

Napa County

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559



Agenda - Final

Friday, April 24, 2026

9:30 AM

Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Third Floor

Climate Action Committee

AMERICAN CANYON Melissa Lamattina, Mark Joseph, Pierre Washington (Alternate)

CALISTOGA Kevin Eisenberg(Chair), Lisa Gift, Irais Lopez-Ortega (Alternate)

NAPA Beth Painter, Bernie Narvaez(Vice-Chair), Christopher DeNatale (Alternate)

NAPA COUNTY Liz Alessio, Joelle Gallagher, Amber Manfree (Alternate)

ST. HELENA Billy Summers, Michelle Deasy, Vacant (Alternate)

YOUNTVILLE Hillery Bolt Trippe, Pamela Reeves, Eric Knight (Alternate)

Brian D. Bordona, Director, McKayla McMahon, County Counsel, Jamison Crosby, Natural Resources Conservation Manager, Jesse Gutierrez, Principal Planner, Ryan Melendez, Planner II, Alexandria Quackenbush Meeting Clerk, Angie Ramirez, Meeting Clerk, Aime Ramos, Meeting Clerk

How to Watch or Listen to the Napa County Climate Action Committee Meetings

The Climate Action Committee will continue to meet at 9:30 AM on the 4th Friday of each month. December 11, 2026 CAC meeting adopted in place of the Regular November and December meetings.

The Climate Action Committee meets as specified in its adopted annual calendar at 1195 Third Street, Suite 310, Napa California 94559. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Assistive listening devices and interpreters are available through the clerk of the Climate Action Committee. Requests for disability related modifications or accommodations, aids or services may be made to the Clerk of the Climate Action Committee's office no less than 72 hours prior to the meeting date by contacting (707) 253-4417 or meetingclerk@countyofnapa.org.

The Climate Action Committee realizes that not all County residents have the same ways to stay engaged, so several alternatives are offered. Remote Zoom participation for members of the public is provided for convenience only. In the event that the Zoom connection malfunctions for any reason, the Climate Action Committee reserves the right to conduct the meeting without remote access.

Please watch or listen to the Climate Action Committee meeting in one of the following ways:

1. Attend in-person at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Napa Suite 305.
2. Watch on Zoom using the attendee link: <https://countyofnapa.zoom.us/j/82901122471>. Make sure the browser is up-to-date.
3. Listen on Zoom by calling 1-669-900-6833 (Meeting ID: 829-0112-2471).

If you are unable to attend the meeting in person and wish to submit a general public comment or a comment on a specific agenda item, please do the following:

1. Email your comment to meetingclerk@countyofnapa.org. Emails received will not be read aloud but will still become part of the public record and shared with the Committee Members.
2. Use the Zoom attendee link: <https://countyofnapa.zoom.us/j/82901122471>. Make sure the browser is up-to-date. When the Chair calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click "raise hand." Please limit your remarks to three minutes.
3. Call the Zoom phone number 1-669-900-6833 Enter Meeting ID 829-0112-2471 When the Chair calls for the item on which you wish to speak, press *9 to raise hand. Please limit your remarks to three minutes.

****Please note that phone numbers in their entirety will be visible online while speakers are speaking****

For more information, please contact us via telephone at (707) 253-4417 or send an email to meetingclerk@countyofnapa.org.

ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE DESIRING TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE:

ON A MATTER ON THE AGENDA

Please proceed to the podium when the matter is called and, after receiving recognition from the Chair, give your name and your comments or questions. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit your comments to the specific subject under discussion. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the Chair or Committee, but is generally limited to three minutes.

ON A MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA

Public comment is an opportunity for members of the public to speak on items that are not on the agenda but are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee. Public comment is limited to three minutes per speaker, subject to the discretion of the Chair. Comments should be brief and focused, and speakers should be respectful of one another who may have different opinions. Please remember this meeting is being recorded and broadcasted live via ZOOM. The County will not tolerate profanity, hate speech, abusive language, or threats. Also, while public input is appreciated, the Brown Act prohibits the Committee from taking any action on matters raised during public comment that are not on the agenda.

1. **CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

In this time period, anyone may address the Climate Action Committee regarding any subject over which the Committee has jurisdiction but which is not on today's posted agenda. In order to provide all interested parties an opportunity to speak, time limitations shall be at the discretion of the Chair. As required by Government Code, no action or discussion will be undertaken on any item raised during this Public Comment period.

4. **CONSENT ITEMS**

- A. Approve the minutes from the Regular Meeting on March 27, 2026. [26-968](#)
Attachments: [Minutes, March 27, 2026](#)

5. **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- A. Receive a presentation on the status of the RCAAP and related CEQA document. [26-970](#)
- B. Receive a presentation by Erik de Kok, Ascent Inc., on the proposed Implementation Plan for the Napa RCAAP. [26-972](#)

- C. Approve the proposed final budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (FY26/27) of \$248,955 for program administration of the Climate Action Committee (CAC), outreach, engagement, and RCAAP related projects with an additional cost of \$181,986 for a regional RCAAP implementation plan for a grand total of \$430,941. [26-977](#)

Attachments: [Item 5C. Public Comment](#)

6. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

8. ADJOURNMENT

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE AGENDA FOR THE ABOVE STATED MEETING WAS POSTED AT A LOCATION FREELY ACCESSIBLE TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AT THE NAPA COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 1195 THIRD STREET, NAPA, CALIFORNIA ON APRIL 21, 2026 BY 9:00AM. A HARDCOPY SIGNED VERSION OF THE CERTIFICATE IS ON FILE WITH THE COMMITTEE CLERK AND AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION
AIME RAMOS (by e-signature)
Aime Ramos, Clerk of the Commission



Napa County
Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Climate Action Committee

Agenda Date: 4/24/2026

File ID #: 26-968

TO: Napa County Climate Action Committee
FROM: Brian D. Bordona, Director, Napa County Planning, Building, & Environmental Services
REPORT BY: Jesse Gutierrez, Principal Planner - Sustainability
SUBJECT: Approval of Minutes

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the minutes from the Regular Meeting on March 27, 2026.



