

APPENDIX A: Online Comments Received

Built Environment

- Implement a residential organic waste composting program. Enforce commercial composting state mandates. Enforce the Renter's Right to Recycle Act by ensuring that all renters in Sacramento have access to recycling (currently there are many apartments out of compliance).
- A priority should be developing vacant land in the City for housing, with an emphasis on affordability. This will cut commute times and save fuel.
- Make buildings more efficient and have them operate on solar power if possible.
- Yes, promote more solar and living rooftops, and green walls.
- Budget to convert City buildings to LEED platinum status, such as was done with 1001 I St during construction. Include building externalities including garbage trucks (gas/electric) and other emissions related to building upkeep. Require all new construction & renovations of existing structures to meet high standards for green building and LEED status.
- Yes. Please ban leaf blowers. Their noisy beyond all reason. They spread bacteria and PM2.5 & PM10 particles into the air column, and they foul our homes and yards--which we must then clean a second time.
- Addressing climate change in the public sector will require money. Federal tax money would be nice, full-fledged FDR style programs would be great, but would require FDR styled high taxes on billionaires. Since climate change is the biggest threat to national security, the defense budget should be put into massive solar and electric vehicle production. Mayors need to demand this from Washington.
- 1) Work with SMUD to allow homeowners to install solar that maximizes potential (rather than just meeting current electricity needs). 2) Work with Sac Trees to ensure there are adequate shade trees for every home in the city. 3) Provide rebates to upgrade energy-intensive water-using appliances and fixtures. 5) Enact stricter water/energy new building and retrofit requirements.
- <https://living-future.org/> International Living Future Institute (HQed in Seattle); <https://biomimicry.org/> Biomimicry Institute. Both of the suggestions apply to all of the questions on this form.
- design to the actual need. too often people focus on just replacing fossil fuels with PVs and windpower.
- 1. Evaluate best practices for reducing GHG from green waste collected by city...for example, composting facilities vs anaerobic digesters, etc. 2. Reduce green waste going to landfill by adding residential fruit and vegetable waste, and clean wood/sawdust waste to green waste container 3. Find a use for methane gas collected at 28th st landfill. Millions of cubic feet of gas have been flared there since Blue Diamond stopped using the gas to generate heat.
- More simple basic secure housing near transit. An ability to park car long-term outside the urban core, so it's not taking up space within.
- Create a program encouraging & facilitating carve-out of separate unit(s) from big home, so aging-in-place senior can rent it out to college students. (Make it easy for a homeowner to shelter other people, who they may not already know, safely.) Also: to build apt. above garage, lift the house and put a rental unit below, etc. - make design/approve/fund/build/rent as simple & low-upfront-cost as possible for the homeowner.
- I think it is really important for people to have parks and walkways close by in the neighborhoods so we don't have to drive to a park or pond or pool. It is counterproductive to drive a car someplace to breathe fresh air.
- Thanks for forming the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change. Let's get going! Tracking progress of others can help in choosing your path. Compare California counties for electricity generation and GHG

production. What county produces the most GHG (CO₂)? <http://wwmpd.com/irp/ghg/index.svg> How much GHG comes from Yolo county electricity generation? In 2001 2,564 MT, In 2017 706 MT, 72.5% reduction. http://wwmpd.com/irp/ghg/p_003267-003263.svg / How much GHG comes from Sacramento county electricity generation? In 2001 1,401,761 MT, In 2017 1,890,531 MT, 34.9% increase. http://wwmpd.com/irp/ghg/p_003267-003126.svg / MT is metric tons (about 2,200 pounds). Read your electric utility's power content labels. SMUD 2008 label 20% renewable - https://www.energy.ca.gov/pcl/labels/2008_labels/SMUD%202008%20PCL.pdf / SMUD 2017 label 19% renewable - https://www.smud.org/-/media/Documents/Corporate/Environmental-Leadership/2017_PowerContentLabel.pdf / PG&E 2008 label 14% renewable - https://www.energy.ca.gov/pcl/labels/2008_labels/PG%20and%20E%20pcl%202008.pdf / PG&E 2017 label 33% renewable - https://www.pge.com/pge_global/common/pdfs/your-account/your-bill/understand-your-bill/bill-inserts/2018/10-18_PowerContent.pdf / Ask others if they have read their utility's power content label and if they have a GHG goal. By law (Title 20 section 1393), all retail suppliers (your electric service provider) must display a label in product-specific written promotional materials, and must send their customers annual label updates. The retail supplier must validate these claims at the end of the year through an independent audit. In this way, consumers can feel confident that retailers purchase what the consumer "pays for." See this Energy Commission web page for more details on Power Source Disclosure and label requirements. <https://www.energy.ca.gov/pcl/background.html> / I will be tracking your progress, if you have any questions or requests, please email Steve Uhler at sau@wwmpd.com

- 2045 may seem far away, but it will take years to see action and savings. If you follow the 80/20 rule, we will get 80% to goal with 20% effort, the last 20% will take 80% of the effort. We have 26 years, that means 80% to goal by 2024. Listening to the commissioners speak, they are focused on job creation, which is great, but you also have to think of the efficiency of this process. The more moving parts you introduce, the harder it will become to stay on track. If the goal is to be carbon zero, then you have to remove the carbon from society. You have to find the carbon, identify an alternative, implement the project, see the rewards. That said, the main carbon is natural gas to buildings, gas stations for cars and power plants for electricity to buildings. I spent many years doing energy efficiency projects throughout the world, it will take sales people finding decision makers, technical staff to design, and construction crews to reduce load at buildings. Energy Service companies are already doing this. The bottle neck will be knowledgeable construction workers doing the builds and site decision makers considering alternatives uses for the funds at the site. Maybe they would rather put in a production line, etc. SMUD incentives are good, which helps, but rates are low, which hurt. Low rates mean that the project isn't going to save a lot of money. We need to get away from doing it for money, but for the embedded cost of what will happen if we don't do anything. End users don't value that. I would recommend looking at special funding to bring solar and battery storage to the consumer power plant, make it 80% green by 2024 (Australia put in projects in 100 days). That would be 400 MW of the 500 listed on the website. That will get you part way there on the supply side While doing this, offer additional incentives for electrification projects in the SMUD territory, to attack the natural gas side. Understand that shift will increase SMUD energy demand, so at the same time there should be a focus on efficiency improvement.
- Yes! I work as an instructor for Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, a worldwide organization. We know from Climate Experts that the major consequences of global depletion and global change stems from our unsustainable food choices. 51 percent of our global warming is due to animal agriculture. Our clearing of forests, the lagoons of manure, the methane gas from cattle, the depletion of fish which will cause them to be extinct by 2048, is all polluting our air, land and water.
- Adopt a reach code that makes gas use in building more stringent, require all buildings to be all electric ready, put in a threshold, like \$250k on remodel permits that at that level require the building to also become all-electric ready.
- Ramp up the activity levels to reach zero fossil fuel use by 2030
- "Yes - investigate and ask SMUD to update the current regressive rate structure to a fair, environmental and community beneficial system. Jennifer Gress is very familiar with this - see my recent editorial

- <https://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/srud-isnt-as-green-as/content?oid=27623584>
- Adopt a revised and more aggressive time schedule for individual carbon reduction actions (decarbonization) and set time schedules to conform with both state law and IPCC carbon reduction recommendations.
- deal with SRUDS rate structure that is anti-conservation, anti-solar anti low energy users.
- more transit first actions like expanded light rail, protected bike lanes and electric busses
- Prioritize electrification and retrofits of existing buildings.
- Dense housing near transit
- Set the goal to 2022 for carbon zero. This is non-negotiable.
- "Yes. Vortex Green Energy (VGE) can help accelerate emission reductions with solutions specific to the industrial and commercial sector provided at no cost to industry, government, or the utilities, with significant environmental benefits. The solution is ""recycled"" electricity--converting wasted electricity into usable electricity at the point of consumption. The technology improves the consumption efficiency which reduces generation requirements of the utility lowering their costs. VGE simply shares the savings created for the utility. 100 units installed (which are already planned for the Greater Sacramento Area in an upcoming pilot program) would save 100 Million kilowatt hours in a year, conservatively. According to the EPA website, these 100 units will reduce annual carbon dioxide emissions by 21,523 metric tons--which is like reducing 52,624,700 miles driven by an average passenger vehicle or the equivalent annual carbon sequestration of 355,900 trees planted 10 years ago. And it's like replacing 817,500 incandescent bulbs with LEDs.
- Short article about impact PER UNIT installed in CA (article highlights numbers from 1 unit--we are installing 100 units locally): <http://VortexGreenEnergy.com/improve-the-environment>
- If we want to achieve carbon zero in the built environment by 2045, we should be looking at multiple ways to encourage and support businesses to achieve this goal on their own, as well as with government support. Initial steps could include incentivizing businesses to get LEED certification, install cool/green roofs, and plant more trees. Larger steps could include installing solar and wind power on individual buildings, ensuring local energy providers are moving to clean energy, or creating partnerships that allow businesses to buy into a clean energy coalition. We should also be looking at new technologies that would decrease the impact of concrete. Here are some ideas on saving money and cooling city temperatures through environmentally friendly changes:
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b104d0b365f02ddb7b29576/t/5b86e700898583a65cb06c64/1535567650399/8+pager+8.21.18.pdf>
- The basics would help - abundant reliable secure housing from "honest brokers", at all price points, 2 miles or less from transit.
- All new developments and recently new developments e.g. McKinley village should be required to use photovoltaics on the residential and commercial unit rooftops; unless it is just impractical. This is to help achieve the State of CA goals noted in the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
- "regarding built environment #11. ""Adopt a rate based infrastructure charge""
- See SRUD fixed charge comments below. This improvement can be implemented immediately for zero cost. A revised rate would save millions of kilowatt hours, reduce emissions and bring fair treatment to low energy users."
- please see additional comments
- Would Sacramento require Sacramento gas stations to display the True Price of a gallon gasoline? The Center for Investigative Reporting claims that the true price of gasoline would be over \$15 a gallon if the hidden cost of air pollution and treating resulting respiratory disease were included in the price of gasoline.

<https://thinkprogress.org/true-cost-of-gasoline-try-15-a-gallon-832db0342a70/> The gas station receipt could reference a website with information explaining the “True Price of Gasoline.” The website might say something like “Note: “the true price of gasoline includes all the hidden costs of gasoline, such as the cost of treating asthma and respiratory illnesses from the air pollution caused by burning gasoline. The true price does not include the costs of sea level rising 33 to 66 feet in the next 1,000 years. (1) Atmospheric CO2 is currently over 400 ppm. The CO2 emissions from your gasoline will help raise atmospheric CO2 over 400 ppm. The last time atmospheric CO2 was over 400 ppm, sea level was 33 to 66 feet higher. Sea level is expected to rise 3 feet by 2100. At that rate, it would take 935 to 1,870 years for sea level to rise 33 to 66 feet.

