach the adopted goals over a 10-year timeframe. The Authority coordinates with member agencies to assist them in developing and implementing those measures that will have the greatest impact in reducing greenhouse gas emissions within their respective jurisdictions.

Grand Jury Report Finding 3- *Interviews revealed that the CAC was generally unfamiliar with the EV charging station subsidy programs currently available through the California Energy Commission and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*

City Response- The City of Napa respectfully disagrees with this finding.

Over the past two years, the Committee has reviewed and discussed electric vehicle charging station grant programs on numerous occasions. At the April 24, 2020, meeting the Committee

reviewed several potential electric vehicle charging station grant programs, including the Marin Clean Energy Charging program, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Charge! program, and the California Energy Commission Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Project program. On May 22, 2020, the Committee reviewed a list of programs offering incentives for residents and businesses to purchase electric vehicles. On February 26, 2021, the Committee received a presentation from the California Hydrogen Business Council, on hydrogen vehicles and fueling stations. On July 23, 2021, the Committee reviewed the number of existing electric vehicle charging stations, the goals of the California Energy Commission Assembly Bill 2127 Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Assessment, and available incentives including the Marin Clean Energy grant program. The July discussion continued into the meetings of October 22 and November 19, providing a summary of available grant programs, including the California Energy Commission Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Project program.

While it is not clear which programs the Grand Jury was specifically referencing, many of the subsidy programs have specific requirements and/or require a local match that require some pre-planning.

For instance, the Charge! program offered by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District offered earlier this year, provides \$7 million to offset a portion of the cost of new public charging stations at qualifying facilities. However, the Charge! program only funds 50% to 80% of the cost of installation. Applicants must pay all up-front costs and at least 15% of the total project costs. With a minimum grant award of \$1 million, local jurisdictions would have to pay between \$150,000 and up to \$500,000 to participate in the subsidy. Environmental review, administrative costs, and maintenance are not eligible for funding. In addition, 60% of all funds awarded by this program are required to be spent within Environmental Justice communities, which excludes several of the Climate Action Committee members.

The Rural Electric Vehicle Charging grant provided by the California Energy Commission offers \$4.8 million to local jurisdictions to install charging stations in rural areas. However, Napa County and other Bay Area jurisdictions are ineligible for the program due to high number of existing charging stations in those areas.

The California Energy Commission also recently awarded a grant program of \$6 million for the Charging Access for Reliable On-Demand Transportation Services (CARTS) program. The grant supports electric vehicle charging stations for high mileage on-demand transportation services including services such as ride-hailing, taxis, and meal and grocery delivery. Each region was allotted one project up to \$2 million, with a 50% match required from the applicant, again requiring significant funding from local jurisdictions.

The California Energy Commission is in the process of developing the application process for Block Grants for Electric Vehicle Charging Incentive Projects. The qualification criteria, amount of subsidy, and other details are still being developed. It is expected that the application period will open late in 2022.

The California Capital Access Program Electric Vehicle Charging Station Financing Program offered by the State Treasurer closed earlier this year. It provided \$2 million to fund a 10-15% rebate on the cost of installing charging stations for small businesses and would not have applied to the Committee or its members.

For the City of Napa, one of the primary job duties of the Management Analyst position will be to identify and track grant opportunities for all City climate related initiatives. This position will work with other City staff to best position the City to be competitive in grant and other funding opportunities to help meet the City's climate change goals. The City of Napa has previously received grants for, and dedicated funding to vehicle charging stations. The most recent City project is for six charging ports

at the Second Street and Coombs Street lot for a total of \$155,000. The City of Napa received a \$14,000 grant for this project from the BAAQMD Charge! Program.

Grand Jury Report Finding 4- *The CAC struggles with a lack of county-wide GHG mitigation funding. However, it has not placed a priority on having an experienced, effective grant and funding pursuit individual on staff to seek and secure GHG reduction grants, even though grant subsidies for programs like EV charging stations currently exist.*

City Response- The City of Napa respectfully disagrees with this finding.