Meeting Minutes

Climate Action Committee

Committee Members

American Canyon	Melissa Lamattina	Mark Joseph
Calistoga	Lisa Gift	Kevin Eisenberg (<i>Chair</i>)
Napa	Beth Painter	Bernie Narvaez (<i>Vice-Chair</i>)
Napa County	Liz Alessio	Joelle Gallagher
St. Helena	Michelle Deasy	Billy Summers
Yountville	Hillery Bolt Trippe	Pamela Reeves

County Staff

Brian D. Bordona, Director
McKayla McMahon, Committee Counsel
Jamison Crosby, Natural Resources Cons. Mgr
Jesse Gutierrez, Principal Planner
Ryan Melendez, Planner II
Alexandria Quackenbush, Meeting Clerk
Angie Ramirez Vega, Meeting Clerk
Aime Ramos, Meeting Clerk

Alternates

American Canyon	Pierre Washington
Calistoga	Irais Lopez Ortega
Napa	Christopher DeNatale
Napa County	Amber Manfree
St. Helena	Vacant
Yountville	Eric Knight

Friday, March 27, 2026

9:30 AM

Board of Supervisors Chambers
1195 Third Street, Third Floor

1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present: Mark Joseph, Melissa Lamattina, Pamela Reeves, Michelle Deasy, Beth Painter, Bernie Narvaez, Liz Alessio, Joelle Gallagher

Committee Members Absent: Billy Summers, Lisa Gift, Hillery Trippe, Kevin Eisenberg

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Three (3) public comments were heard

4. CONSENT ITEMS

A. The Clerk of the Committee requests approval of minutes from the Regular meeting held on: February 27, 2026

Motion by Member Alessio to approve Consent Item, seconded by Member Painter

Vote: Carried 8-0

Yes: Lamattina, Joseph, Narvaez, Painter, Gallagher, Deasy, Gallagher, Reeves

No: None

5. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION FROM PAUL ASMUTH FROM SUSTAINABLE ST. HELENA ON THE ST. HELENA COMMUNITY REDWOOD FOREST PROJECT.

STAFF REQUEST: Receive a presentation.

Paul Asmuth presented the item

Chair Narvaez opened public comment; no public comments were heard

A discussion was initiated by Chair Narvaez with the members and staff

No action was taken

B. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE STATUS OF THE DRAFT RCAAP AND RELATED CEQA DOCUMENT.

STAFF REQUEST: Receive a presentation.

Ryan Melendez presented the item

Chair Narvaez opened public comment; no public comments were heard

A discussion was initiated by Chair Narvaez with the members and staff

No action was taken

C. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE PROPOSED REVISED BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-2027 (FY26/27) OF \$180,955 FOR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION OF THE CLIMATE ACTION COMMITTEE (CAC), OUTREACH, ENGAGEMENT, AND RELATED PROJECTS SUPPORT WITH AN ADDITIONAL COST ESTIMATE FOR A REGIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE RCCAP.

STAFF REQUEST: Receive a presentation.

Jamison Crosby presented the item

Chair Narvaez opened public comment; one public comment was heard

Chair Narvaez initiated a discussion with the members and staff

No action was taken

D. PRESENTATION: CITY OF NAPA STAFF WILL UPDATE THE CAC ON THE PROGRESS OF CLIMATE ACTION AND SUSTAINABILITY ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE CITY OF NAPA'S JURISDICTION.

STAFF REQUEST: Receive a presentation.

Deborah Elliot presented the item

Chair Narvaez opened public comment; no public comments were heard

A discussion was initiated by Chair Narvaez with the members and staff

No action was taken

6. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Member Painter thanked the public, staff and Napa Climate Now for their participation at the Climate Summit.

Member Joseph reported that he attended the Napa Climate Summit and he will be absent for the May Climate Action Committee meeting.

Member Alessio thanked everyone for their participation at the Climate Summit.

Ryan Melendez reported that a sustainability workshop was held on March 11th at the Calistoga branch of the Napa Library. Ryan announced that a workshop will be held on April 8th at the main branch library from 6:00-7:00 pm and another workshop will be held at the Yountville branch library on May 1st from 12:00-2:00pm.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Member Gallagher requested to have a presentation from the Bay Area Air District on the Bay Area Regional Climate Action Plan (BARCAP).

Member Alessio requested to have Linda Brown present on maximizing climate return on investment

and an additional item on climate change as a public health crisis and the nexus of health impacts and climate change.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:19 AM.

AIME RAMOS, Meeting Clerk



Napa County

Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Climate Action Committee

Agenda Date: 4/24/2026

File ID #: 26-970

TO: Napa County Climate Action Committee

FROM: Brian D. Bordona, Director of Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services

REPORT BY: Jesse Gutiérrez, Principal Planner, Sustainability

SUBJECT: Staff update on the Napa Regional Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (RCAAP) and related California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Document

RECOMMENDATION

Receive a presentation on the status of the RCAAP and related CEQA document.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Staff conducted a formal tribal consultation with representatives of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on February 12, 2026, as required by California Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52). Additionally, staff met with representatives from the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley on March 10, 2026, for an informal discussion to establish a working partnership on RCAAP, nature-based solutions, and sustainability programs. Both consultations have been closed for this phase of the RCAAP development with the understanding that staff and jurisdictions will consult with and inform both Tribes on future implementation actions, projects, and programs that directly relate to regional water resources and waterways as well as actions, projects, and programs that consider nature-based solutions. Tribes are also encouraged to comment on the public draft of the CEQA document when it is available for public review.

The Climate Action Committee (CAC) directed staff on June 27, 2025, to proceed with an Initial Study review of the RCAAP, to initiate conversations within municipalities to review the draft RCAAP, to return with feedback in the fall, and to provide opportunities for public input in August and September of 2025.

The draft RCAAP document was subsequently revised to incorporate public feedback, along with additional refinements from project staff, the All Staff Working Group, agency partners, and internal stakeholders. The draft Initial Study continues to be reviewed and refined by the project consultants taking guidance from project staff, the All Staff Working Group, agency partners, internal stakeholders, and the legal review team.

The final RCAAP is expected to be released concurrently with the public draft of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) in Spring 2026.



Napa County

Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Climate Action Committee

Agenda Date: 4/24/2026

File ID #: 26-972

TO: Napa County Climate Action Committee

FROM: Brian D. Bordona, Director of Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services

REPORT BY: Jesse Gutiérrez, Principal Planner, Sustainability

SUBJECT: Presentation on the proposed Implementation Plan for the Napa Regional Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (RCAAP).

