

Log #	Name	Page #	Comment/Question	Staff Response
01	Mayor Nice	General	Where do we stand with the CAP being population adjusted from 2007 to 2050? The incredible growth the region and the city have experienced and will experience is an overwhelming counterforce to all the CAP hopes to accomplish. I always believe that a successful plan needs to be set up for success. Implementing a CAP based on 2007 base year emissions with a 95% reduction by 2050 without considering the significant population growth is a recipe for failure.	The GHG goals in the CAP are drawn primarily from the modeling conducted by partner agencies, such as the K4C and PSRC, which take into account the expected population growth in the region. Cascadia’s emissions projections also account for expected population increases: the main reason that the “Business as Usual” line on the GHG wedge analysis continues to climb upwards in the future is due to the expected emissions from an increasing population. Thus, the amount of emissions reduction needed in the future (i.e. further along the wedge) to meet the 2007-based targets also increases over time.
02	Council-member Reynolds	General	The big picture observation I have is that the goals here are often not very specific. A lot of goals are some variation on “consider” or “explore” or similar. I do not think these are sufficiently specific to be meaningful. For example, we “considered” these items by putting them in our plan. So are we done? I think we need to think about phrasing these as SMART (specific, measurable, actionable, realistic, and time bound) goals. (I recognize time bound may not be practical, given these will require council action, but maybe we can do SMAR goals.)	Staff advises against revisions that mandate specific actions. The language was drafted to allow flexibility for future administrations and Councils to pursue actions as resources allow.  Staff will incorporate changes to the strategies, goals, and actions as directed by the majority of the City Council.
03	Council-member Reynolds	General	Can you please provide spreadsheet or similar versions of all matrices so that I can sort and compare and pivot?	Staff will compile these as available and suggest providing to Council at the end of the editing phase so that action descriptions, action ID#, and implementation details are internally consistent.
04	Council-member Reynolds	General	Maybe I missed it, but I do not see anywhere a quantification of how much carbon each of the actions saves, or how much each contributes to the wedge. Or even the overall result. Do we have that information?	The wedge measures emissions reduction by focus area targets (for example, 22% reduction in communitywide energy use by 2030), not by each specific action. Actions were then selected that are known to support these targets based on climate action best practices, regional forecasts, current research, etc.  If the City Council desires each action to be analyzed separately, the staff and consultants can perform that work. Additional time and resources will be needed to perform this analysis.
05	Public	General	Concern over possible limitations on supply of electricity as more and more items, including vehicles, are electrified. And related concern over stability of the above-ground power grid in Mercer Island.	Communication from PSE indicates that they are currently planning to provide sufficient electricity to power 1 million EV’s by 2050 (PSE currently has approx. 1 million electricity customers).

Log #	Name	Page #	Comment/Question	Staff Response
06	Public	General	Assertion that every CAP action should have a rigorous cost-benefit analysis, and that no action should be pursued if it has a breakeven ROI of longer than 5 years.	The proposal for a five-year ROI analysis is not feasible. Some programs will take 2 to 5 years of ramp-up time before on-the-ground implementation can begin and may also be preparing for known State Legislation that does not take effect until several years into the future. For example, the WA Clean Buildings Act, that slowly ratchets down to eventually include buildings of the size found in Town Center (20-50,000sqft.) has an implementation timeline of 9 years from 2019.
07	Mayor Nice	3	Playing Our Part: Why doesn't the City section include the use of volunteers? They are local and have a low carbon impact compared to hiring labor which is likely to generate more emissions commuting to Mercer Island. This is even more impactful for episodic work like park clean-up when many volunteers/laborers are needed to accomplish a task.	All of the actions listed in this section are programs, which may be delivered through volunteers, staff, consultants/contractors, and/or other partnerships.  The Community Involvement section (page 39) is where the draft CAP promotes the use of volunteers.
08	Mayor Nice	8	2030 Targets: 5% reduction in regional air travel fuel use should be clarified to be per-capita/adjusted if that is true. The air travel target is a regional value ascribed to Mercer Island. If the region grows as expected, a 5% reduction could be offset by expected population growth, couldn't it? We can't expect a plan to be successful if population growth isn't accounted for.	The target was identified using Cascadia's wedge tool, which accounts for expected population growth to determine what reduction is needed to reach our 2030 and 2050 targets.  The target listed is not a per-capita value since the absolute amount of jet fuel burned is what matters most to the environment. While they can be useful for comparison purposes between cities or counties, using per-capita values can mask the severity of projected GHG impacts. In many cases, per-capita emissions in a certain sector are dropping, but total volumes of climate-altering GHG's emitted are still rising, and it is that total amount (Metric Tons) that alters climate, especially in the case of jet emissions directly into the upper atmosphere.
09	Council-member Reynolds	11	The goal for a 20% increase in public participation in "public programs devoted to climate resilience" seems way too modest. What is our baseline?	These targets could be adjusted at the direction of the City Council. Current participation in Emergency Preparedness training (which includes natural disaster topics) averages about 30 course graduates per year. There are also currently 67 fully-badged emergency volunteers who have undergone additional levels of training. New course material could be added to address emerging climate-related threats such as extreme heat, wildfire smoke, local flooding, etc.