Over the past two years, the County has allocated up to \$100,000 for the operations of the Committee. The Cities and Town have reserved an additional \$68,000 for the Committee during this same period. These funds are in addition to the \$50,000 in grant funding secured from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. These monies have paid for staff to support the operations of the Committee, including the successful pursuit of one grant and ongoing monitoring of other available grant programs. Of course, this is all supplementary to the expenditures made by each jurisdiction in developing and implementing their individual climate action plans.

As stated in the response to Finding 3, grant subsidies for electric vehicle charging stations often require match funds and the City of Napa may not always qualify. However, the Management Analyst position will be responsible for seeking opportunities to bring funds into the City of Napa that will advance climate change initiatives.

Grand Jury Report Finding 5- *Past studies have stated that the two largest GHG emission categories are Transportation and Buildings. The Grand Jury's interviews confirm that these two categories are expected to remain the top two items in the GHG study currently underway. The CAC in its three years of existence has not defined and proposed any action items to address the top two categories of emissions.*

City Response- The City of Napa respectfully disagrees with this finding.

The Grand Jury report is correct in that City staff anticipates that Building Energy Use and On-Road Transportation will likely be the two largest categories of greenhouse gas emissions in the upcoming regional inventory. Both issues are largely regulated by the State of California, through the Uniform Building Code and the Vehicle Emission Standards. While there are additional actions that can supplement the State's efforts, in the absence of an updated greenhouse gas emission inventory, the Committee and its members would be acting in the absence of any context.

As a part of the scope of work for the updated regional greenhouse gas emission inventory, the Committee has directed the consultant to identify and evaluate specific greenhouse gas reduction actions for the following sectors: transportation, building and other energy use, waste reduction and material consumption, carbon sequestration, water conservation, and food consumption. These actions will be evaluated by the Committee later this year and the City representatives will bring ideas and conversations back to City Council for consideration and implementation.

Recommendations

For clarity, the City Response only provides comments on matters under the control of the City of Napa. Thus, the City of Napa does not intend to make any representation regarding the operations

of any other respondent, including the Climate Action Committee. The City of Napa is one of six agencies represented on the Committee. The recommendations in this report reference the Committee, not the City of Napa. Therefore, the City of Napa cannot commit to implementing actions on behalf of the Committee. As a member of the Committee, should the recommendations below be brought forth at the committee level for further discussion, the City representatives would participate in those discussion.

Grand Jury Report Recommendation 1: *The CAC should increase the sense of urgency in implementing GHG emission reduction actions.*

City Response- This recommendation will not be implemented by the City of Napa, as it is not warranted or reasonable.

The recommendation is unclear as it does not indicate what timeline should be used for implementation, nor does it define what metrics or steps should be taken to “increase the sense of urgency.” The State has established specific milestones for local jurisdictions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: a 90% reduction below 1990 levels by 2035, and net zero emissions by 2045. These goals are more immediate than the 2050 net zero goal established by Federal agencies, the United Nations, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

In addition, there is much being done already to achieve these goals. The individual members of the Committee have all adopted Climate Emergency Resolutions, and all members have adopted or are in the process of preparing Climate Action Plans. The municipalities participating in the Committee have adopted a Joint Powers Agreement, establishing the composition and operations for the Committee, as well as an ongoing funding commitment. The Committee has secured a grant and is in the final process of updating the 2009 regional greenhouse gas emission inventory, which will include specific actions that can be taken by member agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Committee has also directed staff to begin work on an Electric Vehicle Charging Station plan, to determine how the member agencies will meet the goals established by the California Energy Commission Assembly Bill 2127 Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Assessment.

The City of Napa has implemented and continues to work on implementing projects to reduce GHG emissions. Recent examples include installing electric vehicle charging stations, the elimination of idling vehicles by installing roundabouts, and the synchronization of traffic lights on the busiest corridors (Soscol, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Trancas). The City is also working on implementing bicycle and pedestrian plans with the goal of increasing the mode share of walking and biking from driving a vehicle for shorter trips.

Finally, the City is actively exploring options for the wood waste gasification project at the City's Materials Diversion Facility to convert wood waste to electricity. Four potential project partners have been identified via a recent request for qualification process and they will be responding to a request for proposals on the project in early 2023.