RECOMMENDATION

Receive a presentation by Erik de Kok, Ascent Inc., on the proposed Implementation Plan for the Napa RCAAP.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Napa County Regional Climate Action and Adaptation Implementation Plan (Implementation Plan) will serve to organize each jurisdiction's approach to climate action, both individually and collectively, while emphasizing accountability and transparency. It will clearly outline the tasks and responsibilities assigned to each jurisdiction and their respective departments, with progress tracked through annual work plans. As such, the Implementation Plan will be an essential tool for defining each jurisdiction's climate action work on a fiscal-year basis and for further integrating equity into climate-related projects and initiatives. The City of Napa has contracted separately with Ascent to produce an individual Implementation Plan, however, the intent is to coordinate with the City.

The Implementation Plan should also ensure consistency with the RCAAP's assumptions to maintain consistency with CEQA Guidelines 15183.5, while also identifying where certain measures may allow flexibility in implementation approaches on a jurisdictional basis.

Implementation Plan monitoring and reporting tools will enable the County, working in collaboration with the jurisdiction, to track the status of implementation activities, monitor the performance of individual measures in achieving the performance targets and estimated GHG reductions for quantifiable GHG reduction measures,

and track progress in achieving the RCAAP's quantitative GHG reduction targets and goals for 2030 and 2045 with the RCAAP.



Napa County

Board Agenda Letter

1195 THIRD STREET
SUITE 310
NAPA, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4580

Climate Action Committee

Agenda Date: 4/24/2026

File ID #: 26-977

TO: Napa County Climate Action Committee

FROM: Brian D. Bordona, Director of Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services

REPORT BY: Jesse Gutiérrez, Principal Planner, Sustainability

SUBJECT: Proposed Final Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Budget for Program Administration of the Climate Action Committee, support for related projects, an implementation plan for the RCAAP.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed final budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (FY26/27) of \$248,955 for program administration of the Climate Action Committee (CAC), outreach, engagement, and RCAAP related projects with an additional cost of \$181,986 for a regional RCAAP implementation plan for a grand total of \$430,941.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: The proposed action is not a project as defined by 14 California Code of Regulations 15378 (State CEQA Guidelines) and therefore CEQA is not applicable.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

On January 23, 2026, the CAC discussed priorities for FY26/27 and supported staff's recommendations to complete and adopt the RCAAP, develop a regional implementation approach, begin strategizing for implementation, and consider options for updates to the CAC Joint Powers Agreement.

On February 27, 2026, staff presented a Draft Budget of \$144,455 and received direction to:

1. Include budget for Napa Resource Conservation District (Napa RCD) to support outreach on the RCAAP on behalf of CAC members,
2. Work with BrightAction Communities to provide minimal support to maintain the Napa Climate Challenge webpage operational for an additional year while municipal staff consider a long-term regional approach to local outreach once the RCAAP has been adopted and is under implementation, and
3. Explore the development of a regionally focused implementation plan for the RCAAP.

On March 27, 2026, staff presented a revised budget to the CAC. The CAC requested an additional budget item for Global Heat Reduction to conduct a heat reduction potential analysis on the 17 quantified GHG

emissions reduction measures in the RCAAP.

Napa County Staff Time and Resources

The proposed FY26/27 budget includes an estimate of staff time needed to:

- Support and administer the completion of the RCAAP,
- Support and administer the completion of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND),
- Facilitate and support the adoption of the RCAAP and the IS/MND by individual municipalities,
- Continue coordination of the All Staff Working Group,
- Develop and coordinate a regional implementation strategy,
- Support municipalities with implementation,
- Lead with the development of model actions, programs, and policies,
- Monitor the status of RCAAP strategies and measures, and
- Provide administrative support to the CAC by preparing agendas, developing staff reports and sharing information, preparing an annual budget, and providing staff support for associated tasks and requests.

The estimated staff time total for FY26/27 is \$134,455, which is an 18% decrease from FY25/26. This decrease is due to work on the RCAAP and IS/MND documents winding down. FY25/26 called for intensive reviews of the administrative, public, and final drafts of the RCAAP, coordination of staff reviews of these drafts, public engagement for the public draft RCAAP, the review of public comments, the development of staff and consultant responses to comments, coordination of staff reviews of the administrative draft of the IS/MND, AB 52 tribal consultations, and the expected release of the IS/MND, final RCAAP, and public comment responses.

Staff time for FY26/27 will shift the workload to developing an approach for implementation once the RCAAP has been adopted. This will include collaboration and coordination amongst municipalities and relying on the All Staff Working Group to facilitate the prioritization of RCAAP measures, cost and funding analysis, and community engagement and outreach.

County staff time has been broken down by task and subtask in the attachment document, *Napa County Staff Time - Hours Breakdown*. The quoted staff hourly rates are weighted labor rates provided by the County Auditor for FY26/27. Rates may change depending on contract negotiations.

Table 1: Napa County Staff Time and Cost

Napa County Staff hours and cost to administer CAC and coordinate RCAAP activities for FY 26/27				
Position	% Time	# Hours	Labor Rate	Total
Planner II – Sustainability	15%	319	\$105.90	\$33,782
Principal Planner – Sustainability	26%	535	\$125.24	\$67,003
Natural Resources Conservation Manager	5%	104	\$159.76	\$16,615
Director of Planning, Building & Environmental Services	2%	40	\$252.37	\$10,095
Deputy County Counsel I	1%	29	\$240.00	\$6,960
Total	49%	1027		\$134,455

*total costs have been rounded to whole numbers

RCAAP and IS/MND

The final RCAAP will be released concurrently with the public draft of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). The IS/MND will be circulated for public review and comment on the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, CEQAnet web portal - <https://ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/> Following this process, the Climate Action Committee will consider and possibly recommend adoption of the RCAAP and IS/MND, which will be forwarded to the member jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction will independently consider adoption of the RCAAP and the associated CEQA document as a lead agency (Napa County) or responsible agency (all other member jurisdictions).

Proposed FY26/27 Budget

The proposed CAC budget for FY26/27 is \$248,955 and includes \$134,455 in County staff costs, \$1,500 for the continued presence of Napa Climate Challenge on the BrightAction Communities platform, and Placeholder amounts of \$35,000 for outreach and engagement support by Napa Resource Conservation District, \$10,000 for continued support by Ari Ball-Burack for the EV Charging Equity Tool, and \$68,000 for Global Heat Reduction (GHR) to run heat reduction potential analysis on the 17 quantified GHG emissions reduction measures in the RCAAP.