- The following UC Professors are listed as a reference for this video. Might Sacramento city officials contact them and ask for references and an update on the true price of gasoline? Has it increased since 2011? Has it increased with the forest fires and other climate change events? Professor Dan Kammen, U.C. Berkeley Chris M. Jones, U.C. Berkeley Chris Jones is lead developer at the CoolClimate Network, an applied research consortium at UC Berkeley's Renewable and Appropriate Energy Laboratory that supports the development of comprehensive, socially integrated carbon footprint management tools and programs for individuals, schools, businesses and Severin Borenstein, U.C. Berkeley Dan Sperling, U.C. Davis Dr. Daniel Sperling is Professor of Civil Engineering and Environmental Science and Policy, and founding Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Davis (ITS-Davis).
<https://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2013/05/130510-earth-co2-milestone-400-ppm/>
- Yes, phase out the use of gas-powered leaf blowers. According to the California Air Resources Board, by 2020, gas-powered leaf blowers and other small gas engines will create more ozone pollution than all of the passenger cars in the state.
- The city could explore a concept of multi-level geothermal/solar greenhouse that can grow produce and other goods that otherwise are transported here. A more sustainable city can reduce the carbon from commercial trucking and transport.
- Encourage the development of market rate condominium homes in the urban core by working to eliminate the condominium 10 year liability provision in California law. This discourages builders and architects from designing and building condominium homes. Liability insurance to address this issue is very costly and adds significantly to the cost of this type of housing. Condominiums are the most sustainable form of owner occupied housing in the urban core. This recommendation relates both to housing and mobility. Washington Commons, a cohousing community in the development stage in West Sacramento, will consist of 30-40 condominium flats. We have had difficulty finding architects who will take our project on because of this liability issue.
- You are welcome to read the following, for it involves all of us. I had shown Remi a graph of the Average Californian staying in their 1.5 degree C CO2 emissions budget. It was based on the California Air Resources Board data showing the average Californian emitting about 82 pounds of CO2 equivalents per day from 2007 to January 1, 2018. On January 1, 2018 that Average Californian was given their 38,367 pounds of CO2 emissions budget from IPCC data. In 2011 the IPCC gave the world 400 billion metric tonnes of CO2 to emit, and then there was a 66% chance the world would warm 1.5 degrees C. If you subtract world CO2 emissions from 2011 to January 2018, and divided the remaining CO2 emissions among 7.6 billion people, we each get about 38,367 pounds of CO2.
- An Excel spreadsheet then subtracted 0.22% from the Average Californian's 82 pounds of CO2 per day to show the Average Californian used up their 38,367 pounds of CO2 equivalents before by 2021. You can divide our 38,367 pounds of CO2 equivalents budget by 82 pounds of CO2 per day and find it would last about 468 days or about 1.3 years. So, though the City of Sacramento can have a goal of being carbon neutral by 2045, we can see this city wide goal is based on limiting global warming to 2 degrees C. In Paris world leaders decided we should try to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C, so we personally should try to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C. So, how can Sacramento City residents live when their CO2 emissions budget is used up? We can take responsibility for our CO2 emissions, and invest in Negative

Emissions Technologies to take our CO₂ emissions out of the atmosphere. We can go to the Cool California Carbon Calculator, find out how many tonnes of CO₂ we emitted last year, and donate \$15 per tonne of CO₂ to Professor Stuart Licht's GoFundMe Site. Professor Licht's Group has calculated that if fully funded, his method could remove all anthropogenic CO₂ in 10 years. That is 1,374 billion tonnes of CO₂. <https://www.carbonbrief.org/doha-infographic-gets-the-numbers-wrong-underestimates-human-emissions> California's Cap and Trade Program currently pays \$15 a tonne in their carbon offset program. <http://calcarbondash.org> At \$15 a tonne, 1,374 billion tonnes of CO₂ would bring in \$20.610 trillion dollars. If members of the UC Davis Department of Chemistry think Professor Licht's ideas are worth pursuing, might the City of Sacramento negotiate a contract with Professor Licht? Sacramento lawyers could negotiate a contract with Professor Licht and possibly Fidelity Investments. This contract might ask Professor Licht to sign something like the following: "if I make more than \$400,000 a year from taking CO₂ out of the atmosphere, I will give the City of Sacramento and those who have contributed to my GoFundMe Site 10% a year on their donation, as long as the total I pay to others is less than 5% of the total money made from taking CO₂ out of the atmosphere. The rest of the money will go to improving methods of taking CO₂ out of the atmosphere." Fidelity Investments might help administer this pay out. Sacramento could start raising money for Professor Licht's GoFundMe Site by stating "the Sacramento Kings basketball team members and Sacramento city officials will lead the way in taking responsibility for our CO₂ emissions. We will fill out the Cool California Carbon Calculator and find out the tonnes of CO₂ we emitted last year. We will donate \$15 a tonne to Professor Licht's GoFundMe Site. Many Presidential candidates disclose their tax records. Sacramento City could state "Presidential Candidates should disclose the tonnes of CO₂ they emitted last year, and the amount of money they have donated to sequester those tonnes of CO₂." Why would Presidential candidates do that? Scientists tell us that our CO₂ emissions are a major cause of climate change, and the Department of Defense says that "climate change is an urgent and growing threat to our national security, contributing to increased natural disasters, refugee flows, and conflicts over basic resources such as food and water. These impacts are already occurring, and the scope, scale, and intensity of these impacts are projected to increase over time." Sacramento City officials and the Sacramento Kings can lead us in protecting our country from our CO₂ emissions, and lead us in sequestering the tonnes of CO₂ we emit. The City of Sacramento might ask the U.C. Davis Department of Chemistry and the CSUS Department of Chemistry if they can help Professor Licht take CO₂ out of the air. Can we build a Negative Emissions Technology Factory here in Sacramento to take CO₂ out of the air using Professor Licht's methods? Thank you for considering helping Professor Licht develop his Negative Emissions Technology,

- We just returned from Denmark (powered almost entirely by wind), Sweden (powered by wind and hydro) and Norway (all hydro- they have so much water). Copenhagen burns its non-metal waste and creates fuel for its bus systems, and the tall plant that does that doubles as a recreation facility, climbing wall and summer ski venue. Copenhagen, Stockholm and Oslo (smaller) are about the same size as Sacramento + West Sac. Of course, electric storage is still a problem, Denmark shifts its excess electricity to the German grid. What we want is being done elsewhere, we do not have to reinvent the wheel, just build the wheel to match our frame. Call the cities of Copenhagen or Stockholm or Oslo and talk to people, they all speak excellent English, have been taking it since they were seven. There are more Teslas in Norway than in the states, we even saw Tesla taxis. They incentivize buying electric cars. I am thrilled to see that we are on our way too....
- We must adopt more design integration into all the systems in the built environment including, energy, building, infrastructure and landscape. We must encourage opportunities within the built environment to grow our own food, harvest/reuse water, and design for the passive environmental controls (not relying on HVAC to solve comfort).
- How about built environments that include spaces for individual or community gardens, even decks that can support raised beds for gardens? How about something like the "pea patch" community gardens that are all over Seattle in every neighborhood?

- Investigate the green buildings in Paris. They have both solar panels and walls covered with foliage, vines, etc. Another suggestion is more new building that incorporates using white roofs and requiring solar panels
- Consider incorporating climate adaptation strategies into mitigation measures
- "Are you aware of the report Right Type, Right Place: Assessing the Environmental and Economic Impacts of Infill Residential Development through 2030. (<https://www.next10.org/right-housing/>)? It is the first comprehensive academic study of its kind – and finds that encouraging new housing development in infill areas would spur economic growth, reduce monthly household costs, and cut greenhouse gas emissions, keeping the state on track to achieving its climate goals. It says the infill is key to California's future.
- I recently reviewed the Draft Sacramento Historic District Plans and now I am concerned that Sacramento is heading in the wrong direction. www.cityofsacramento.org/HDP
- Are you aware that almost half of the residential area in the Central City are now in historic districts? These districts are in the most transit friendly areas of the city. (see map in draft document) The new draft plans severely restrict infill development in historic districts, especially in the deep lots (40' x 160') that are found throughout the city. I drove around and photographed many of the existing infill housing units along the alleys, including one directly behind my historic mid-town home. Many of these built infill units are family homes, not just rentals. Using Google Earth, I checked to see if they could be built under the proposed restrictions. None of them could. I looked through Historic District Plans of many other cities including Los Angeles. None of the have these such severe numerical restrictions. The worst of the restrictions calls for setbacks between the front house and new infill alley construction both on the project lot and from neighboring houses of 40 feet. This is the infill along our neglected alleys that we absolutely need to build to meet the 2030 Climate goals in SB 34. Another restriction has to do with so called protection of 40 ft x 160 ft lots. These lots are found throughout the city and are not a historic feature of any district. There should be no special protection as they are the most likely site that infill can be built upon. We cannot as a City be adopting greater restrictions on infill development for over half of the Central City. I hate to use the word NIMBY but these are misguided attempts to freeze in place a landscape that does not allow for change. Both areas in Historic Districts and in non-historic areas need to share the solution to meet SB 34 goals. I am both an environmental scientist by profession and a preservationist having been a member of Preservation Sacramento, National Trust for Historic Preservation and California Preservation Foundation. Please be aware of this draft document that still can be changed to balance environmental needs with protecting our historic resources.
- implementation of the proposals heard on May 29 will face some resource constraints that the commission may not have considered. these are explained in detail in the following information: Green Illusions: The Dirty Secrets of Clean Energy and the Future of Environmentalism, by Ozzie Zehner 2012 <http://www.greenillusions.org/> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v6uVnyjTb58&t=81s> Peak Mining and Implications for Natural Resource Management, Simon Michaux 2013 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TFyTSiCXWEE&t=537s> The World In a Grain: The Story of Sand and How It Transformed Civilization, by Vince Beiser 2018 <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/537681/the-world-in-a-grain-by-vince-beiser/9780399576423/> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LcfVEbo3N5A&t=484s> Bumpy Ride: Why America's roads are in tatters 2017 By Dale Maharidge <https://harpers.org/archive/2017/11/bumpy-ride/> "
- I am in STRONG support of placing urban growth boundaries around the city and creating protected nature and natural undeveloped spaces, farmland, and green space. The only "development" on those open spaces that should occur is investment in carbon sequestration farms - ways that have been scientifically vetted as taking carbon out of the atmosphere.
- Credits and rebates for deep retrofits of existing residential and commercial buildings. Retrofits are expensive. A well done deep retrofit that makes a home zero net energy can be as much as \$50,000 or more. Most people can't afford that and most incentives focus on low income leaving middle income families out in the cold. Credits and rebates should work like the clean vehicle rebate where it's based on income. Families with annual incomes less than \$50,000 should get 100% cost coverage, less than

\$100,000: 75%, less than \$250,000: 50%, less than \$500,000: 25%, less than \$1,000,000: 10% with no benefits above \$10,000,000 (for owner occupied buildings and non-owner occupants only). Occupants who pay the utility bills should have decision power over whether or not retrofits are made. Multi-family building occupants should be able to vote on retrofits. In all cases, there would be cost share between tenants and owners. For commercial, benefits should be the same but replace income with annual revenue. This would also include the benefits for commercial renters and commercial owners. For industrial, electricity usage can be covered as above, however, most energy usage is in thermal applications (boilers, hot processes etc.). Ensure that all existing industrial processes are using natural gas fired sources that meet the current state of the art and work towards replacing gas fired sources with solar thermal by 2030. Solar thermal is expensive, but we're talking about achieving carbon zero. Carbon zero cannot be achieved cost effectively, but the burden cannot be placed on the people least able to afford it."