Grand Jury Recommendation 2: *The CAC should create monitoring protocols that seek to identify what its individual members have set as goals and to identify whether they have met meaningful standards consistent with those goals. These should be formalized and reported to the CAC on a quarterly basis.*

City Response- This recommendation will not be implemented by the City of Napa, as it is not warranted or reasonable.

Using individual climate action plans as the basis for monitoring progress towards greenhouse gas reduction goals would require a significant level of effort due to the different timelines and methodologies used by each jurisdiction. For example, both American Canyon's 2012 Climate Action Plan and Calistoga's 2014 Climate Action Plan have a greenhouse reduction goal of 2020, but no goals beyond that date. The City of Napa's 2012 Sustainability Plan has goals for 2030, 2040, and 2050, but it looks only at municipal operations and not at community sources of greenhouse gas emissions. Yountville's 2016 Climate Action Plan has a goal of 2030, St. Helena's 2019 General Plan has goals of 2030 and 2040, and the draft County 2019 Climate Action Plan has goals of 2030 and 2050. Beyond the lack of common timelines used, how each jurisdiction calculates emissions also varies. Different methodologies, definitions, and data sources have been used, as climate modeling has changed greatly over the past 10 years. Lastly, not all jurisdictions have action items that have quantitative reductions in emissions associated with them. Several of the plans have qualitative action items and are not clear as to how reduction goals will be achieved. The value of a single integrated inventory is that all jurisdictions can be analyzed using the same information and modeling to create a basis for comparison, as well as the opportunity to determine how collaborative actions can gain greater reduction through effective collaboration.

The Climate Action Committee is established as a collaborative effort that allows each member agency to retain local control within its jurisdiction. Consequently, the City and Town Councils and Board of Supervisors are held accountable by their respective constituents for meeting greenhouse gas reduction goals. Staff is not aware of any regional climate action committee (including the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority) that monitors member agencies for progress towards meeting each jurisdiction's climate action goals. It is unclear what added value monitoring by the Committee would provide, or what steps (if any) would be taken by the Committee for any member that was not meeting "meaningful standards" as established by the Committee.

Grand Jury Recommendation 3: *The CAC should provide a detailed prioritized list of potential projects for possible grant funding and either retain or designate a current staff person as a grant researcher and writer to identify and seek grants from any possible source.*

City Response- This recommendation will be partially implemented by the City of Napa.

Staff to the Committee have already secured one \$50,000 grant and continue to search for other appropriate potential funding opportunities, where local agencies qualify and where funding to support and implement the grant has been allocated at the direction of the Committee member agencies.

The City of Napa has also established a Management Analyst position to identify prioritized projects for the City of Napa and seek grant funding where applicable. The Management Analyst is specific to the actions and opportunities within the City of Napa.

Grand Jury Recommendation 4- *The CAC should restructure itself to provide authority over and accountability of its member jurisdictions.*

City Response- This recommendation will not be implemented by the City of Napa, as it is not warranted or reasonable.

The Climate Action Committee is established as a collaborative effort that allows each member agency to retain local control within its jurisdiction. The Grand Jury is proposing a restructuring of the Climate Action Committee to convert it into a regional climate agency, with the ability to enforce and regulate within member jurisdictions.

The Grand Jury describes "...the problem of each jurisdiction going its own way and operating on a non-collaborative course." They advocate for the creation of a new bureaucracy, where power over climate change can be centralized and enforced. Certainly, such an approach can lead to greater and faster action. However, the Grand Jury does not discuss the disadvantages of such an approach. A regional agency would be able to enforce actions against a member agency, regardless of the fiscal or economic impact on the jurisdiction. Solutions that work in a City of 75,000 may be equally applied in a Town of less than 4,000, or a rural community where they may not be effective or relevant. Residents and businesses who may be disproportionately and adversely affected by new regulations would not have a place to appeal any decision and would not be able to directly vote for the decision makers. If this model were the most effective approach, it seems that the State would have created a centralized regulatory agency to administer climate change requirements throughout California, but that has not occurred. The sources of greenhouse gas emissions, patterns of community development, demographics, and lifestyles of communities in Napa County are very diverse. A uniform, top-down strategy to expedite action on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions can lead to oversimplification and may instead impede progress by focusing scarce resources enforcing a "one-size-fits-all" solution.