Placeholder tasks and budgets are included to ensure that jurisdictions have coverage in their budgets to conduct the work proposed as part of the RCAAP and related projects without the need to return to councils halfway through the year for additional funds. Adopting this budget does not commit jurisdictions to spending the full amounts proposed or to participating in the regional implementation plan, for example. What passing this budget will do is cover estimated budgetary needs while preserving each jurisdiction's options for they choose to move forward with implementation.

New consultant contracts and amendments to existing contracts are not yet in place and will be brought to the CAC for approval before moving forward.

Table 2: Climate Action Committee FY26/27 Proposed Budget

Climate Action Committee FY 26/27 Proposed Budget (Shared Costs)		
Task	Cost	Description
County Staff	\$134,455	Ongoing administrative services. See staff report for estimated staff work plan, hours, and labor rates.
Climate Challenge Platform	\$1,500	Fee to "pause" full use of the platform. This fee will keep the "napaclimatechallenge" domain running with no engagement support from Bright Action Communities with minimal tech support.
Placeholder Tasks		
EV Equity Charging Mapping Tool	\$10,000	Placeholder for updates and continued support for the EV Charging Tool from Ari Ball-Burack.
Napa RCD Outreach & Engagement	\$35,000	Placeholder for localized outreach and engagement work provided by Napa RCD.
Heat Reduction Potential Analysis	\$68,000	Placeholder for Global Heat Reduction proposal to run a heat reduction analysis on the 17 quantified GHG emissions reduction measures in the RCAAP.
Total County Staff, RCAAP, and Placeholder Tasks Shared Costs	\$248,955	

Cost-Share

Under the Joint Powers Agreement, the Unincorporated County contributes 33.0% of the actual costs of the CAC Program Administration costs, from the PBES budget. The cities and town each reimburse the County for the remaining Program Administration, according to a formula that allocates costs based on fifty percent (50%) equal shares and fifty percent (50%) proportional share of population exclusive of the unincorporated area population, more specifically as follows:

Napa: 29.9%

American Canyon: 12.8%

St. Helena: 8.5%

Calistoga: 8.3%

Yountville: 7.5%

The cost sharing allocation among the member jurisdictions for FY26/27 would be as follows:

Table 3: Climate Action Committee FY26/27 Proposed Budget Breakdown by Jurisdiction

FY26/27 Proposed Budget Breakdown by Jurisdiction (shared costs)		
Jurisdiction	Percentage	Total
Unincorporated Napa County	33.00%	\$82,155
City of Napa	29.90%	\$74,438
American Canyon	12.80%	\$31,866
St. Helena	8.50%	\$21,161
Calistoga	8.30%	\$20,663
Yountville	7.50%	\$18,672
Total	100%	\$248,955

*total costs have been rounded to whole numbers

Implementation Plans

On February 27, the CAC directed staff to explore the development of a regionally focused implementation plan for the RCAAP. Previously presented options for individualized implementation plans were met with concern by a significant portion of CAC members, who felt such an approach was inconsistent with the CAC's mission and the overarching intent of a regional climate action plan. In response, staff reached out to Ascent to request a scope of work and cost estimate for a regionally focused implementation plan for the RCAAP - one that emphasizes a collaborative, region-wide approach while allowing for flexibility in implementation approaches on a jurisdictional basis. The City of Napa has indicated the need for an individualized implementation plan and is working directly with Ascent to develop one. The regional implementation plan will align and coordinate with the City's individualized plan.

The RCAAP Implementation Plan will define how implementation efforts will proceed and be coordinated across the jurisdictions following RCAAP adoption, through inter-jurisdictional coordination and collaboration. It should clarify the roles and responsibilities of individual incorporated jurisdictions in implementing measures applicable across all jurisdictions, while also identifying County-specific measures, actions, and the County's programmatic responsibilities as the JPA administrator. The RCAAP Implementation Plan should also ensure consistency with the RCAAP's assumptions to maintain consistency with CEQA Guidelines 15183.5. Staff estimates the cost of the RCAAP Implementation Plan to not exceed \$181,985.

Table 4: Implementation Plan Shared Costs Breakdown by Jurisdiction (without City of Napa)

	Under JPA Agreement	Regular Cost Share	Without City of Napa	Without City of Napa	Cost Share w/o City of Napa	Difference
			Pop. 2024	Pop. Percent		
Unincorporated Napa County	33.0%	\$60,055	22860	39.5%	\$81,548	\$21,493
City of Napa	29.9%	\$54,414	0	0.0%	\$0	
American Canyon	12.8%	\$23,294	21758	37.6%	\$43,754	\$20,459
St. Helena	8.5%	\$15,469	5314	9.2%	\$20,475	\$5,006
Calistoga	8.3%	\$15,105	5142	8.9%	\$19,948	\$4,843
Yountville	7.5%	\$13,649	2781	4.8%	\$16,261	\$2,612
Total	100%	\$181,985	57855	100%	\$181,985	\$54,414

Table 5: Shared Administrative Costs plus Implementation Plan Breakdown by Jurisdiction

Grand Totals: Shared Administrative Costs + Implementation Plan			
	Shared Costs	Implementation Plan	Total
Unincorporated Napa County	\$82,155	\$81,548	\$163,703
City of Napa	\$74,438	\$0	\$74,438
American Canyon	\$31,866	\$43,754	\$75,620
St. Helena	\$21,161	\$20,475	\$41,636
Calistoga	\$20,663	\$19,948	\$40,611
Yountville	\$18,672	\$16,261	\$34,933
Total	\$248,955	\$181,986	\$430,941

County staff time for the implementation of actions in the RCAAP affecting only unincorporated Napa County will not be billed to the member jurisdictions. If the CAC directs additional actions or efforts beyond the scope of the proposed budget, the budget may be amended with the approval of all Parties.

Procedural Requirements:

1. Staff report.
2. Public comment.
3. Motion, second, discussion and vote on the item.

Requested Action:

Approve the proposed final budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (FY26/27) of \$248,955 for program administration of the Climate Action Committee (CAC), outreach, engagement, and related projects support with an additional cost of \$181,986 for a regional implementation plan for the RCAAP for a grand total of \$430,941.

