

Environmental Services Strategic Planning Meeting
October 5, 2018

The aspirations of the group were: Farmland/Ag; Land use/ Development; Surface Water - Rivers/Creeks; Climate Change and Adaptation; Habitat / Open Space; View Shed; Other Environmental Issues;

Solutions included: conservation easements - mitigation lands, county equivalent to Williamson Act; farm stays, farmworker housing; create incentives; County should do expensive science / studies; County should do expensive science / studies; more monitoring sloldercal; AWOS needs to be split; re-evaluate AG as "best use" in water shed areas; establish enforcement methods and objectives. Then require org. facilitate groups to discuss development; transparency EG-CALFIRE timber process; enhance traffic engineering / plan far out +20yrs; create long range planning dept.; increase access to information for public to understand what / how / why; stories of people doing responsible development need to highlighted and used as example. With a caution on symbolism of responsible development; prohibit development within stream set beds; incentivize/encourage riparian; education of riparian habitat protection and benefits; public access to more water ways; scientific monitoring reporting; do climate smart planning - which implies balancing different land uses to protect open spaces (invading Ag & forest) (see level rise impacts too; requiring GHG and activity based emissions inventory of businesses (focus on big producers) and for them to have a plan for lowering tier climate impact; before adding more variance, stop and evaluate where we are right now with production of GHG; Need a baseline of data; work from shared date and in crease communication and transparency across the board; distinguish open space and august change the zoning for the hills establish aggregate tree removal limits for areas and county as a whole; specific zoning for biological sensitive or important areas including wild life corridors; gather and publicize evidence-update the baseline data report; incentivize private land owners to preserve open space; preserve/purchase skyline park; inspect 25%of all wineries every year; enforce and adhere to existing zoning and permit requirements; enforce and adhere to existing zoning and permit requirements; convene a science based collaboration around measure C issue; decrease public traffic - public transit; increase walkability (vine trail); litter enforcement (open pick up beds, esp.); replant trees in right of way; complete fire education plan; Fuels mgmt. needed from (FMP); and, additional \$ from USDA-NRCS for Federal easement with other matching funds.

Aspiration: Farmland/Ag		
Specific Challenge or Problem	Evidence this Challenge or Problem Exists	Impact of the Challenge or Problem on You?
Urbanization	solar farms	traffic
Regulation - cost/compliance	housing	noise
Balance conservation/commerce	rural residences	constrained infrastructure
topsoil erosion	resorts	storm water
lack of scientific research /outreach	wineries	GHG
Ensuring AG is Biodiverse/sustainable-share cost, credit	corporate money	Absentee management
	land owner complaint	tax benefits doesn't go back to farming
	confusion	life experts
	costs-time	freezes action
	hard for agency support	costly
	lack of continuity	split community
	trust	would incentivize
	in Napa-good balance - erosion would be a problem	fish/wildlife
	community needs to share in cost to owner for public benefit	AG productivity
	soil analyst	Fertilizer required
	potential hazard	water use
	water courses- spawning	
	general permit	
	delisting	

Solution			
Actions to Solve	Who Needs to Be Involved	Pros Cons	
mitigation lands, county equivalent to Williamson Act		land protection	reduced taxes
farm stays, farmworker housing		privacy	erosion of AG use segregates farmers from community
reduce annexation		carrot than stick	reduce city revenues
transfer development right		easy to implement	paperwork
reduce regulations/cost		reduce congestion	voluntary
create incentives		AG quality	claim of "green washing"
County should do expensive science / studies		quality of life	needs to be on going
County should do expensive science / studies		reduce illegal living	
expand erosion control to other uses rural homes, small uses		increase density	
Third party sustainable programs		walkable	
more monitoring sloldercal		keep AG land	
		better transportation	
		protect open space	
		spreads cost out over public benefit	
		improve water quality	
		reduce erosion more	
		buys more people H2O	
		problem / solution	
		better operational base line	
		carrot not stick	
		low cost / big impact.	

