

Log #	Name	Page	Comment/Question/Engagement Theme	Staff Response
Part A: Recommended discussion items based on City Council comments				
01	Mayor Nice	13	<p>Climate Change and Equity: This paragraph addresses the impacts outside our borders and global inequities, many of which are grounded in economic and political factors. The statement is silent about importing dirty coal-generated electricity or environmentally impactful hydroelectricity and the inequity of a transition to electrification in this region. In contrast, the transition's pollution or environmental impacts are deposited or borne in another community. Should this equity statement be more inclusive of the inequities the CAP targets create or contribute to? Minimally, we need to understand the role of the equity statement in the plan and ensure it serves a purpose that doesn't conflict with the plan. Equity could have a role in each strategy's implementation.</p>	<p>Note: Staff is seeking direction from the City Council on the equity language revisions. Multiple comments and suggestions were posed on the topic of equity, including a lengthy discussion with the Sustainability Committee.</p> <p>If a majority of Council agrees, staff will incorporate language exploring how the proposed GHG mitigation and adaptation actions could be made more equitable (this often involves grants, or full cost-coverage for low-income residents).</p> <p>Staff also agree that the equity statement could integrate language that is more specific to the Puget Sound region and the potential inequities that could result from climate action if equity is not considered as the plan is implemented. Again, seeking direction from the City Council on the areas of focus for revisions to the equity language.</p>
02	Mayor Nice	18	<p>Page 18, Who is most vulnerable?: Again, this statement doesn't speak to the vulnerabilities of the frontline communities that this CAP might directly and negatively impact. What are we saying to the communities that house PSE's coal-fired plants? What are we saying to low-income individuals that proposed CAP strategies could negatively impact? I'm generally confused by the equity language that is trying to attach to an empirically driven CAP. We are saying that climate change has disparate impacts while ignoring that the CAP might have those same impacts. Again, we need to understand the intent of the equity language and how it has a role in the CAP strategies being assessed and potentially implemented at a future date. What is the equity lens for CAP implementation?</p>	<p>Staff is seeking direction from the City Council on the equity language revisions.</p> <p>In CAP's from other communities, the cost or health impacts of implementing proposed GHG reduction and climate resiliency measures are often mitigated using social service programs, adaptation grants, or full cost-coverage.</p> <p>For instance, Issaquah's CAP included an energy efficiency incentive program with free services for low-income residents: <i>BE1.1: Develop energy efficiency outreach and incentive programs for residents and businesses, including targeted campaigns to contractors and the public, focused on specific retrofits (e.g., weatherization, energy efficient appliances, LED lighting). Develop free home energy audits and upgrade programs for income-eligible residents.</i></p> <p>In the case of PSE's power supply, state law (CETA, passed in 2019) already requires it to cease delivery of coal-fired power by 2025, and includes financial provisions for workforce transition and community impacts.</p>

Log #	Name	Page	Comment/Question/Engagement Theme	Staff Response
03	Councilmember Reynolds	30	TR 2.4 on gas leaf blowers should be a requirement.	Staff assumes this is a request for a text revision and will seek direction from the majority of the City Council on this requested change.
04	Mayor Nice	38	Add a new bullet to “Implementation Plan” under the sub-heading “MONITORING, EVALUATING, & REPORTING,” which addresses per capita emissions.	<p>Add a bullet as follows: “Report communitywide GHG emissions on a gross and per-capital adjusted basis as compared to a 2007 baseline.”</p> <p>Staff will also modify the graph on page 19 to include a depiction of per-capita emissions data (currently found in the City’s GHG Report)</p>
Part B: Suggestions/feedback from the community for City Council discussion				
05	Public	8	Finalizing Transportation targets to use either K4C or PSRC numbers.	Staff recommend sticking with the more aspirational K4C targets that the City has endorsed via its ongoing K4C Commitments, but to include a footnote detailing that recent PSRC modeling indicates there may not be enough tools currently under its control to achieve the targeted levels of VMT reduction in 2030 nor in 2050. For example, some 2022 PSRC research indicates that a road usage charge (which would be imposed by the State Legislature, not PSRC) may be necessary to achieve sufficient driving reductions and higher use of transit. These discussions are ongoing.
06	Public	28-30	Concern of over minimal focus on car alternatives (e.g. bike & scooter, etc). Shouldn't there be a KPI that tracks E-Bike ownership, miles of bike lane? The City's Ped-Bike Plan has been in existence since 1996, but has barely been implemented. We don't need a Ped-Bike Plan rewrite, we just need to elevate bike transportation as a solution in the CAP.	<p>Some other cities, such as Shoreline, use the following KPI's to address this topic: miles of bike lane and sidewalks added; number of bike commuters; average community 'WalkScore.'</p> <p>E-bike ownership is not a current KPI and would be difficult to measure given the bikes are not (currently) registered.</p> <p>If the City Council would like to include bike lane miles as a KPI, this could be researched and drafted for the next meeting.</p>

Log #	Name	Page	Comment/Question/Engagement Theme	Staff Response
07	Public	31	Support for CAP focusing more on reducing single use plastic waste	<p>Consider adding an action focused on exploring a single use plastic ban in alignment with upcoming state laws that take effect in 2024.</p> <p>Two possible actions to incorporate into the Consumption and Disposal Section on page 31 as specific actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>“Prepare for Washington’s expanded polystyrene bans by enacting a local single-use plastic ban. Conduct outreach and technical assistance to support implementation.”</u> - <u>Enact ban on select single use plastic containers in alignment with Washington state policy.”</u>