Moreover, for the City of Napa, staff are unaware of any region within the State of California that has adopted such a model. The Sonoma County process referred to in the Grand Jury report is not binding on member jurisdictions. The countywide plan is made available for each municipality to consider on its own. It should be noted that an appeal of the Superior Court decision regarding the California Environmental Quality Act document for the Sonoma countywide climate action plan was not pursued because member agencies did not unanimously support continued action. As a result, an Environmental Impact Report for the Sonoma countywide climate plan was never certified. The other examples of regional climate agencies that staff are familiar with are also advisory; none have legal authority over the participating jurisdictions. The Grand Jury is advocating for a new agency with powers over climate action planning and implementation that has not been attempted anywhere in California. This would require extensive analysis before a discussion could be had.

Grand Jury Recommendation 5: *To benefit its work, the CAC should consider the following actions: (A) Reducing the number of CAC members, currently from 12 (2 per jurisdiction), to 6 (1 per jurisdiction) to facilitate faster action, use of advisors and plan development; and (B) Utilize county citizens familiar with GHG emission reduction strategies to assist the CAC in the preparation of recommended actions.*

City Response- This recommendation will not be implemented by the City of Napa, as it is not warranted or reasonable.

The Sonoma County Climate Action Committee is similar to Napa County and has two representatives from each jurisdiction for a total of 24 members (compared to Napa's 12 members). It should be noted that the Sonoma Regional Climate Authority, which the Sonoma Climate Action Committee advises, also has 12 members. The Contra Costa County Sustainability Commission has 17 members and the Mendocino County Climate Action Advisory Committee has 15 members.

The CAC recently discussed the assembly of a “staff working group” from each member agencies (as required by CAC JPA section 5) to facilitate more effective coordination between information presented to the CAC, advisory recommendations provided by CAC to its member agencies, and action by the member agencies in response to the CAC recommendations. This would be the appropriate place for an initial discussion and possible recommendation on the number of representatives from each agency. The City of Napa will bring the topic up at a future meeting of the staff working group and will engage in the conversation, should the staff of the member agencies agree a discussion is warranted.

The Climate Action Committee has an extensive history of considering input from county residents and interested parties regarding greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies. On August 28, 2020, the Committee heard a presentation from Napa Climate Now! regarding budget conscious climate actions. On February 26, 2021, the Committee heard a presentation from the California Hydrogen Business Council, on hydrogen vehicles and fueling stations for local governments. On March 26, 2021, the Committee heard a presentation on the Napa Green program. On April 23, 2021, the Committee heard a presentation on forest health from the Napa County Resource Conservation District. On May 28, 2021, the California Land Stewardship Institute gave a presentation to the Committee on the Climate Adaptation Certification, a comprehensive science and winegrower collaboration to benefit agriculture and the environment. On June 25, 2021, the Committee heard a presentation from the Napa County Bicycle Coalition regarding Safe Routes to School: Parent Perception Research. On July 23, 2021, Napa Climate Now! made a second presentation to the Committee on a Reusable Foodware and Waste Reduction Ordinance. On October 22, 2021, Napa Schools gave a presentation to the Committee. On April 22, 2022, the Committee heard from City of Napa staff regarding solid waste and recycling programs and potential projects. On July 26, 2022, Community Climate Solutions gave a presentation on the Napa County Climate Challenge website.

The Committee will continue to seek out and encourage ideas from local residents and organizations and will welcome public comment on the proposed greenhouse gas reduction action items that will be included with the updated regional inventory. Should the majority of the committee agree that any topic should be revisited or discussed, the City representatives would participate in the discussion.

The City of Napa thanks the Grand Jury for its service during the 2020-2022 term.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Potter
City Manager

cc: Michael Stone, Foreperson, 2021-2022 Napa County Grand Jury (Napa County Grand Jury, 1754 Second St., Suite D, Napa, CA 94559)
Michael Barrett, City Attorney
Molly Rattigan, Deputy City Manager