From: [Christopher J Warner](#)
To: [MeetingClerk](#); [Gutierrez, Jesse](#)
Subject: Napa Climate Action Committee Meeting April 24, 2026 - Public Comment on Agenda Items 5.B and 5.Cs 5.1 and 5.2
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:11:29 PM
Attachments: [Draft RCAAP Comments St. Helena and CAC Summary of Recommendations.pdf](#)
[Draft RCAAP Comments St. Helena and CAC.pdf](#)

[External Email - Use Caution]

CART BEFORE THE HORSE

Dear Climate Action Committee Members and Staff:

Agenda Items 5.B and 5.C at your meeting on April 24, 2026 request the Climate Action Committee to approve a plan for drafting an implementation plan and a \$182,000 proposed budget for an implementation plan for the RCAAP *before* the RCAAP is actually presented to the public and the Committee for final review, comment and approval -- and *before* the Committee has approved the actual RCAAP measures, their costs and benefits, the required CEQA review of the measures, and -- most importantly -- the source of funding for residents, businesses and public agencies to implement and comply with the final RCAAP as adopted after the required further public review.

This is an **imprudent, arbitrary form of "cart before the horse" and unreasonable decision-making and prejudgment.** The Committee should postpone work on a "RCAAP implementation plan" until the actual, final proposed RCAAP is available, including evaluation of implementation and compliance costs to the residents, businesses and public agencies in the Napa Valley, along with an evaluation of the sources to fund those implementation and compliance costs.

I attach my prior comments filed with the Committee last September which raise these specific issues regarding the draft RCAAP. I respectfully request that the Committee respond to and modify the draft RCAAP as requested by these comments and the comments of other interested parties and Napa jurisdictions and make the revised draft available for public comment. The Committee should complete its evaluation and public review of a proposed final draft RCAAP **BEFORE** embarking on an "implementation plan" and additional expenditures of \$182,000 for a final draft RCAAP that has not yet been reviewed by the public, the Committee, and the jurisdictions represented on the Committee. Working on an "implementation plan" is premature and prejudicial before the legal and environmental reviews are completed that are required before its final adoption.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. My comments are personal only and not in any official capacity or representing any entity.

Christopher J. Warner
1434 Grayson Avenue
St. Helena, CA 94574

Christopher J. Warner
Preliminary Comments on
Draft Napa Regional Climate Action and Adaptation Plan
September 19, 2025¹

Summary of Recommendations

The Draft RCAAP’s voluntary measures and programs are worthy of consideration and potential funding by the Climate Action Committee, participating jurisdictions and the public. **However, the mandatory greenhouse gas reduction and climate adaptation measures recommended by the Draft RCAAP are not supported by environmental analysis, quantitative benefit-cost evaluations, consideration of impacts on vulnerable and disadvantaged communities, or feasible funding to pay for the government costs of implementation.** These proposed mandatory measures and programs should not be considered or adopted until the missing analyses, evaluations and assured sources of funding are completed and available for review and public consideration.²

- 1. RECOMMENDATION: Public comments and final adoption of the Draft Plan by participating jurisdictions should not be scheduled until the required environmental and legal reviews and modifications to the RCAAP in response to the environmental and legal reviews are completed and available to the public.**

- 2. RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP should not be considered and adopted until realistic sources of funding and budgets for the \$1.1 billion in governmental costs of implementing the plan are identified and assured, particularly in light of severe current reductions in available state and federal funding.**

- 3. RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP should include benefit-cost evaluations for each proposed measure and program, consistent with benefit-cost methods for government programs and regulations, before the Draft RCAAP is submitted to the Napa jurisdictions and the public for consideration. Specific benefit-cost evaluations are required for the mandatory building electrification measures that would force Napa homeowners, schools, hospitals, offices, restaurants, stores, hotels, wineries, government buildings and other property and building owners to stop using their gas appliances and retrofit and rewire all**

¹ These comments are solely personal and individual, and not provided in any official capacity and not on behalf of any third party or entity.

² These comments do not address the potential changes in assumptions in the Napa greenhouse gas inventory used in the draft RCAAP, which appear to assume that any changes in greenhouse gas emissions since the 2019 data used in the inventory, such as changes in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) or water consumption due to COVID, water rate increases, or other factors, should be excluded from the GHG inventory. See draft RCAAP, Appendix B, Greenhouse Gas Inventory Memorandum, November 29, 2022, p. 1 (“The update year of 2019 was selected because this was the latest year in which data were most complete and excludes data anomalies due to the COVID-19 pandemic starting in 2020, such as reduced transportation emissions from increase telecommuting.”)

their existing residential and non-residential buildings at an average cost of \$30,000-\$100,000 per home and building, and require electrification of all new housing and buildings. Other potentially costly mandatory measures would be imposed on municipal water and waste disposal systems; existing wineries, vineyards and agriculture; residential water uses and rates; home hardening; vehicle use by commuters, visitors and residents; availability of public parking, etc. None of the mandatory measures and programs should be adopted until specific cost estimates and benefit-cost evaluations are completed for each measure and program.

- 4. RECOMMENDATION: The procedural schedule should be modified to consider and complete the changes to General Plans, Housing Elements, zoning and building codes and local climate plans that would be required prior to adoption and implementation of the Draft RCAAP.**
- 5. RECOMMENDATION: The confusion as to whether the Draft RCAAP is intended to require new, mandatory measures unanimously agreed to by all participating jurisdictions and/or enforceable by an independent new “joint powers authority” should be resolved before any further public, stakeholder or local government consideration of the Draft RCAAP.**
- 6. RECOMMENDATION: The equity and affordability analysis of the Draft RCAAP and its impacts on vulnerable and disadvantaged communities should be developed and included prior to any consideration of the Draft RCAAP by participating jurisdictions and the public.**
- 7. RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP should not be considered by the participating jurisdictions and the public until the estimated compliance costs to the public and all affected stakeholders are included in the Draft RCAAP.**
- 8. RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP’s proposed mandatory residential and non-residential building electrification measures should not be adopted unless the quantitative benefits to Napa residents and businesses significantly exceed the costs of compliance and the impacts on real estate market values and appraisals that impact property tax revenues.**
- 9. RECOMMENDATION: Similar to the existing building electrification mandate, the Draft RCAAP’s proposed new building electrification mandate should not be adopted unless the direct benefits and costs to new housing and buildings are evaluated and the benefits significantly exceed the costs to new and affordable housing, economic development and the local Napa economy.**

Christopher J. Warner
Preliminary Comments on
Draft Napa Regional Climate Action and Adaptation Plan
Submitted to
St. Helena City Council, September 23, 2025 Meeting, Agenda Item 13.1
And to Napa Climate Action Committee
September 19, 2025¹

Summary.