- Yes, the goal for carbon neutral needs to be 2030. We are in a climate emergency, not just a climate "problem". If we cave to money and politics, we will not have a planet that is habitable. I was very upset at the end of the last Commission meeting - all the work that that the TAC did on built environment was co-opted by SACOG board member's request that the majority of the board then did indeed endorse. Really? The wording of Mr. Corless's request did NOT make sense (as FLojaune Cofer noted during the meeting) Is this how this board is going to conduct itself?? After weeks of work/research etc., the TAC is then undermined by the demands of one board member and the remaining board members are ok with this as witnessed by their endorsement?? How does this encourage/support the future TAC participants? NOT.
- measures should be evaluated in terms of kwhr or similar units rather than dollars.
- The commission needs to acknowledge a goal of aggressive action in this region that acknowledges 2045 is 15 years too late. In addition, the commission needs to RECONSIDER a strong urban growth boundary, not the watered down one from the last meeting. THANK YOU FOR RECONSIDERING.
- Soyama turbine, which lets the world change completely by a climate change.
- Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Rick Codina. I served on the Built Environment TAC as a representative of 350 Sacramento. I want to address the urgency of our work and to point out some possible "early wins" as Commissioner Orchard calls for tonight. The fact is that while we continue our climate action discussion here, many communities, particularly in Northern California, have already begun significant action that leapfrogs over our ongoing work. All of you are no doubt aware of Berkeley's recent city ordinance banning natural gas in new construction. This is among the primary recommendations of the Built Environment TAC. Berkeley is not alone here. For example, Daniel Hamilton, who addressed the Commission earlier this year as Oakland's Sustainability director, will soon introduce a similar measure in that city. In actuality, 50 other California cities are actively developing measures to require or incentivize electrification. In particular, I would point out the joint effort by the Peninsula Clean Energy, Silicon Valley Clean Energy and the San Mateo Office of Sustainability which has developed Reach Codes for electrification that go beyond the new construction efficiency standards set by Title 24 of the California Energy Commission. And cities like Sunnyvale and San Jose have updated their Green Building codes to incentivize electrification. Pertinent to tonight's current Mobility discussion, the cities of Oakland, San Francisco and Fremont have already adopted Reach Codes that require that all new multi-family and commercial buildings be EV-ready. This, by the way, was another Built Environment TAC recommendation that didn't make the top 3 cut. I trust our cities will join these pioneers, hopefully with even more aggressive actions. But we might not want to delay, by waiting for some of these Commission recommendations to be passed on to the Climate Action Plan teams for eventual public approval and then translation into appropriate ordinances. City staff should be directed to begin working now on ordinances that will immediately support electrification and EV charging.
- 1. We must remodel and develop within the city or county. urban sprawl is not the solution, even if developers are lobbying for it. There are multitudes of spaces that can be used for housing, parks etc. There is a large lot with a derelict eyesore of a building that has sat unimproved, fenced off with a large hot asphalt parking lot for 8 years in my neighborhood.

2. Sea level rise is going to slow river drainage leaving the potential of an atmospheric river to dump a large amount of precipitation that will create drainage and flooding problems as well as more pressure on levies, with the potential for catastrophic floods. All development in the low lying areas of Sacramento should take this into consideration and require mitigation and disaster planning for these areas.

- Provide incentives for achieving LEED/Net Zero status for both new construction and retrofit.
- The website needs to be fully populated with meeting minutes, TAQ minutes etc.
- Mobility - the lowest-carbon trip is the one you don't have to take. What are you doing to facilitate remote attendance?
- Keeping and expanding urban tree canopy is a fundamental climate action
- more trees, less pavement
- The cities should make a much bigger commitment to preserving tree canopy and ensuring future tree canopy is at least 50 percent throughout the urban area. Current city tree protection and enhancement policies lack the political commitment required for the cities to result in achieving the goals and visions adopted. Too often trees are removed to facilitate public works projects or private developments with mitigation that will take decades to have impact. Tree planting projects are small in scale and there is no plan for urban forest expansion.
- Keeping and expanding the urban tree canopy is a fundamental climate action. A single elm tree can remove 5 pounds per year of air pollutants, 565 pounds per year of carbon dioxide, and can store about 5000 pounds of carbon dioxide.
- Infill
- <https://goodanthropocenes.net>
- SMUD's IRP plan to meet the state's greenhouse gas targets would have SMUD continuing to burn fossil fuels indefinitely. SMUD is wrongly using its investments in the transportation sector to offset the emissions from its 5 natural gas plants. This will mean that by 2040, SMUD will still emit one million metric tons of CO2. SMUD needs to get serious about leading California's transition to a clean energy future. This means going back to the strategies of the past, namely: Discarding the accounting tricks and committing to a real plan to shut down its fossil fuel plants as fast as possible, using an aggressive program to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 5% per year until SMUD is fully decarbonized. Several online Solar sources and several newspapers have reported on the cities listed below closing down their fossil fuel plants within the next couple of years. Some cities will have their fossil fuel plants closed by 2030 and the state mandate by 2045. SMUD is dragging its feet on this issue with excuse after excuse. When SMUD is asked why not sooner, the answer from SMUD is that the technology isn't there yet or that fossil fuel plants will still be needed for reliability. LA, Oxnard, Oakland have all figured out how to close power plants ahead of schedule. Once upon a time, SMUD would have shown leadership role. The roadmap is already here so why isn't SMUD following suit? What are these cities doing that SMUD is not doing? And why can't SMUD adopt a similar plan to shut down their fossil fuel plants sooner rather than later?
- Build protected bike lanes and make it harder, more expensive to park
- Renovating and retrofitting existing older buildings to be more energy efficient. Working with federal organizations to update the power grid to use wind and solar energies.
- Require corporations to take back packaging waste
- Engage more youth (k-12 and young people ages 18-25) in the action planning and provide more funding to local school districts for environmental education and climate change mitigation. Education is the key to true, long-lasting change!!
- Incentives for solar/ev vehicles and bess. Working w/ west sac/sac to share PT. Encouraging employers to support pretax PT as a standard benefit. In city planning, create little "townships" within neighborhoods

encouraging community spaces, jobs, schools and groceries within walking distance for each neighborhood. MORE community gardens!!! Using goats and TEK for fire prevention. Making all new construction have graywater/rainwater systems. Return to right relationship with the earth. Roof gardens. Roof Bee Hives. Restricting pollution in our waterways fr motorcraft. Large Semi trucks limited to travelling in densely populated areas to non-rush hr. biodiesel vs standard. No new gas stations. All charging stations to be powered by solar.

- Plant based food in schools, hospitals, every government building and make a campaign to eat more plant based food.
- When buildings are abandoned, they should revert to the community. They can be turned into green spaces, community gardens, and low cost housing.
- Stick to infill development and stop sprawl. Maintain and increase our tree canopy and plant native plants everywhere possible.
- The Commission's final report should encourage the 1) voluntary application of "Passive House" (<http://passivehousecal.org/>) for all new single-family attached and detached homes; 2) provide incentives to build to Passive House through investor-owned and public utilities, local tax abatement, state tax credits, Residential PACE, etc.; 3) phase-in the mandate of Passive House for multi-family and commercial buildings; and 4) provide various incentives to developers of multi-family and commercial in advance of mandating the use of Passive Housing in such buildings. Passive House has a far more positive impact on reduced embodied carbon of new homes and buildings than does the CA 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, and the consume upwards of 60% less energy than code minimum homes and buildings. These super insulated homes and buildings allow occupants to remain comfortable for sustained periods when black outs happen or power is turned off by the utility. Finally, these "low energy load" homes and buildings substantially amplify the impact of solar and storage.
- Please stop building parking garages and making more accommodation for cars. Stop taking down trees like their planned removal in Capitol Park. Urban renewal should involve more tree plantings and less accommodation of cars, not the other way around.
- Create sustainable plantings that support wildlife and trees over humans. Value long term moral-ethical decisions over short term benefit. There is truly a way to have alternatives with win wins in building development that sustains the environment thoughtfully.
- Keeping and expanding urban tree canopy is a fundamental climate action
- Biggest challenge is removing natural gas from buildings. There is a huge cost differential as well as no one likes to cook on an electric stove.