Log #	Name	Page #	Comment/Question	Staff Response
10	Mayor Nice	16	Themes from community engagement: Are these select themes? All of the themes? Ranked themes? Can someone send me all of the themes if these are just a selection? Can we see the stack-ranked themes list if these are select themes? There is an appendix with a summary of the Community Survey. Why summarize it for the Appendix? We had detailed results from the Community Survey that might be more appropriate in an Appendix. The summary is something that I expect to see in the plan.	<p>The full results of the survey will be added as a new appendix to the final CAP.</p> <p>Verbatim public input from the mailed survey tool was included in the full report that was provided to Council as Exhibit 1 of <a href="#">AB6180</a> (15 Nov 2022).</p> <p>Summaries from other public input tools used (such as online surveys; polling during public workshops; etc.) are available on Let's Talk (see: <a href="https://letstalk.mercergov.org/climate-action-plan">https://letstalk.mercergov.org/climate-action-plan</a>) which will be retained as an archive once the CAP is adopted.</p>
11	Mayor Nice	17	Random Sample Community Survey: The opening paragraph includes a sentence referencing Appendix D. Survey Summary that "provides the full detail on survey results." As a summary, it does not provide the full details of the survey results. Can we please put the full details of the Community Survey in the appendix?	The full survey results will be added as a new appendix
12	Mayor Nice	23	Page 23, Cross-Cutting and Municipal: The opening paragraph says city operations account for 1% of the total emissions, with most coming from employee commutes. The 2030 and 2050 targets in the chart below state 100% (Carbon neutral). What is the city's strategy to offset the GHG of employee commutes?	Actions <b>CC2.1</b> ( <i>CTR participation &amp; incentives</i> ) and <b>CC2.2</b> ( <i>Alternate commuting incentives</i> ) highlight some of the initiatives planned to offset employee commutes. Alternative commute incentives may include incentives to drive electric vehicles, free ORCA transit passes that most other Lake WA cities provide to staff, e-bikes available to City staff, etc.

Log #	Name	Page #	Comment/Question	Staff Response
13	Council-member Reynolds	23	I know I have asked this before, but I don't recall getting an answer I really understand. What exactly does the premium paid by consumers for green power really do? Clearly we get the same electrons we always get. Does PSE really buy or produce more green energy when people pay this premium? How is this demonstrated/documentated? I would love to see this discussed for the record in the council meeting.	<p>The premiums accrue are then invested in local renewable energy projects that PSE then sources energy from. Increasing the portion of renewable energy in its energy mix reduces the PSE emissions factor (the amount of GHG emissions generated per kWh of electricity).</p> <p>The individual paying the premium does not receive more electrons of renewable energy than their neighbor. Instead, they are sending a market signal: they are paying to add more renewable energy in the future to the PNW power-supply grid (along with electricity from other resources). The PSE program is monitored and certified by a third party, <a href="#">Green-e</a>, which certifies similar programs nationally, and audits PSE's program annually.</p>
14	Mayor Nice	28	<p>Transportation: There is a citation that 3% of transportation emissions come from recreational boats. What is this in MTCO2e? What was the watercraft contribution in MTCO2e for the base year of 2007? Is a recreational power boat transportation?</p> <p>As long as we're on the topic of transportation and now recreation, is there a potential strategy around recreational skiing and city-supported bus shuttle service to Crystal and Steven's? This could have a significant impact on the recreational GHG emissions related to recreational skiing.</p>	<p>To be more specific, the text says that 3% of emissions derive from "off road vehicles/equipment (including recreation boats)" – boats are thought to be the smallest share of this amount.</p> <p>The data for off-road vehicles came originally from the EPA MOVES tool to measure emissions from mobile sources, including recreational boats; an exact number for boats-only is not available. Based on the backcasting conducted for the City's GHG Emissions Report (available on Let's Talk), the off-road portion of emissions was approximately the same in 2007. (The GHG Report is on the City website at: <a href="http://www.mercerisland.gov/GHG_Emissions">www.mercerisland.gov/GHG_Emissions</a>)</p> <p>The City Council could explore future shuttle opportunities (such as a ski bus) as a program/service in support of CAP goals.</p>
15	Council-member Reynolds	28	How could it be remotely possible to hit 100% EV by 2050? There are gas cars on the road today that will still be on the road in 2050. Is the state going to confiscate them?	This target is based on alignment with the Washington Internal Combustion Ban, which establishes a target that, "all publicly owned and privately owned passenger and light duty vehicles of model year 2030 or later that are sold, purchased, or registered in Washington state be electric vehicles." <sup>1</sup> The wedge model assumes that vehicles are replaced on average every 15 years.