The Draft RCAAP’s **voluntary measures and programs are worthy of consideration and potential funding** by the Climate Action Committee, participating jurisdictions and the public. However, the **mandatory greenhouse gas reduction and climate adaptation measures** recommended by the Draft RCAAP **are not supported by environmental analysis, quantitative benefit-cost evaluation, impacts on vulnerable and disadvantaged communities, or feasible funding to pay for the government costs of implementation.** These proposed mandatory measures and programs should not be considered or adopted until the missing analyses, evaluations and assured sources of funding are completed and available for review and public consideration.²

Discussion.

As a threshold matter, the Climate Action Committee staff should be commended for providing a draft regional climate action plan for initial public consideration. The work put into the Draft RCAAP so far is extraordinary, particularly for its recommendation of voluntary actions that members of the public can take themselves to address climate change.

¹ The following are preliminary comments on the Draft Napa Regional Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (Draft RCAAP). These comments are personal, and not in any official capacity or representing any third party or entity. These preliminary comments will be supplemented as more information and content are added to the Draft RCAAP.

² These comments do not address the potential changes in assumptions in the Napa greenhouse gas inventory used in the draft RCAAP, which appear to assume that any changes in greenhouse gas emissions since the 2019 data used in the inventory, such as changes in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) or water consumption due to COVID, water rate increases, or other factors, should be excluded from the GHG inventory. See draft RCAAP, Appendix B, Greenhouse Gas Inventory Memorandum, November 29, 2022, p. 1 (“The update year of 2019 was selected because this was the latest year in which data were most complete and excludes data anomalies due to the COVID-19 pandemic starting in 2020, such as reduced transportation emissions from increase telecommuting.”)

However, as discussed below, the Draft RCAAP fails to include essential information and benefit-cost analyses on its proposed mandatory measures. These analyses are essential for consideration by the Napa Climate Action Committee, elected leaders, communities, and members of the public. The Draft RCAAP is not ready for consideration or adoption until this missing information and analysis is included and the Draft RCAAP complies with environmental and other legal requirements.

The Draft Plan must be modified to answer the following three basic questions, before it can be considered by the public and participating jurisdictions:

- *How much will it cost Napa residents, businesses, schools, hospitals and local governments to comply with the Draft Plan?*
- *Where will Napa local governments get the \$1.1 billion in funding required just to implement and enforce the Draft Plan?*
- *How will the Draft Plan impact workers and other vulnerable and disadvantaged community members in Napa, including impacts on affordable housing, living and commuting expenses, jobs and small businesses?*

Comments on RCAAP Procedural and Legal Status, and Schedule for Adoption

1. Lack of Required Environmental and Legal Reviews.

The Draft RCAAP has not completed required environmental review. The Climate Action Committee staff has recommended seeking to avoid full environmental review, contrary to the Committee consultant’s recommendations on CEQA.³ Even if limited, the initial environmental review will not be available for 6- 9 months, and a full environmental review including a program environmental impact report will take more than a year.

³ February 20, 2025 CEQA Approach Memorandum submitted to the Climate Action Committee, pp. 5- 6, 11 (“Due to the deferential standard of review and high degree of legal defensibility, as well as the anticipated potential for significant (and perhaps unavoidable at the program-level) impacts, Ascend encourages the preparation of a PEIR for the RCAAP”).

Additionally, municipal and state regulations that prohibit the distribution of natural gas to existing building and property owners have been declared unlawful by the Ninth Circuit, United States Court of Appeal.⁴ The Draft RCAAP’s proposal to ban the use of natural gas by mandating that existing residential and non-residential buildings be retrofitted to eliminate the use of gas and gas appliances will not only be significantly costly to the public, but also may be unlawful and barred by the federal courts.

RECOMMENDATION: Public comments and final adoption of the Draft Plan by participating jurisdictions should not be scheduled until the required environmental and legal reviews and modifications to the Draft RCAAP in response to the environmental and legal reviews are completed and available to the public.

2. Lack of Funding for Local Government Costs of Implementing the Draft RCAAP.

The Draft RCAAP includes no assured funding to cover the \$1.1 billion-\$1.4 billion estimated government implementation costs required by the Draft RCAAP’s measures and programs.⁵ Unless funding for government implementation costs is assured, it is not feasible for affected Napa governments to evaluate the cost-effectiveness and fiscal feasibility of the proposed measures and programs in the Draft RCAAP.

RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP should not be considered and adopted until realistic sources of funding and budgets for the governmental costs of implementing the plan are identified and assured, particularly in light of severe current reductions in available state and federal funding.

3. Lack of Modifications and Consistency Reviews of Jurisdictions’ General Plans, Housing Elements, Hazard Mitigation Plans, Local Climate Plans, Zoning Codes, Building Codes, Etc.

The Draft RCAAP’s procedural schedule includes no schedule for the required modifications to the participating jurisdictions’ General Plans,

⁴ *Cal. Rest. Ass’n v. City of Berkeley*, 89 F.4th 1094 (9th Cir. 2024).

⁵ Appendix I, “Cost and Funding Analyses” of the RCAAP indicates that the “implementation” point-cost estimate of \$1.1 billion may range 30% higher, i.e. to as high as \$1.4 billion. Appendix I, p. I-2.

Housing Elements, Hazard Mitigation Plans, local climate plans, zoning and building codes, and potential CEQA mitigation measures. These modifications and reviews must be considered and completed prior to approving and implementing the recommended mandatory individual greenhouse gas reduction and climate adaptation measures in the Draft RCAAP.

RECOMMENDATION: The procedural schedule should be modified to require consideration and completion of required changes to General Plans, Housing Elements, Hazard Mitigation Plans, zoning and building codes and local climate plans prior to adoption and implementation of the Draft RCAAP.