Mobility

- When people buy gasoline, most are not aware of the true price of gasoline. A Center for Investigative Reporting website says the true price of gasoline was about \$15 a gallon back in 2011 (if you take into account all the health effects like asthma and lung disease from car exhaust.).
<https://thinkprogress.org/true-cost-of-gasoline-try-15-a-gallon-832db0342a70/> This web page lists UC Professor Daniel Kammen of the Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy as a reference. Might gas stations in Sacramento list the "True Price of Gasoline" along with what you will pay for a gallon of gasoline? Similar, when people emit CO₂ when they drive in their gasoline powered car, or fly in an airplane, they do not think about adding to the over 400 ppm of CO₂ that are already in the atmosphere. The last time atmospheric CO₂ was over 400 ppm, sea level was 33 to 66 feet higher. With Sacramento at 13 feet elevation, they are helping put Sacramento under 20 to 53 feet of water. Might gas stations and other appropriate places say "WARNING! - The CO₂ from this gasoline will help raise sea level 33 to 66 feet (unless we find a way to take CO₂ out of the atmosphere.)"
<https://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2013/05/130510-earth-co2-milestone-400-ppm/> . Sea level is expected to rise 3 feet in the next 85 years. At that rate, it will take 935 to 1,870 years for sea level to rise 33 to 66 feet. Still, these facts are enough to make people think "I should try to emit less CO₂. I should try to take my CO₂ emissions out of the atmosphere by donating to some organization like the Nature Conservancy that will protect trees to sequester the tonnes of CO₂ I put into the atmosphere last year. In summary, gas stations might have WARNING! signs on the gas pump, on in big letters with the price per gallon the gas station is charging: WARNING! The true price of gasoline is over \$15 a gallon. alternating with WARNING! The CO₂ you are emitting will contribute to 33 to 66 feet of sea level rise. Sacramento City might ask Sacramento County to have similar WARNING! signs at the airport. All Sacramento City employees might be required to fill out the Nature Conservancy Carbon Calculator, find out the tonnes of CO₂ they emitted last year, and make a \$15 a tonne or higher donation to the Nature Conservancy or some other organization that will help preserve trees or do some other activity that will help take their CO₂ emissions out of the atmosphere.
- Focus on bringing access to public transportation to areas that currently lack access. Protect pedestrians by working to improve walkability and safe sidewalks in areas of Sacramento that currently lack those things. Fully fund Regional Transit to provide more frequent routes, increased safety and accessibility to public transit.
- Instead of intensive infrastructure that street cars need, why not focus on more electric buses which can easily adapt to route changes.
- Yes, do whatever you can to reduce driving - amplify public transportation and build more affordable housing close to transit and near downtown, like in Southern Pacific/Richards area.
- Provide electric vehicle procurement incentives; install free electric charging stations (City of Napa provides this -for example of how it can be done) in parking areas citywide. Convert all City fleets to electric including a commitment to fuel electric vehicles using renewable energy -solar, etc. It is available via SMUD for a nominal extra fee - perhaps no extra fee to the City -?
- First off, Commissioners need to spread the word. If everyone who can get an electric car does get one, and uses it for their primary car, the impact will be huge, particularly if they are commuters. Not only does this reduce carbon, but every dollar spent on gasoline goes straight into oil companies agendas. More offshore exploration, more pipelines, more refinery spills and especially more money to elect climate denier politicians. That's where the money we spend on gasoline goes. We can't rely on the government alone to make this transition; we have to do it ourselves too.
- 1) Add bus shelters to every stop. 2) Within city limits, identify and commit to improving places along light rail lines where a) access to the stop is compromised by inadequate infrastructure that prevents ridership (e.g., to access the blue line's city college stop from Carleton Tract, prospective riders have to cross the Sutterville Bypass, where there are busted or missing sidewalks, too few crosswalks and no lights to protect pedestrians) and where b) people live within 1/4 of a mile of the tracks but more than 1/2 mile from a stop

(e.g., much of Carleton Tract and Hollywood Park). 3) Expand the micro transit program to serve areas that are not within 1/2 mile of a transit stop. 4) Make Land Park car free on Sundays. 5) Add protected bikes lanes throughout Land Park. 6) Prohibit car parking in all but a few areas of Land Park. 7) Repair the bike lane on riverside so riders don't have to navigate less than 1 foot of paved space between oncoming traffic and certain death (i.e., the graveyard). 8) Enact a city-wide congestion charge to help pay for these and other improvements. 9) For lottery schools (e.g., Alice Birney, LDV, etc.), reserve 50% of all spots for children who live within walking and/or biking distance of the schools. 10) Generally make it easier for people to walk, bike and take public transit. 11) Generally, make it less attractive to drive everywhere (e.g., charge for parking everywhere, enact an additional tax for residents who own more than one car) and use proceeds to install infrastructure (e.g., median diverters) that make biking and walking easier but driving more difficult.

- arrange activities so almost everyone can access clean water and healthy food within walking distance, without using refrigeration. don't use motor vehicles to ship watery foods like bottled water, milk, juices, almond milk, rice milk, etc. - the ratio of food value to weight makes it very inefficient.
- 1. Reduce idling by city vehicles while employees are on breaks. Often see city vehicles parked at local parks with engines running for long periods of time.
- More awareness that if the infrastructure is good, most trips can be made using bikes or e-bikes, so don't just focus on electric cars for C-zero. And don't just serve the rental ebike market - bike owners need to be able to ride and park securely too.
- Destination-oriented protected bike lanes. Look at common cyclist trips from A-B and protect them. Example: provide low-stress (protected) bike routes from Capitol Park to CSUS and to other local colleges.
- Parking: offer preferential street parking for future-friendly vehicles (especially small ones like Smart cars etc.). And let residents (not just business owners) request secure bike racks where they turn out to be needed, and don't let a tiny budget allocation limit their installation.
- The more "walkable" a city or burbs are, the more people are likely to walk, bike for errands. The safer a city is, the more likely people are to walk and take public transport. A feeling of safety gets people out and about on foot or bikes. Fear keeps people in their cars. More charging stations will encourage more emission free electric cars. People complain about not feeling safe on light rail. A lot more children in Sacramento and West Sac could walk to school and back if their parents felt it was a safe, normal thing to do.
- Close a shopping street such as J, K or Capitol on some Sundays just for pedestrians and bicycles. Has been very successful in L.A. see: <http://www.ciclaviva.org/>
- Obviously, there isn't a single answer. You need solutions for each kind of person. Here is a short list, cars/trucks driving through Sac, commuters to/from sac, etc. Then you have to say why are these people doing these actions. Some people don't like dealing with the homeless, so they move to the suburbs, some don't like the quality of schools, so they move. If you look at a map, we are a hub of freeways, no wonder we have poor air quality (score of an F). I would recommend those who are coming from outside Sacramento (Elk Grove, Roseville, Davis) get free mass transit to get cars off the road. Use the connect card to track where they are getting on and off for data. Even then, people won't do it, because they need the car to pick up the kids after work or go buy groceries, and mass transit doesn't go there. Those people will need to pay road tolls or congestion charge, similar to London. Both of these will increase ridership, which means adding routes and services, which SACRT won't add fast enough, which will cause frustration. This process needs to be made faster, smaller van instead of big busses (Hong Kong does this) need to be used. You need to create the density. For all others, microtransit pilot needs to be expanded. I want an option for the bus to pick me and a few people near me at a central place daily for work. 15-20 passenger vans are a great start, electric if you can make it.
- Yes, PCRM (Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine) has instructors, like myself, all over the world. We instruct people how to avoid chronic diseases, i.e. heart disease, diabetes, cancer, etc., by teaching

whole food plant based nutrition classes. We teach employee wellness at large companies, i.e. Geico and US Post Office, etc., government agencies, and or we teach the general public. Getting people to learn how to make simple, tasty plant based meals helps people to not only regain their health, but growing plants is sustainable and raising animals for food is not. For instance, it takes 2,500 gallons of water to produce one hamburger and only 250 gallons to produce a loaf of wheat bread. By stopping to raise and kill animals, we could stop the forests from being cut to grow food for animals or raise animals. We would no longer have "dead zones" caused by massive manure now sitting all over USA. Stopping the cattle production for both meat dairy and pig production would clean up our air.

- All-electric ready buildings should include EV charging, continued emphasis on charging stations
- Increased installation of EV chargers; and streamline the permitting process for home installation of charging equipment.
- Our transit systems are held back by low productivity and high cost, and one way they are particularly wasteful is in how they travel through congested areas such as the Downtown grid during peak travel times. Many driver hours (and passenger hours) are wasted because there are not priority lanes in key corridors through downtown. As a result, the various bus agencies can't deliver as much service as they could if they spent less time getting through downtown. This is largely a City of Sacramento issue that could be resolved through picking a couple of key north-south and east-west corridors and creating an all-day or at least rush-hour designation of a lane for buses only. We are doing a good job of creating bike lanes, but need to pick some routes for bus lanes as well. The change in travel time and the increased reliability would attract a great deal of additional riders and the systems could deploy the labor hours saved on running more frequent service. This would be even better if the buses didn't have to pull in and out of traffic, perhaps building bulb-outs for the sidewalk to meet the bus lane in key locations. Or at a minimum, a law could be passed requiring drivers to give way to buses when they are trying to re-enter traffic, and a sign reminding drivers of this could be put on the back of the bus. There is no need to create expensive BRT infrastructure by building something new. We need to use what's already there to get more people over the roadway system. Portland, OR is implementing something like this right now in their downtown, and in their case, have chosen to eliminate a certain amount of street-based parking. We may choose to do the same thing (perhaps replacing those places with nearby short-term space in a garage), or a different path. More efficient transit will contribute significantly to a carbon zero sector (especially if done with electric buses).
- Insist that SMUD study alternatives to the current regressive rate for electricity see 2 min video - <https://medium.com/getting-it-right-on-electricity-rate-design/new-explainer-video-on-utility-fixed-charges-and-donuts-b97095d0b71e>
- Convert all city transportation functions including private contractor provided municipal functions to all electric service, by date certain. Include City Garbage, Recycling, Water, Parking Enforcement, and Park maintenance services. Issue tax exempt "green" bonds to provide capital funds for municipal equipment purchases and conversion. Offer muni bonds to City Residents prior to underwriting and secondary market sales.
- fix the SMUD rate problem - see my editorial <https://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/srud-isnt-as-green-as/content?oid=27623584>
- electrification of everything
- Prioritize transit. Do not allow RT to continue cutting transportation routes.
- Reliable public transit, protected bike lanes
- Excellent public transportation (frequent connections, well-priced), connecting all Sacramento communities with job centers. Plan so that parking a car will be a less attractive option than taking public transport. Parking costs increased downtown to pay for the arena, but public transportation did not fill the gap for people who would choose not to drive and pay to park.