<sup>1</sup> WA E2SHB 1287 (page 5): <https://lawfilesexternal.wa.gov/biennium/2021-22/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/1287-S2.E%20HBR%20FBR%2021.pdf?q=20210702143820>

Log #	Name	Page #	Comment/Question	Staff Response
16	Council-member Reynolds	31	What is our current diversion rate for waste as compared to our 70% target?	Residential diversion rate averages about 68% per year; commercial about 57%.
17	Council-member Reynolds	31	The target of 11% reduction in landfill waste by 2030 and 60% by 2050 seems very backloaded / nonlinear. What is the justification for this pattern?	<p>This target was generated based on the wedge target inputs to reduce the amount of recyclable and compostable waste sent to landfills by 5% by 2030 and 95% by 2050 (i.e., a 95% reduction in recyclable and compostable waste translates to a 60% reduction in overall landfill waste).</p> <p>The 5% target was selected as a conservative target to reach in the short term, and 95% as a more ambitious target to reach in the long term.</p>
18	Council-member Reynolds	31	Does MI have any power over landfill emissions?	<p>Yes, in the sense that community members have influence over the amount of waste sent to landfills that in turn generate emissions.</p> <p>Landfill emissions are also impacted by the amount of landfill gas collected on-site at landfills. Because Mercer Island’s waste is sent to a landfill that is not controlled by the City, we do not, however, have the ability to impact emissions in this manner.</p>
19	Council-member Reynolds	33	Tell me about tree canopy. The goals talk about 5% increase in tree canopy. But my recollection is that we are already growing tree canopy. What is our historical canopy growth rate?	This section of the CAP was not complete when the draft was released. Proposed new targets for the Natural System focus area is included as <b>Exhibit 6 – Revised Natural Systems Section</b> .
20	Council-member Reynolds	38	The “Monitoring, evaluating, and reporting” section talks about regularly updating the CAP webpage. “Regularly” is not defined. We should include a specific commitment to make more often (quarterly?) updates to things for which easy or automated data dumps are available.	Staff do not recommend making this change. Minor updates occur frequently. More extensive updates occur annually. This language is flexible to allow for both to occur.
21	Council-member Reynolds	A-8	Why is CC3.1 a \$\$\$ item? Where are the costs? Consultants? Can we create a process that volunteers can do?	<p>Yes, the cost estimate was based on consultants supporting updates to the inventory; Mercer Island is exploring the cost efficiency of conducting its inventory using a partnership model along with 4 other eastside cities, which could bring down the cost.</p> <p>Updating the inventory is labor intensive and complex. Staff do not recommend assigning this work to volunteers.</p>

Log #	Name	Page #	Comment/Question	Staff Response
22	Council-member Reynolds	C-1	Did we consider co-benefits when ranking items? In other words, did we ever consider that reducing gas powered yard tools addresses noise pollution as well? How about other co-benefits for other tasks?	Staff did a very preliminary analysis of the co-benefits, but it was not exhaustive and therefore not included in the MCA.