4. Lack of Clarity Regarding Whether the Draft RCAAP’s Measures and Programs Are Voluntary or Mandatory When Adopted by the Local Governments, or Will Be Enforced by an Independent “Joint Powers Authority”.

The Draft RCAAP as written provides for adoption of numerous legally binding greenhouse gas reduction measures and unbudgeted programs that each Napa local government would be required to enforce against residents, businesses, agricultural entities, housing developers, retailers, workers, visitors and the local governments themselves. The Draft RCAAP also as written appears to be intended to be adopted as a single “regional climate plan” with no separate modifications or changes by individual Napa jurisdictions, but including a yet undetermined sharing and allocation among the individual participating jurisdictions of the \$1.1 billion in government implementation costs and yet undetermined costs of compliance to the public, residents and businesses in each of the jurisdictions.

Contrary to these provisions of the Draft RCAAP as written, initial comments by elected leaders of the various local governments during presentations by Committee staff appeared to be confused as to whether the individual measures and programs in the Draft RCAAP are intended to be voluntary, or whether the plan is intended to be adopted by each jurisdiction “up or down” without separate changes.

Additionally, Committee staff are considering whether enforcement of the Draft RCAAP should be delegated to a new “joint powers authority” instead of to each individual Napa jurisdiction.

RECOMMENDATION: This confusion as to whether the Draft RCAAP is intended to require new, mandatory measures unanimously agreed to by all participating jurisdictions or enforceable by an independent new “joint powers authority” should be resolved before any further public, stakeholder or local government consideration of the Draft RCAAP.

Comments on Substantive Omissions in the Draft RCAAP

1. Lack of Benefit-Cost and Equity Evaluations for Each of the Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Climate Adaptation Measures, and Lack of Cost Estimates for the Compliance Costs of Each.

Contrary to California and federal standards on new government regulations and projects,⁶ the Draft RCAAP has no benefit-cost evaluations or cost effectiveness evaluations for each of its 47 targeted and mandatory greenhouse gas reduction measures and programs that Napa governments including St. Helena would be required to adopt and begin implementing in 2026. 30 of the greenhouse gas reduction measures have no quantification of greenhouse gas reductions at all.⁷

RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP should include benefit-cost evaluations for each proposed measure and program, consistent with benefit-cost methods for government programs and regulations, before the Draft

⁶ See, e.g., OMB Circular No. A-94, Guidelines and Discount Rates for Benefit-Cost Analysis of Federal Programs; [Transportation Economics | Caltrans](#); [Benefit-Cost Analysis | Organizing and Planning for Operations - FHWA Office of Operations](#); [Benefit Cost Analysis \(BCA\) | Mass.gov](#) [Benefit Cost Analysis \(BCA\) | Mass.gov](#) ; the social cost of carbon used in GHG-related benefit-cost evaluations is a monetary estimate of the damage caused by emitting one ton of carbon dioxide. The monetary value used by the federal government has ranged between \$51-\$255 per ton, with discount rates of 3% and 7%. The lack of benefit-cost evaluations in the draft RCAAP is not a new issue for Napa climate planning. See Napa Register article, August 17, 2018 at [Napa County's draft climate action plan has its critics | News | napavalleyregister.com](#).

⁷ Draft RCAAP, p. 3-3; pp.3-4- 3-6, Table 3-1. Inexplicably, Table 3-1 at pp. 3-4- 3-6 lists 47 targeted measures with 30 lacking any quantification of greenhouse gas reductions, while p. 3-3 lists 46 targeted measures.

RCAAP is submitted to the Napa jurisdictions and the public for consideration.

The Draft RCAAP has no “affordability” analysis, and no “equity” evaluation of the impact of the Draft RCAAP on low-income, disadvantaged and vulnerable communities, particularly regarding availability of affordable housing and convenient transportation.

RECOMMENDATION: The equity and affordability analysis of the Draft RCAAP should be developed and included prior to any consideration of the Draft RCAAP by participating jurisdictions and the public.

The “cost estimates” provided in the Draft RCAAP only cover government implementation costs, not the costs to the general public, households, residents, workers or businesses to comply with the Draft RCAAP. Even as so limited, the Draft RCAAP estimates that the costs to Napa governments to implement the Draft RCAAP for 19 of the proposed greenhouse gas reduction measures and “climate adaptation” measures would be from \$1.1 billion to as much as \$1.4 billion.⁸

Divided up by the population of each of the participating Napa jurisdictions, St. Helena’s governmental costs of implementation alone could be 4% or \$44-\$56 million or higher.

The Draft RCAAP provides no estimates of the costs of compliance by residents, homeowners, wineries, hotels, retailers, and other members of the public and businesses *et al.* However, it is reasonable to expect that the **compliance costs overall could be as much as an *order of magnitude higher* than \$1.1- 1.4 billion estimates of governmental implementation costs.**

⁸ Appendix I, “Cost and Funding Analyses” of the RCAAP indicates that the “implementation” point cost estimate of \$1.1 billion may range 30% higher, i.e. to as high as \$1.4 billion. Appendix I, pp. I-2, I-4. The “implementation cost” estimates for each mandatory measure include some nominal estimates of rebates to offset compliance costs, but none of the rebates would offset actual compliance costs. For example, the “rebates” estimated for building electrification retrofits of all existing buildings would be limited to \$2,000 per residential building and \$3,500 per non-residential building, far less than the current market costs for such retrofits. Appendix I, Attachment I-1, Estimate 1, Sheet 2, lines 7 and 8.

RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP should not be considered by the participating jurisdictions and the public until the estimated costs to the public and all affected stakeholders are included in the Draft RCAAP.

2. The Costs of the Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures and Climate Adaptation Measures Are Likely Significant and Potentially Unlawful.

Existing Building Electrification Mandate. The most costly greenhouse gas reduction measure recommended by the Draft RCAAP is to mandate that all 56,000 residential homes and buildings and all 35,000 non-residential restaurants, retail stores, wineries and other buildings be “retrofit” to be “zero-carbon” and “electrified,” which means prohibiting use of gas appliances and converting all the buildings to electricity.⁹

Non-residential buildings including schools, hospitals, stores, restaurants, hotels, offices, wineries and public buildings would need to begin to be retrofitted, converted to electrification and stop using natural gas beginning **as early as 2026. Residential buildings and homes** would need to be retrofitted and stop using natural gas **beginning in 2031** (only because the California Legislature has prohibited adoption of stricter local building codes before 2031, in order to make housing more affordable.) Even if the effective date for the residential building mandatory retrofits were delayed until 2031, adoption of the building electrification standards beginning in 2026 would likely have an immediate, significant impact on the market value of all residential real estate properties and residential real estate sales, as well as on appraisals for calculating property taxes and revenues. Potential buyers would adjust their purchase offers downward to reflect the \$30,000 to \$100,000 in retrofit costs that each property owner would incur to comply with the new building electrification standards beginning in 2031.