Aspiration: Land use/ Development		
Specific Challenge or Problem	Evidence this Challenge or Problem Exists	Impact of the Challenge or Problem on You?
Lacks communication City/County	agreements-RUL	loss of quality of life
urban use vs rural use	housing arguments - ABAG	balance BTWN commercial VS. residents
environmental report how is it review	lacks communication	infrastructure support
review needs clarification\	rest/wineries in AWOS	lawsuits /cost. Fire access
neg/declaration mind	Reservoirs - County turning blind eye (60/40)	permits are complicated lengthy delay
bifurcation/ask, water, open, space	too much litigation	people go around
not treated differently	deforest trees	can't get to work on time
lack of compliance and enforcement of EIR and conditions and approvals	ground cover	hazards / unsafety road loosing support for real agriculture
redefine AG	workers/labor force has to commute	congestion of traffic
traffic	road access/maintenance/rural wineries	
lack of affordable housing	MSRC - 18K think problem	
land use decisions driven by commercial concerns rather than sustainabilities	traffic	
	Supervisor Dillon "Land use being fiscalized"	

Solution			
Actions to Solve	Who Needs to Be Involved	Pros Cons	
look @ housing site approach to all projects	PBES	increase quality of life	different for people to see L/T view
impact	Different Stakeholders	safe guarding our future	politically personal division
upfront	long range planning dept	government of will be responsible to well being of community as whole (humans, enviromental, animals, etc)	who pays
participation of many grades	BOS	protect our climate	comm/corporate and businesses resist/loss of clout
AWOS needs to be split	Advocacy for future Generation	we are talking about this and coming together	
re-prioritized	community		
re-evaluate AG as "best use" in water shed areas	CEO		
education about efforts	business		
change the general plan change	homeowners		
to protect sensitive domestic water shed areas	builders		
policy change	cities/town(esp. AMERICAN CANYON)		
move to 90/10	Regional entities		
improve permitting process			
remove conversations from plan commissions			
establish enforcement methods and objectives. Then require org. facilitate groups to discuss development;			
more opp for community engagement before formal process			
transparency EG- CALFIRE timber process			
enhance traffic engineering / plan far out +20yrs			
create long range planning dept.			
advocacy for future generations			
increase access to information for public to understand what / how / why			
ombudsmen position			
regional efforts/approaches city/county/state			

Red indicates top vote getter(s).

<p>stories of people doing responsible development need to highlighted and used as example. With a caution on symbolism of responsible development</p>			
--	--	--	--

Aspiration: Surface Water - Rivers/Creeks		
Specific Challenge or Problem	Evidence this Challenge or Problem Exists	Impact of the Challenge or Problem on You?
water quality and quality of ground water and surface waters	DWR determination that the Napa Valley Sub basin is a high priority under the sustainable ground water management Act for sustainability	Depletion of habitat
development encroachment into stream creek and other reviewing water bodies	TMDL listing by the water quality control board (eg. sediment , nutrients. Etc.)	import to special species: with brad turtle, yellow legged from, red legged frog, fresh water shrimp, fisheries steel shed
	erosion	tile down system impiety/depletory of shallow ground water, stream bore flow, ground water dependent eco systems
	channel incision	land subsidence
	hardening of natural channels	salt water intrusion
	loss of property, habitat, riparian vegetation	flooding
	flooding	property damage
		loss of species
		decline water quality
		invasive species

Solution			
Actions to Solve	Who Needs to Be Involved	Pros Cons	
prohibit development within stream set beds	Napa county	future generations having water security	Expensive to restore, existing development
more public outreach (bulletins, fliers, etc.)	flood district	cheeps Napa - Napa (maintains the beauty and aesthetic of the natural environment)	reduces the use of the AG land for AG
incentivize/encourage riparian	RCD	protecting an important ecological area	political push back
restoration (private & public lands)	NRCS	reduces cost of water treatment	
education of riparian habitat protection and benefits	Stakeholders	public benefits	
environmental sustainable plan and agency	homeowners	species recovery	
public access to more water ways	AG & Residential groundwater users	less flooding and food damage	
scientific monitoring reporting	RWQCB/Dept of water resources	implementation of conservative sustainable projects reduce risk of climate change	
more partnership with other organizations and agencies, NGO's	dept. of water rights/SWRCB	beneficial uses of NC waters (access for recreational purposes)	
conserve and protect of waters	under served communities (disadvantaged)		
low impact development requirements for development (e.g. less impervious)	cities		
low inflow stream ranges with transparency and public access	granting agencies		
	private philanthropist		
	families		
	national news agencies		

Red indicates top vote getter(s).