- Yes. Since one main goal is to electrify transportation, creating energy savings in the industrial and commercial sectors improve the capacity to serve additional customers without costly upgrades to transmission infrastructure. For example, the 100-unit pilot program will reduce load (increase capacity) by 12 megawatts. Further it will displace 105 gigawatt hours of regional fossil fuel generation over the course of a year.
- Educating citizens about the true price of gasoline would inspire citizens to use less gasoline. Would the City of Sacramento require gas stations to list the True Price of Gasoline along with their prices? The following website states the true price of gasoline is about \$15 a gallon. <https://thinkprogress.org/true-cost-of-gasoline-try-15-a-gallon-832db0342a70/> UC Davis Professor Dan Sperling is listed as a reference for the true price of gasoline being about \$15 a gallon. Would the City of Sacramento ask Professor Sperling if the true price of gasoline has increased with the recent wildfires and other extreme weather events made worse by our CO2 emissions since this video was made in 2011?
- Knowing when we are contributing to global warming would help Sacramento residents drive less and fly less. Would the City of Sacramento ask Professor Daniel Sperling “how many pounds of CO2 equivalents per day can the average California emit and not contribute to global warming? Is it 10.4 pounds of CO2 equivalents per day as suggested by the following information? This estimate is based on the following website which says the earth sequesters about half of world CO2 emissions. <https://phys.org/news/2012-08-earth-absorbing-carbon-dioxide-emissions.html> Half of world CO2 emissions of 36.2 billion metric tonnes of CO2 comes to about 13.1 billion metric tonnes. If we divide that by 7.6 billion people, we each can emit about 1.72 tonnes of CO2 per year and not contribute to global warming. 1.72 tonnes of CO2 times 2205 pounds of CO2 per tonne, divided by 365 days per years shows we can each emit about 10.4 pounds of CO2 per day and to contribute to global warming. Thus, if every Californian and every world citizen emitted less than 10.4 pounds of CO2 per day, there would be no global warming from CO2 because all of our CO2 would be sequestered by the earth. Sacramento residents can find out how many pounds of CO2 per day they emitted last year by filling out the Cool California Carbon Calculator: <https://coolcalifornia.arb.ca.gov/calculator-households-individuals> They can multiply the tonnes of CO2 emitted last year by 2205 pounds per tonne, and divide by 365 days per year to find out their average “pounds of CO2 equivalents emitted per day” last year. For reference, it takes about 10 pounds of CO2 per day to produce food for the average vegetarian in America, and 20 pounds of CO2 per day to produce food for the average meat loving American. This estimate is based on the following website: <http://shrinkthatfootprint.com/food-carbon-footprint-diet> It takes 1.7 tonnes of CO2 to provide food for a vegetarian in America. Multiplying by 2205 pounds per tonne, and dividing by 365 days per years shows it takes about 10 pounds of CO2 per day to provide food for the average vegetarian in America. It takes 3.3 tonnes of CO2 per year to provide food for a meat loving American. Multiplying by 2205 pounds per tonne, and dividing by 365 days per year gives about 20 pounds of CO2 emissions per day to provide food for the average meat loving American. Thus we are contributing to global warming when we buy meat products, and when we buy anything other than our vegetarian meals for the day. The average \$100 spent in California is associated with emitting about 35 pounds of CO2 equivalents. This estimate comes from taking the California per capita CO2 emissions of 9.26 metric tonnes of CO2, and dividing it by the California per capita Gross Domestic Product of \$58,619 dollars. The 9.26 metric tonnes need to be converted to pounds of CO2 equivalents by multiplying by 2205 pounds per metric tonne. I could send you the following Excel spreadsheet if that were of interest. The following Guardian website says it takes about 720 kg of CO2 equivalents to produce 1,000 British pounds of car. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/green-living-blog/2010/sep/23/carbon-footprint-new-car> Multiplying 720 kilograms times 2.2 pounds per kilogram equals 1,584 pounds. Multiplying 1,000 British pounds by 1.329 US dollars per British pounds equals 1,329 US dollars. Thus about 1,584 pounds of CO2 equivalents are emitted for each approximately 1,329 US dollars, or about 1,191 pounds for each \$1,000 US dollars spent on a car. Might the City of Sacramento require new and used car dealers to tell potential customers “when you emit more than 10 pounds of CO2 equivalents per day, you are contributing to global warming and climate change. When you buy this car or truck, you will be contributing to the emissions of 1,191 pounds of CO2 equivalents for each \$1,000 spent. Have you considered using a Jump bike or taking Lyft, or Uber or a taxi, rather than buying a

car or truck? Thank you for considering infuriating new and used car dealers and buyers, but how else are we going to protect young people from the severe droughts predicted by the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research in 2060 and beyond?

http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/cas/adai/news/Dai_Drought_UCAR.htm The University Corporation for Atmospheric Research predicts that by 2060, California and most of the United States will be at risk for droughts as severe as the drought that preceded the Oklahoma Dust Bowl in the 1930's. With continued world CO2 emissions the risk of even more severe droughts will increase. The website has four maps that illustrate the potential for future drought worldwide over the decades indicated, based on current projections of future greenhouse gas emissions. These maps are not intended as forecasts, since the actual course of projected greenhouse gas emissions as well as natural climate variations could alter the drought patterns. Thank you for trying to decrease our CO2 emissions,

- To achieve carbon zero in the transportation sector, we need to make it affordable and easy for people to travel in the area in their own zero-emission vehicles or on zero-emission public transportation. This could include more electric/hydrogen charging stations in the area for personal vehicles, making some parts of the city car-free as other cities around the world have done, and converting all city buses and transportation to electric or other clean energy options.
- Safe transit. Protected, night-lit bike lanes, visible to "eyes on (and from) the street".
- Yes. Sacramento is the capital of California, and California leads our nation in action on climate change. Pass a tax on carbon emissions, for which engine size can serve as a proxy. Pass a gas tax in the city. If we simply price the externality of carbon emissions, capital will flow toward clean energy and electric or alternative fuel vehicles naturally.
- For one. Eliminate the words on vehicles that say "Clean Fuel" on vehicles that run on Natural Gas. Natural gas is not a clean fuel. It's a fossil fuel that emits pollutants. This language misleads the public.
- Would Sacramento require Sacramento gas stations to display the True Price of a gallon gasoline as between \$15 a gallon and \$126 a gallon? I submitted this idea before, but without the true price of gasoline being between \$15 a gallon and \$126 a gallon. What is the reason for thinking the true price of gasoline might be as high as \$126 a gallon? Beginning at minute 3:40 of the following website climate scientist Lonnie Thompson says that Himalayan glaciers are melting.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2of9A6R1zjU> The water from these melting glaciers become major rivers in Asia that supply water for 1.5 billion people, including the people of India, Pakistan and China. When the glaciers get smaller and the rivers get smaller, India, Pakistan and China may have a nuclear war over water. This US and Russia may be drawn into this nuclear war, and the entire global economy may collapse. Our CO2 emissions from our gasoline are helping to melt these Himalayan glaciers, and so we will have contributed to a nuclear war and the collapse of the world economy. In 2016 the US economy was 18 trillion dollars in 2016, and 142.6 billion gallons of gasoline were sold in the US 2016. If we divide \$18,000 billion dollars by 142.6 billion gallons of gasoline the price of this was would \$126 per gallon gasoline sold in the US. If we add the \$15 per gallon to \$126 dollars per gallon, that would be \$141 dollars per gallon of gasoline, and this does not include the costs of future damages from our CO2 emissions like the damages from rising sea levels. The goal of posting the price of \$141 dollars a gallon would be to start a conversation about "what should we do to prevent a nuclear war?" To prevent the First Use of Nuclear Weapons by the United States, the California Assembly and Senate have passed Assembly Joint Resolution 30 (AJR 30) urging the United States Congress to speedily take up and pass the Restricting First Use of Nuclear Weapons Act of 2017, and send it to the President for his signature. AJR 30 requires the Chief Clerk of the Assembly to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States. Would the California Assembly and Senate consider an Assembly Joint Resolution recommending a Carbon Footprint and Nuclear Weapons Tariff to get rid of nuclear weapons? To focus the attention of countries and their citizens on decreasing their CO2 emissions, there would be a tariff on imports based on the per capita CO2 emissions of a country. To focus the attention of countries and their citizens on destroying their nuclear weapons, this

carbon footprint tariff would be tripled if a country had nuclear weapons on hair trigger alert. This carbon footprint tariff would be doubled on countries with nuclear weapons not on hair trigger alert. When countries start to destroy their nuclear weapons, there would be the standard per capita CO2 emissions tariff. Below is a table of proposed tariffs: States with nuclear weapons Tariff is per capita CO2 emissions (in per cent) tripled. Per capita CO2 emissions (2014) Belgium 8.3 24.9 China 7.5 22.5 France 4.6 3.8 Germany 8.9 26.7 India 0 Italy 1.7 5.1 Netherlands 9.9 29.7 North Korea 1.6 .8 Pakistan 0.9 2.7 Russia 11.9 35.7 Turkey 4.5 13.5 United Kingdom 6.5 19.5 United States 16.5 49.5 Representative States without nuclear weapons tariff is per capita CO2 emissions (in percent) Argentina 4.7 4.7 Australia 15.4 15.4 Bhutan 1.3 1.3 Cambodia 0.4 0.4 Chile 4.7 4.7 Columbia 1.8 1.8 Costa Rica 1.6 1.6 Cuba 3 3 Denmark 5.9 5.9 Dominican Republic 2.1 2.1 Egypt 2.2 2.2 Having a tariff on the imports from countries with nuclear weapons would put pressure on the nuclear powers to destroy their nuclear weapons so their exports would not have such a high tariff. Having a tariff based on a country's per capita CO2 emissions would encourage all countries to lower their per capita CO2 emissions. Would Sacramento require gas stations to state the true price of gasoline as between \$15 a gallon and \$141 dollars a gallon to begin this discussion? Thank you for considering it, PS These are painful and upsetting thoughts. To help Sacramento residents deal with them, would the City of Sacramento have a portion of its website devoted to ways of dealing with climate change grief and painful thoughts? The following TED talk found mindful meditation decreased the perception of pain 44%, while a sham group practicing "mindful meditation decreased their perception of pain only 24% <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLQJJDrbj6Q> The group practicing mindfulness meditation reduced their pain unpleasantness perception 44% while the sham "mindfulness meditation" group reduced their pain unpleasantness 24%. The mindfulness meditation group was told to be present in the present moment, aware of their breathing in their chest and the sensation of their breath leaving their nostrils, and when their attention drifted from their breath, they were to non-judgmentally bring their attention back to their breath. The sham group were told to sit the same amount of time as the mindfulness meditation group, but they were not instructed to focus on their breath in a non-judgmental way. Would the City of Sacramento consider defining (science based) Love as acts which sustain life, acts which enhance life, and acts which make life possible. After a while, residents would see the words (science based) can be silent, since all acts by people can be seen as (science based) love from someone's perspective. The act of our neurons having a thought is an act of (science based) love, for our neurons are always searching for thoughts that help us in some way. Thus all the acts of our neurons are acts of (science based) love, acts trying to enhance our life, or sustain our life, or acts which make our life possible. So, instead of defining act of (science based) Love, we can define acts of Love as acts which sustain life, acts which enhance life, and acts which make life possible. Here is an Irish Prayer, re interpreted from the perspective of (science based) Love. We might imagine ourselves as our heart, taking care of ourselves and all the parts of our body. When I say "I", I might think of my heart and think: As I arise today, may the strength of Love pilot me, the power of Love uphold me, the wisdom of Love guide me. May the eye of Love look before me, the ear of Love hear me, the word of Love speak for me. May the hand of Love protect me, the way of Love lie before me, the shield of Love defend me, (we might imagine our skin defending our heart from outside bacteria) May Love shield me today. (May my skin shield my heart today) Love with me, (all the acts of love by my cells are with me today) Love before me, (all the muscles and skin in front of my heart are before my heart) Love behind me, (all the muscles and skin behind my heart are behind me.) Love in me, (all the acts of love within my heart that the cells of my heart are performing) Love beneath me, (all the acts of love performed by the organs and my legs beneath my heart are beneath me) Love above me, (my brain and my mind are above my heart, and they are performing acts of love helping my heart get enough food and water) Love on my right, (my right arm is to the right of my heart) Love on my left, (my left arm is to the left of my heart) Love when I lie down, (I can meditate on all these acts of love as I lie down.) Love when I sit, (I can meditate on all these acts of love as I sit.) Love when I stand, (I can meditate on all these acts of love as I stand) Love in the heart of everyone who thinks of me, (the neurons of everyone who thinks of me are performing their acts of (science based) love in the mouth of everyone who speaks of me, (the muscles of the mouth of everyone that speaks of me are performing their acts of (science based) love for that person.) Love in every eye that sees me, (the rods and cones in the eye of everyone that sees me are performing their acts of (science based) love, helping that person to see and find food.) Love in every ear that hears me. (the cells of every ear that hears me are performing their acts of (science based) love, helping them to

hear and hear acts of (science based) love Amen Does meditation on acts of love help people find the peace and contentment and love they desire?