The governmental cost of implementing and enforcing these new “building electrification” mandates is estimated to be \$448 million.¹⁰ **The cost of the actual retrofits and conversion to electrification would be from \$30,000 to as much as \$100,000 per residential home and building alone,** based on PG&E cost

⁹ Draft RCAAP, “Measure BE-1: Retrofit Existing Buildings to Zero Carbon, pp. 3-10- 3-12; Appendix H, Implementation Matrices, Action BE-1-F, p. H-1.

¹⁰ Appendix I, p. I-4.

estimates for building electrification and “de-carbonization,” as well as the recent per-unit costs for electrification of Laurel Manor multi-family housing in the City of Napa.¹¹

This means the **total compliance and implementation costs for all 56,000 residential homes and buildings in the County could be over \$2 billion (residential buildings alone; costs for non-residential buildings would likely be similar on a per unit basis.)**

RECOMMENDATION: The Draft RCAAP’s proposed mandatory residential and non-residential building electrification mandate should not be adopted unless the quantitative benefits to Napa residents and businesses significantly exceed the costs of compliance and the impacts on real estate market values and the appraisals that impact property tax revenues.

New Building Electrification Mandate. New housing and buildings—including affordable housing, rental housing, retail stores, restaurants, government buildings, schools, hospitals, hotels, office buildings, wineries, etc.—would be required to be fully “zero carbon” and not use natural gas beginning in 2026, resulting in immediate, significant additional costs for new and affordable housing in Napa.¹² The Draft RCAAP provides no estimates for the additional costs or the impact of this new government mandate on affordable and new housing.

RECOMMENDATION: Similar to the existing building electrification mandate, the Draft RCAAP’s proposed new building electrification mandate should not be adopted unless the direct benefits and costs to new housing and buildings are evaluated and the benefits significantly exceed the costs to new and affordable housing, economic development and the local Napa economy.

Other costly measures recommended by the Draft RCAAP include:

- a. **Green Certification of All Wineries.** Require all new wineries, winery retrofits, and additions greater than 10 percent to comply

¹¹ City of Napa Housing Authority, Resolution approving Laurel Manor building electrification project, September 2, 2025 (\$2.5 million total estimated costs for 50 housing units= \$50,000 per unit; PG&E Supplemental Testimony, California State University- Monterey Bay zonal electrification project, Table 1-3, p. 1-13, November 15, 2024 (\$30,499 per unit cost for electrification); PG&E 2027 General Rate Case, Alternative Energy Program workpapers, May 15, 2025 (\$100,000 per unit costs of electrification).

¹² Draft RCAAP, “Decarbonize New Buildings,” pp. 3-16- 3-17; Appendix H, Action No. BE-5-A, p. H-4.

with “sustainability certification” standards, targeting 75 percent of all existing vineyard acreage to be certified by 2030.¹³ No cost estimates are provided.

- b. **Restrict fossil fuel use by agricultural field equipment** and irrigation pumps, replace with renewable electricity only.¹⁴ No cost estimates are provided.
- c. **Implement “transportation demand management” ordinances and measures to reduce “vehicle miles traveled” by residents, workers and visitors, and reduce existing public and off-street parking** in existing and new housing and building developments.¹⁵ No cost estimates are provided.
- d. **Require and mandate reusable food ware and waste reduction,** and commercial food waste diversion.¹⁶ No cost estimates are provided.
- e. **Restore and re-forest 20% of all areas affected by wildfire** since 2017.¹⁷ No cost estimates are provided.
- f. **Require all existing and new residential and commercial structures to implement “home hardening”** to protect against wildfires.¹⁸ No costs estimates are provided.
- g. Reduce indoor residential water use and **impose new water conservation standards and tiered water rates, including prohibition on “wasteful” water uses such as use of potable water for irrigation, even during non-drought conditions.**¹⁹ No cost estimates are provided.
- h. **Multiple mandatory measures requiring municipal infrastructure, equipment and vehicles to be retrofitted or**

¹³ Draft RCAAP, “Measure BE-4: Increase Sustainable Wine Certification;” p. 3-15; “Measure AG-7: Increase Sustainable Vineyard Certification;” pp. 3-67- 3-68; Appendix H, Action No’s BE-4-B, 4-E, AG-7-F, pp H-4, H-27.

¹⁴ Draft RCAAP, Appendix H, Action No’s AG-1-A- AG-9-C generally, pp. H-24- 28.

¹⁵ Draft RCAAP, Appendix H, Action No’s TR-1-C- TR-14-C, OF-2-A, OF-2-C, generally, pp. H-6- - H-14.

¹⁶ Draft RCAAP, Appendix H, Action No’s SW-1-B, SW-1-D, SW-1-E, pp. H-14- H-15.

¹⁷ Draft RCAAP, “Measure AG-6: Restore Woodland and Forest Habitat,” pp.3-65- 3-66.

¹⁸ Draft RCAAP, Appendix H, Action No’s ALL-3.2, p. H-29.

¹⁹ Draft RCAAP, Appendix H, Action No’s WW-3-A, 3-F, 4-C, 4-E, 5-A, 5-B, 5-C, 7-E-7-I, 7-V, 7-X, 7-Y, 7-Z, pp. H-19- H-24.

replaced to achieve greenhouse gas reduction and climate adaptation standards.²⁰ No cost estimates are provided.

RECOMMENDATION: These additional measures and programs should not adopted until specific cost estimates and benefit-cost evaluations are completed.

**Respectfully submitted,
Christopher J. Warner
1434 Grayson Avenue
St. Helena, CA 94574
chrisjwarner52@gmail.com**

²⁰ Draft RCAAP, Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Climate Adaptation Measures, generally as applicable to municipal and governmental buildings, facilities, utility infrastructure, equipment and vehicles.