Aspiration: Climate Change and Adaptation			
Specific Challenge or Problem	Evidence this Challenge or Problem Exists	Impact of the Challenge or Problem on You?	
Lack of focus on climate issues	climate action plan not complete proposed mandates are low hanging fruit	urbanization in RUL	
projects pushed through without considering impact on whole environment (all spaces that we share)	e.g. winery approved at small size but they ask for increase in production/visitors in the future yrs., no requirement for project to project longer term growth	Loss of Ag and open space pollution from cars coming into the Valley	
housing imbalance impacts climate	more people have to commute into Napa County lack of affordable housing	increase in greenhouse gases	
cutting down oak trees (and other trees) up in hillside / watershed)	measure C - County stood with NO on C	collection of carbon decrease; streams clogged with sediment; don't maintain biodiversity	
fewer protection for AG open space conversion to things like solar farms	intensification of use on Ag land	more cars; increase in pollution	
prioritizing of tourism	increase visitors with out improvements in infrastructure		
burning in Ag lands			
Solution			
Actions to Solve	Who Needs to Be Involved	Pros Cons	
do climate smart planning - which implies balancing different land uses to protect open spaces (invading Ag & forest) (see level rise impacts too.	residents	collaborative efforts toward climate action	disrupts status quo, May cause resistance, lack of trust or trust broken if expectations not met
requiring GHG and activity based emissions inventory of businesses (focus on big producers) and for them to have a plan for lowering tier climate impact.	business - family businesses and industry	solutions address system as a whole	some would have to business plan
advocate for housing solutions that reduced the need to commute and increase transportation service for employees to decrease car usage	elected officials (County, Cities and State)	new practices could reduce use of fossil fuel /carbon emissions	county struggles with right forum/venue to hear from community in effective way
increase protection for the county's green space (including Ag, parks, wildland). County should address intensification of use on Ag land	Scientist and experts from other areas that have had success in addressing these issues	everyone starts from same baseline of information and data	
before adding more variance, stop and evaluate where we are right now with production of GHG. Need a baseline of data.		set goals incrementally to reduce share of climate to pollution oriented	
county should embrace climate concerns of its citizens and be welcoming at public meetings			
work from shared date and in crease communication and transparency across the board.			

Red indicates top vote getter(s).

Aspiration: Habitat / Open Space		
Specific Challenge or Problem	Evidence this Challenge or Problem Exists	Impact of the Challenge or Problem on You?
deforestation - allowing vineyards in the hills w/oak tree removal	CEQA documents	erosion, reduced water quality and availability - change of scenery, increased green house gas
loss of habitats as a whole - migration paths, wild life corridors, (includes non-oak woodlands)	contaminated water supply	same as above plus loss of wildlife, more road kills, loss of diversity for future generations
developing an ability to rationally discuss issues where there are fundamentally opposed point of views	net loss of trees (massive)	loss of our natural heritage pressure on biological diversity hot spots
dealing with projects that comply with existing zoning and regulation- but have opposition-maybe based on opposition to existing zoning, regulations, etc.	take a look out your window studies by ecologist and other scientist	people at each other's throats
lack of appropriate code and zoning enforcement		skyrocketing permitting costs
failure to take cumulative impacts into consideration when addressing individual projects		bad actors causing loss of confidence in the process
preservation of skyline park		failure to adequately characterize the true impact of projects