- The cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento should set an example by replacing city-owned gas powered leaf blowers with electric blowers and establishing a gas-powered leaf blower buy-back program with SMUD.
- Before the electric charging grid becomes widely available in all communities, which it needs to be, electric vehicles need to become affordable for people who can only spend \$10-\$15k. \$35K is not bad for a brand new car but most can't or won't spend that much on a car. There has to be a genuine option for electric vehicle ownership at every level of income. A used electric vehicle market will help once that grows. Also, reduced congestion would lower the carbon produced from traffic daily. If more businesses, manufacturers, banks, offices, and government businesses operated around the clock then not everyone would be needing to go to the same place at the same times. Shifts could be rotated so some people don't get stuck always working in the A.M. hours.
- Condominium infill development supports carbon zero transportation forms -- walking and bicycling; and creates the basis for supporting carbon zero transit.
- Yes
- Two stroke engines contribute a surprisingly large carbon burden. Gas powered lawn equipment (mowers, blowers, edgers, etc.) are considered to be mobile sources of air pollution and form a serious component of mobile emissions. Several CA cities have now outlawed gas powered two stroke engines. Sacramento and West Sacramento parks departments and other departments using similar equipment need to go all electric. The cities should form programs to encourage homeowners and private lawn care companies to do the same. Money can be saved, health improved and carbon emissions cut. Our neighborhood is starting a bottom-up program to educate homeowners and private businesses. We are hosting an event on May 18th in our park. Maybe your commission should support a range of bottom-up efforts like ours to build and inform an activist base.
- City of West Sacramento and Sacramento have been doing great things to expand Jump bikes and other alternate forms of transportation. Keep it up. Also keep encouraging electric vehicle charging and multi-modal nodes.
- Improve bus service and coverage of the bus routes
- Don't exceed the law of diminishing returns in the pursuit
- see
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256048802_Sustainable_Investment_Means_Energy_Independence_From_Fossil_Fuels
- More clean transportation.
- Take the master bike plan, expand it to include separated bike lanes and off street bike paths on all streets with traffic speeds exceeding 40 MPH, buffered lanes for streets with traffic speeds exceeding 30 MPH and bike lanes for the rest. Remove traffic lights and replace with roundabouts at all major intersections (the design style to follow are the types of roundabouts found in Assen, Netherlands). The traffic lights that remain (and there should be a lot less of them) should have signaling for cyclists as well as motorists. Put roads on a "diet." Make them narrower, take lanes out, replace with separated bike lanes and tram/BRT lines (more on that later). Close whole segments of downtown areas (in all the regions cities) during peak hours. Steep fines and penalties to drivers who block bike lanes or who are aggressive towards cyclists. Higher penalties for cell phone usage while driving (\$20? Really?!). On the transit side of things, take the 2035 MTP, expand it beyond the existing airport extension to include additional branches of light rail extending it up towards North Highlands, up towards Auburn, down towards the west and east ends of Elk Grove, down towards the Urban core and west towards Davis. The existing plan for the downtown tram/street car needs to be expanded to encompass downtown, midtown, East Sac and up to Arden/Cal

Expo areas. Additional trams/street cars should be built in Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Roseville and Davis. All of which should have multi-modal points connecting with light rail and train service. Lastly, for all major areas that light rail/street car service doesn't cover, there needs to be true Bus Rapid Transit (as in dedicated lanes). They all need to be at least as fast and convenient as driving. Ultimately, public transit only makes sense when it's rapid and has its own right of way. Since we have many suburban communities, micro-transit will be needed and SacRT is starting to roll this out. It should be designed to connect people with the services above. All of this needs to happen by 2030. Planning should also begin for a BART like service interconnecting the Sacramento/Stockton/Modesto/Tracy areas with rapid transit (this would allow the existing train services to have improved service and fewer stops). Such a service could interconnect with the existing light rail service in Sacramento and free up above ground real estate with below ground stations for both the Rapid Transit and light rail stations akin to BART and Muni. Call it SMART for San Joaquin Metro Area Rapid Transit. This should be completed by 2050. Work with Capitol Corridor Express, San Joaquin Amtrak and ACE to upgrade trains and tracks to operate higher speed electrified service (speeds should reach at least 120-150 MPH, not the current 80 MPH). Work with CalHSR to get High Speed Rail to Sacramento sooner rather than later. There is no reason why the HSR network should not be built out by 2030 (including the Sacramento and San Diego segments) with an eye towards building to Oregon and Las Vegas by 2050.

- Still learning about what makes sense with this topic. We have a real lack of decent, let alone ecologically friendly public transportation, especially out to the suburbs, where it is needed as well.
- the goal is ACCESS rather than mobility
- Any incentives for individuals to drive electric vehicles are very effective. my senior community could respond well because it is hard for seniors to invest in those changes when they do not use their cars much. Even if they can afford changes, but they love incentives!
- I invent the world's first turbine which I make an internal combustion engine the exhaust gas of the thermal power station absorption offset, silence having no bad smell from idling by a climate change the issue of air pollution and solves a problem.
- "Commissioner Chris Ledesma mentioned his concern over the Port of Oakland's GHG impact. He might be interested to investigate the electrification projects now underway at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, using state Energy Commission funding: <https://newpowerprogress.com/port-of-long-beach-starts-new-electrification-program/> <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonianmag/california-plans-clean-its-entire-freight-industry-2050-starting-la-ports-180959337/> State money may also become available from the CPUC which revised its energy efficiency funding criteria yesterday to allow beneficial fuel switching. This is a huge (\$1 billion) source of money.
- 1. I like most working class people haven't the financial resources to buy a "New Car". I have only bought used cars for decades and at a place when I can no longer afford a car payment in my budget. In the interest of equity and to be more likely to meet the 80% and 100% goals, I would like to make two suggestions. A. subsidies businesses that will replace fossil fuel engines in existing vehicles. This will prevent huge Junk yards of discarded gas engine cars. B. Start a "Habitat for Humanity" like program for people to participate in replacing their gas engines in the car they have. This will also create skills that the participants can add to their resume that may also lead to their employment in electric car maintenance and development. Additionally the disenfranchised will be more likely to embrace electric care technology.
- Extend light rail to the airport.
- 1. The lowest-carbon trip is the one you don't have to take. What are the Mayors doing to encourage use of zoom.us or equivalent? 2. What are Mayors doing to remove obstacles to taking intercity mass transit?
- People need more tree canopy to enable more biking and walking in the warm season.
- design transportation systems for ACCESS rather than mobility per se

- Unless streets and sidewalks are shaded with tree canopy, it is unlikely that strategies for increasing biking and walking will actually result in more biking and walking. People will avoid exposing themselves to heat and sun so tree canopy is central to getting folks to bike and walk more.
- A greater tree canopy can enable increased biking and walking in the warm seasons. Sacramento is warm enough to need trees in spring, summer and early fall.
- Invest in public transit. Light rail to the airport.
- Mobile micro grids with EV's and solar charging.
- Here are links to some of the articles: Los Angeles: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-california-natgas/los-angeles-abandons-new-natural-gas-plants-in-favor-of-renewables-idUSKCN1Q12C9>
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ge-power/general-electric-to-scrap-california-power-plant-20-years-early-idUSKCN1TM2MV> <https://www.utilitydive.com/news/la-scraps-plan-to-rebuild-3-gas-plants-moves-towards-100-renewable-energy/548218/> Oxnard: <https://www.vcstar.com/story/news/2018/03/10/ormond-beach-power-plant-close-october-officials-confirm/413075002/> https://www.huffpost.com/entry/oxnard-california-gas-plant_n_5cfeafdce4b0aab91c0a2f27 Oakland: <https://ebce.org/east-bay-community-energy-approves-resource-adequacy-contract-with-vistra-energy-for-new-battery-energy-storage-project-paving-way-for-shut-down-of-fossil-fuel-fired-power-plant-in-oakland/> <https://www.marketwatch.com/press-release/sunrun-solar-and-battery-systems-to-help-replace-retiring-oakland-power-plant-2019-07-18> Also some an interesting study from 2018 published by Union of Concerned Scientist which found that 28 fossil fuel plants in CA could be shut down by 2030. Most in the central valley. Though I didn't see a specific reference to SMUD, perhaps contacting the group to get input would be worth the effort <https://www.ucsusa.org/about/news/california-can-close-28-natural-gas-plants>
<https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2018/07/Turning-Down-Natural-Gas-California-fact-sheet.pdf>
- Build protected bike lanes
- Adding vertical green spaces to transportation infrastructure like freeway underpasses. Expansion of public transportation systems.
- Expand light rail and RT options and hours. Make public transport safe, clean, and fun so when people go downtown they don't need to drive or take an Uber
- Make light rail and the bus systems safer. Especially and almost exclusively for women, we do not ride because we don't feel safe and are afraid of being harassed. We'd rather drive our own car and clog up the roads. Feeling safe is a HUGE concern.
- EV and Solar Installation incentives.
- School buses serve barely any students in public school. Can we expand carpooling, vanpooling, or access to public buses?
- Build bikeways and walkways. Improve public transportation!
- Invest with abandon in non-automotive technologies throughout our region
- People need more tree canopy to enable more biking and walking in the warm season.
- Taking light rail out to Roseville would help with the commute.
- Very few apartment complexes have electric charging stations. Where are lower income people going to plug in their zero emission vehicles? Requiring zero emission vehicles without the infrastructure won't work. Perhaps a tax incentive to make it worth it for the owners?

Community Health and Resiliency

- I'd like to see more land acquisition projects of areas that are currently greenspace that can be used by the community for parks and recreation. Preservation of existing greenspace, especially in urban and suburban areas makes huge differences in air quality and temperature regulation in hot summers. I pass small residential and commercial undeveloped lots all the time and think it would be wonderful if they could be purchase and preserved as green space.
- Dedicate staff to actively engage with community groups that are already doing this work and provide resources to community based solutions.
- The City should work with farmers and owners of vacant land in the city to develop urban agriculture.
- Better zoning so neighborhoods are walkable. Some places one has to drive for everything because businesses and residences are so separated.
- Ban gas-powered leaf blowers and restrict use of all leaf blowing devices. Use of rakes & electric leaf vacuums only should be our goal. The air inversions we get in Sac Valley create horrible air quality - leaf blowers contribute badly both in terms of CO & particulate matter emissions.
- please consider to eliminate blowers and gasoline powered garden equipment. Please eliminate the use of styrofoam they end up recycled in the oceans. Thank you
- Covering more commercial and government buildings with solar would make a huge difference. Make them hybrid systems, that can work with the grid or off-grid when the grid goes down in a weather event or when PG&E turns it off due to fire hazard, like PG&E is doing now.
- 1) Work with organizations like Oak Park Sol to purchase empty lots and transform them into mini-parks and/or urban agricultural plots. 2) identify and transform stranded public assets (e.g., the old city college parking lot on the Sutterville Bypass) into parks and/or urban agricultural plots. 3) Build a playground in the SE corner of Land Park. 4) Do everything you can to enable and encourage residents to get out of their cars on their feet, bikes, and/or on public transit. 5) Enact residential stormwater fees based on the average surface area of impervious cover on residential properties and use the generated \$ to fund green infrastructure projects (see Philly's program). 6) Initiate a conserve to enhance program (C2E) to fund local environmental enhancement projects (<https://conserve2enhance.org/>) (see City of Tucson's program).
- replace pavement with gardens. ban leafblowers.
- Socially, Sacramento has a giant 'missing middle' problem, at least visually - either homeless or SUV driver. Need place-based communities. Libraries should help but branches are too \$%^Y&* small, and becomes a homeless center downtown. City needs an org like the PD (but that doesn't arrest people), that you can call when someone's in need.
- Enforce safety & info display regs. at pharmacies that offer immunizations. They don't seem to be enforced.
- The Commission should build partnerships and identify strategies for community health and resiliency that addresses specific barriers for low-income communities. ENERGY RESILIENCY: Households living with low incomes, and those living without houses, are not adequately resourced to respond to the health risks of a changing climate. Low-income households and the houseless have fewer resources to evade or mitigate severe weather events, or recover from loss of income owing to the same. Inadequate access to electricity exposes people to a range of risks, including sweltering heat without access to air conditioning or extreme cold without heat. These risks affect lower income, elderly populations, and incarcerated individuals (disproportionally people of color) who are unable to evacuate or have limited mobility. EQUITABLE ACCESS: Low-income individuals, incarcerated individuals, people who are undocumented, and people whose first language is not English, are more likely to lack access to services and information regarding in their language or with their culturally specific needs in mind. With regards to goal 5: Advance Social Equity and Economic Prosperity, GRID makes the following suggestions: -Engage in advancing low-income

community solar and deep energy efficiency efforts with SMUD as a necessary component to the Commission's Carbon Neutral goal -Consider incentives for urban heat island mitigation measures such as cool roofs and solar shading. Develop local renewable generation goals and a focus on energy cost savings and jobs for low-income individuals. -Initiate distributed energy resource projects that integrate technology like solar, battery storage and EVs, to provide backup power for critical community facilities including dedicated area cooling (or heating) centers. Develop a strategy to identify vulnerable individuals in advance of extreme weather seasons, and ensure adequate communications, and power and water delivery for residents of all incomes. GRID Alternatives is a nonprofit organization working to create equitable access to clean energy technology and training. We have provided solar and EV services for low-income individuals and the agencies that serve them across the State of California, and advise on equitable energy policies from coast-to-coast. We have installed solar for more than 10,000 low-income residents, installed various multi-family solar projects, and have expanded our services to include EV access in the past year. GRID partners with SMUD to provide energy assistance to very low-income households through energy efficiency and distributed solar PV systems. We would be pleased to lend our organizational expertise to address issues related to energy access for vulnerable community members under the guidance of the Commission, and advancing Goal 2, and share GRID's policy and project portfolio with the Commission.

- Yes, keep school yards open for neighbors to play and walk be outside. Kids will happily play outside if they can get to a school yard or park. There is a trend to close school yards in an overabundance of caution, but the unexpected consequences are obese kids on couches or playing in the street or lots of portable bball hoops out in the street. We need playgrounds and fields for all ages for unstructured play and time outside. The last two weeks, we have had a living lesson on what life is like with bad air, Mumbai or Beijing style. We didn't like it. People have now experienced what that is like and may be more amenable to more emission free changes, more solar, wind power, etc.
- see above...walking and biking good for community health
- My favorite. This in my mind is anything outside of the first two buckets. Big issues here would be Education/research, Unemployed, Retired, Homeless, Disadvantage, Low Income, Farmers, those impacted by fires or other climate emergencies, landscapers, city level agriculture, leaf blowers, Modernize Waste collection and management, single use plastics, planting of trees, vegan/non meat integration, locally made products, warming centers, cooling centers, etc. If we can't figure out how to help some of these people, we are not going to solve the problem.
- Yes, allow PCRM to create Employee Wellness Program in corporations, and especially in Hospitals! Allow the PCRM to assist the school food programs so our children will receive the food they need to be healthy. Right now, we are feeding our children the very foods (eggs, dairy, meat) which cause our number one killer: heart disease! We must stop childhood obesity and early puberty caused directly from eating animal products. The World Health Organization has labeled, hot dogs, ham, salami, bologna, etc. as Class One Carcinogens, exactly like cigarettes. Yet, we feed these to our children.
- Phase out the use of fossil fuels in our communities: homes, cars, trucks, commercial buildings, kitchens.
- Increase incentives to support urban food production, including starting a program to encourage the use of empty lots for urban gardens.
- Address land use and zoning issues in a manner that encourages more walking, biking and transit use.
- "to learn more about SMUDs anti climate anti conservation , anti-solar policy see this - may take some time
- <http://www.synapse-energy.com/project/fixed-charges-impacts-and-alternatives>"
- Require conversion (by date certain) of gas powered lawn and landscaping equipment to all electric service to reduce air emissions harmful to operators and residents while reducing a significant greenhouse gas contributions. Provide capital financing not to exceed 3500.00 per business to permit conversion to all electric landscaping services by small city licensed service existing and new providers. Equipment rebates to be handled by SMUD- Capital Loans through City Economic Development Office.

- "fix the SMUD rate problem - see video on rate policy
- <https://medium.com/getting-it-right-on-electricity-rate-design/new-explainer-video-on-utility-fixed-charges-and-donuts-b97095d0b71e>"
- carbon sensors and public shaming when it gets above a certain threshold, more transparency
- Many small parks. Plant trees. Incentives for landlords to insulate homes
- Transparency and opportunities for members of different communities to mingle.
- Yes. Directly improving health by improving air quality. The 100 units installed not only reduces carbon dioxide as explained above, but also reduces other pollutants known to be harmful to health. According to the EPA's Avoided Emissions and generation Tool (AVERT) the following air quality improvements will occur in California ("- " means a reduction in these pollutants): -385 lbs. of SO₂, -8,861 lbs. of NO_x, and -2,650 lbs. of PM_{2.5}.
- I believe one of the most important ways to combat climate change and support community health and resiliency is to provide more green space and plant more trees. Green open spaces with many trees have the double impact of sequestering carbon and also providing people with places to play and relax.
- Yes. Rainwater catchment, green roofing, and flood preparation are all key areas to address. Sacramento sits in a Delta and will be affected by rising sea levels. We will also experience drought years followed by atmospheric rivers/flood years. As such, water catchment is critical for drought years.
- Enforce gas-powered leaf blower use restrictions currently in place (use prohibited before 9 am and after 6 pm M-Sat and prohibited before 10 am and after 4 pm Sunday) so that Sacramentans can walk, ride their bikes, garden and enjoy the outdoors without being subjected to dangerous fumes and harmful noise emanating from gas-powered leaf blowers.
- More parks, sidewalks and communities that are more accommodating to children playing outside. Fair access to cleaner forms of transportation, public and personal.
- We need to promote eating less (ideally no) meat simply due to the amount of resources (water and grain, which also requires water) to produce. Filtering the nutrients of plants through animals to eat is not sustainable for the planet. Just eating the plants directly would be more sustainable and take fewer resources. Start in the schools by reordering the food to put several plant-based options first before any animal products in the cafeteria line. Processed meat is a Class 1 carcinogen, just like cigarettes. We should not be feeding this to our children, especially in schools and work to remove it. All meat, milk and eggs have significant health risks as well. In general, we should all be growing as much of our own food as possible. This concept can also be introduced in schools.
- Send a City of Sacramento Climate Action Resolution to the US Senate and Congress demanding that they take urgent action on the climate emergency (similar to the Climate Action Resolution recently released by the Sacramento City Unified School District School Board on April 4th. Check website of Schools for Climate Action for links to 77 existing resolutions)
- Remove overly stringent measures that would restrict alley infill development in Central City Historic Districts. It is in draft form and can still be changed to meet a balance of environmental achievements and historic preservation.
- permaculture
- My name is David Baker. I am the director the Community Compost Network, ReSoil Sacramento, and I believe that Sacramento could become the Greenest and most Verdant City in the West, while preparing for the changing climate. Our community-scale compost program, partnered with sixteen Farm-to-Fork Restaurants and dozens of community members, has diverted over One Million pounds of food scraps to build organic gardens and climate-resilient landscapes in Sacramento neighborhoods. According to the EPA calculator, this has the GWP Global Warming Potential of driving over 687,000 miles (or 227 times from SF

to NY). I am just back from New York City, which is the nation's leader in Community Composting, and where composting is done under bridges and behind public schools, and compost drop-offs are at the subway stations and farmers markets. And while San Francisco's municipal compost model sounds ideal, it may not be feasible for all cities. Like New York City, cities such as Washington DC, Atlanta, New Haven, Philadelphia and Cleveland have made Community-Scale composting a key part of their long term waste strategy. Community composting can take action immediately (to address SB 1383) without the need for big regional infrastructures. Community Composting feeds the soils of local neighborhoods. The benefits of healthy soil to communities include: • plant health • fighting hunger & malnutrition • drought/flood resistance • erosion control • increased biodiversity • mitigating the heat-island effect, and • carbon sequestration. We could literally retrofit our City with Nature. I believe that our City of Trees, plus our Farm-to-Fork Capital, plus Regenerative Practices, will make Sacramento a leading Green City ready for the end of the 21st Century. Please consider prioritizing Community-Scale Composting in our short and long term waste plans. ReSoil Sacramento is program of GRAS (Green Restaurants Alliance Sacramento).