Solution			
Actions to Solve	Who Needs to Be Involved	Pros Cons	
distinguish open space and august change the zoning for the hills establish aggregate tree removal limits for areas and county as a whole	citizens	healthier environment	this will take time
specific zoning for biological sensitive or important areas including wild life corridors	BOS	better value on the mature native trees	changed zoning-reduced future tax base
gather and publicize evidence-update the baseline data report	Planning Commission	reduce the impact of traffic and housing needs for the community	
incentivize private land owners to preserve open space	UC Cooperative extension	anything that has the potential to rebuild trust benefits everyone	
preserve/purchase skyline park	dept. of fish and wildlife	enforcement will reward and protect those who want to play by the rules	
county version of the Williamson act for open space	research conservation district	easier and cheaper to preserve than restore	
independent cumulative impact study for projects approved in the past 10yrs	California Native plant society	greater recreational opportunities for everyone	
inspect 25%of all wineries every year	wildlife rescue	taking a long term view will help avoid problems associated with short term thinking	
enforce and adhere to existing zoning and permit requirements	Napa vision 2050		
convene a science based collaboration around measure C issue	Sierra Club		
handle adjudication of CEQU issues using outside judges	farm bureau		
	wine growers		
	AG commissioner		
	scientists		
	organizations like the American Forests		

Red indicates top vote getter(s).

Aspiration: View Shed		
Specific Challenge or Problem	Evidence this Challenge or Problem Exists	Impact of the Challenge or Problem on You?
air quality impacting	some days air quality impacts the view (visual)	first impression - impact views of people on living / visiting Valley including points when stopped at locations
view-entry points	move Soscol/Hwy 29/121 intersection	embarrassed for visitors coming (first impression)
litter/trash on road (don't see it as much up Valley)	removal of trees, hap hazard commercial development	poor impression of visitors coming into the valley
entry point on Soscol - too commercial; not aesthetically pleasing	2017 Fires and dead trees - (not fire related)remaining	increase areas of fire risk
lack of knowledge to improve fire safety (especially around water creeks)(fire zone around development)		slowly decrease the beauty of the value
no value to view site ordinance if a variance can be obtained		impact groundwater quality

Solution			
Actions to Solve	Who Needs to Be Involved	Pros Cons	
decrease traffic-public transit	NVTA	increase public safety	\$\$
require electric vehicles	Cal Trans/ City /County	improve air quality	enforce = reactive
increase walkability (vine trail)	Private business	increase accessibility to EV	\$\$
pedestrian bridges move frequent. AC, North of Trancas	enforcement Hwy patrol / County/ City	welcoming appearance	\$\$
increase EV charging stations as demand increases	Pick up community groups/school	increase public awareness	various view points not satisfied
litter enforcement (open pick up beds esp.)	Cal Trans/ City /County	education = proactive	\$\$
increased resources for trash p/u	County/City planning	improve appearance	enforcement pushback
provide more education	CAL-FIRE, NFPA, Fire wise Foundation	improve air quality	time consumed
replant trees in right of way	Landscapers	decrease fire risk	
control new development , review standards for development (new or replacement)	Code Enforcement	increase public awareness	
complete fire safety education plan	Planning Commission	maintain beauty of value	
education of professional landscaping companies	Code Enforcement	consistent code application	
increase Fire Marshall routine inspections		improve watershed	
no variance			
strict enforcement			

Red indicates top vote getter(s).

Aspiration: Other Environmental Issues		
Specific Challenge or Problem	Evidence this Challenge or Problem Exists	Impact of the Challenge or Problem on You?
increased risk of wild fires (from 2017 fires)	Standing burned trees and understories remain	continued wildfire risks to home owners
wetland mitigation bank doesn't exist	absent	challenge of forest management plan (FMP)
	finest on people on all lands that didn't follow proper permitting	Time consuming
		Destruction of natural resources

Solution			
Actions to Solve	Who Needs to Be Involved	Pros Cons	
Fuels mgmt. needed from (FMP)	USDA-NRCS	Eliminate high fuel load danger	hurdles with landowners with under 20 acres not accepted to Cal fire - CFIP program
Landowner follow USDA-NRCS Cal fire- Fire management for technical and financial assistance notice to absentee landowners	Cal fire	remove high flood risk land	USDA requires matching funds
give landowner options to work with Local/State agencies	RCD	stable environmental/ecosystem	local partnership requirements
additional inclined	Fire Safe Council		high crop land value
additional \$ from USDA-NRCS for Federal easement with other matching funds	Landowners		
us fish	County planning		
vintners, grape growers etc..			