- More parks. Also, local agencies (I'm looking at you CSD) need to be better about rehabbing/upgrading their existing parks and including the residents near the park in the process for rehabbing/upgrading the parks. More parks should have spray parks to help kids cope with hotter weather. More parks also need to have natural/native vegetation to help the stressed local wildlife populations. Such vegetation would also help reduce water needs for parks. However, they need to include ponds and water features that could add to the enjoyment of people and help wildlife find a place to rest, drink, and keep cool. Such spaces should be walking distance for ALL residents in the ENTIRE Sacramento region. Provide higher incentives for ""cash for grass"" programs. Current incentives are unbelievably pathetic. Landscaping is expensive and current incentives only capture a fraction of the cost. Most people, I think, would want something a little more natural or native but landscaping costs can be a minimum of \$10,000 or more. As with building retrofits above, there needs to be income level based incentives on a similar scale.
- If you really address climate change, it will cover these issues. Community Health & Climate justice is part of the package. We have to include ALL Sacramento residents, especially the most vulnerable. There is a need to replace Ms. Cofer with another knowledgeable Public Health Advocate (Flojaune please come back!!)
- support humanpowered devices, such as for gardens
- The world prays the solution to climate change for holding in an international conference of the adoption of the Soyama turbine.
- No
- 1. Develop a volunteer tree planting team to more quickly respond to city planner identified and supervised tree planting needs for shading on walking and bike routes. This will more quickly help with carbon sequestration. Check with Arbor Society, Sierra Club, Extinction Rebellion, Climate Coalition and neighborhood social web sites for volunteers. 2. Create small electric busses that make loops of a few major streets of shopping and services areas, that interface with longer transit routes. Some people would not need the longer route if they can access the loop bus, which would be faster and less of a wait. Example a loop bus that loops Marconi, Fulton, El Camino, and Watt. Or one looping El Camino, Fulton, Arden, and Watt. 3. Electric cars that can taxi a person to a loop bus from existing suburban neighborhoods that can be a mile or more from a transit line of any kind. People without the ability to walk, cycle or scooter; when they are pregnant, injured, unwell, mildly handicapped or elderly, as well as when there is inclement weather would be situations that this would be helpful. I live in Sacramento County/ Arden Arcade area and I am a senior citizen with 4 total Joint replacements. The house I live in is the only one I could afford. There are no sidewalks in my neighborhood. Housing co-ops and senior communities were too expensive for me. Additionally, I live across the street from one of my daughters.
- Reduce air and noise pollution near the airport and freeways.
- Pancaked bicyclists don't experience the health benefits of bicycling.

- Environmental justice, community health and resiliency depend upon expanding neighborhood tree canopy in all neighborhoods
- end subsidies for fossil fuels, for sugar, for meat. ban leafblowers, and support manual devices to replace low-power motors and give people more exercise. connect qualified homeless people with houses and foster kids who come with stipends.
- Community shade is highly variable with poorer communities having less shade. The cities must aggressively take on shading all communities to combat the negative impacts of climate change in every neighborhood.
- Trees improve air quality. They filter dust and polluted air, particulates such as nitrogen oxide, sulphur dioxide, ozone. The more trees in a neighborhood, the lower the incidence of asthma.
- Resilience hubs.
- Pressure SMUD to close all fossil fuel plants by 2030 and to embrace rooftop solar. Unfortunately, in recent years, SMUD has lost its way. Under the leadership of the current Board and soon-to-be-retiring General Manager Arlen Orchard, SMUD is slow-walking its transition from fossil fuels, and actively working to suppress rooftop solar. These include:
 - It's plan to meet the state's greenhouse gas targets would have SMUD continuing to burn fossil fuels indefinitely. SMUD is wrongly using its investments in the transportation sector to offset the emissions from its three natural gas plants. This will mean that by 2040, SMUD will still emit one million metric tons of CO₂.
 - Undermining the state's Solar Homes Mandate. SMUD is lobbying state officials to grant SMUD a loophole that will effectively keep solar and battery storage off thousands of new homes constructed in the coming decades.
 - Discouraging rooftop solar customers. This includes a recent attempt to hit solar users with a punishing \$40-\$60/month fee, making it difficult for solar users to expand their systems to accommodate increased electricity use, and prohibiting renters from easily benefiting from their landlord's solar.
 - Lobbying against protections for solar users. SMUD actively lobbied state lawmakers to kill the Solar Bill of Rights, which among other things, would have prohibited utilities from charging solar users discriminatory fees.
 - Spreading misinformation about solar. SMUD persists in repeating the unsubstantiated claim that rooftop solar is more expensive than utility scale solar, forces non-solar users to pay higher electricity prices, and is in general a product only for the very affluent. This perspective inhibits SMUD from properly valuing rooftop solar and setting rates and policies that would use rooftop solar to meet the region's energy needs. Despite these actions, SMUD continues to taut itself as an environmentally friendly, pro clean energy utility. There is an increasing dichotomy between their actions and image. This obscures all the ways SMUD is working at cross-purposes with our urgent decarbonization goals. It also confuses state policymakers and opinion leaders, misleading these critical actors into believing that the bar for action is much lower than it actually needs to be.
- More trees, protected bike lanes, and make it harder to drive/park
- Increasing public awareness of eco friendly programs, along with their expansion. Solar, brown water systems, home composting, insulation and window updates.
- Reduce pollution from vehicles. Create jobs for the homeless and provide them with restroom and shower facilities
- Reach out more strategically to low-income areas where they have little knowledge of the health services and environmental programs that are out there.
- Organic Urban Gardens, education and incentives for native/drought tolerant landscaping, same for rainwater/graywater. Community spaces in every neighborhood hosting dance/education opportunities. NO 5g! Ban styrofoam and all plastic ware.
- A plant based diet is best for the planet, and for people's health. Let's make that the norm for public events. People can eat meat on their own dime, and then events are inclusive to all beliefs.
- Preserve and create more green spaces within the city

- Make the city livable, not a giant parking lot. “ They paved paradise to put up a parking lot.” That’s what you’re doing if you destroy those trees in Capital Park.
- More bike lanes and wider walking paths with easy access to rivers. Please embrace making all hiways by rivers underground with mixed use bike/walking above
- Community health and resiliency depend upon expanding neighborhood tree canopy in all neighborhoods
- The Mayors’ Commission on Climate Change and Sacramento’s Climate Action Plan should encourage citizens to advocate a Nuclear Weapons Tariff on imports from India and Pakistan. The nuclear weapons of India and Pakistan are a threat to Sacramento’s climate and the health of Sacramento's citizens. At minute 44 of his Deakin Oration Dr. Tillman Ruff shows a graph showing 1 degree C of global cooling with a nuclear war between India and Pakistan. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c5PTTr6CKryw> A Physicians for Social Responsibility study says the lives of 2 billion people would be at risk with a nuclear war between India and Pakistan involving just 100 nuclear weapons. <https://www.psr.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/two-billion-at-risk.pdf> The fires from a nuclear war between India and Pakistan would put enough soot into the air to block out sunlight and decrease crop yields that would threaten the lives of 2 billion people. Why begin with the nuclear weapons of India and Pakistan? At minute 3:40 of the following website climate scientist Lonnie Thompson discusses global warming melting Himalayan glaciers. Himalayan glaciers provide water for India and Pakistan. As the glaciers get smaller, the Indus River will get smaller, and India and Pakistan may have a nuclear war over water. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2of9A6R1zjU> A Nuclear Weapons Tariff on imports from India and Pakistan would encourage them to destroy their nuclear weapons. When India and Pakistan begin to destroy their nuclear weapons, the Tariff money could be returned to help them destroy their nuclear weapons. Hopefully other countries would impose a Nuclear Weapons Tariff on all countries with nuclear weapons, and all nuclear powers would agree to destroy their nuclear weapons. India and Pakistan have about 150 nuclear weapons. The world’s nuclear armed countries have 14,000 nuclear weapons with the United States and Russia having 90% of these nuclear weapons. <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/Nuclearweaponswhohaswhat> Sacramento’s Climate Action Plan should recommend citizens advocate the United States negotiate the destruction of all nuclear weapons and sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. <http://disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/tpnw/text> Sacramento’s Climate Action Plan should recognize that nuclear weapons are a threat to climate change, and that nuclear waste is a threat to the health of Sacramento citizens if they were to travel to places with nuclear waste. The following videos by John Oliver can help Sacramento residents understand the importance of destroying nuclear weapons, and properly disposing of nuclear waste. Nuclear Weapons: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver (HBO) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Y1ya-yF35g> Nuclear Waste: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver (HBO) Nuclear waste poses a serious threat to public health if it's not stored in a safe place. John Oliver explains why the United States desperately needs to build a metaphorical toilet for all that waste. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZwY2E0hjGuU>

Equity TAC Recommendations

- Approve the 3 recommendations on p.18 of the draft April 2020 Report
- Community involvement Plans for our transportation into the future should greatly consider and create solutions for working citizens so that they can provide for their families without increases in transportation costs, time and health deterioration. Transportation equity is very important. By safeguarding existing transportation corridors, many times passing through poorer neighborhoods is a mandate in providing transportation alternatives that both meet the needs of the existing communities and the achievable goals of this commission.
- Environmental pollution has historically been shunted off to poor and marginalized communities, including communities of color, so that the middle class and the wealthy can't see it. As a result, the power brokers think they don't have to deal with it. Don't let these unfair practices influence decisions about how Sacramento deals with climate change. Include truly representative members of all marginalized communities in all decision making about climate change. Give them equitable time, access, and voice to share their input. Equitable means giving these communities MORE help if they are limited by lower income, less experience with government, less political influence, or any other limitation that reduces their political power than are other more privileged groups.
- Equity can be achieved by providing as many avenues of inexpensive transportation as possible. This is especially important for areas that are populated with low wage earners. Gentrification of many Sacramento neighborhoods is pushing people's affordable housing further and further from downtown, where they may work. So the more transportation options available, the better. This creates equity.
- Equity is extremely important, especially as lower income residents of the Sacramento metropolitan area continue to move outside the City in order to find more affordable housing. Expansion of the metropolitan area continues in all directions, but especially in the area SOUTH of the City. As that expansion continues, it will be important to utilize existing transportation corridors such as the Sacramento Southern Railroad (SSRR), AKA the "Walnut Branch Line" right of way that stretches from Downtown Sacramento to the Delta. This will not only save significant amounts of public funding but will also greatly accelerate the timeframe to meet the needs of residents living south of the City. Many of these residents depend upon affordable and responsive public transportation to commute to jobs in the Downtown area and to access other essential services. Utilizing existing corridors such as the SSRR/Walnut Grove Branch Line will make this much more achievable and in a shorter period of time.
- Equity is very important, preserving existing transportation corridors, often in poorer neighborhoods is a first step in providing transportation alternatives that both meet the needs of the existing communities and the achievable goals of this commission. The future transportation plans must create solutions so those with lower paying employment can provide for their families without increases in transportation costs, time and health deterioration.
- I am commenting on behalf of over 40,000 low income service and domestic workers and other low income workers in the greater Sacramento area. We have consistently advanced our position for the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change to endorse and implement the Sustainable Development goals. The handling of the COVID-19 pandemic is an example of our government leaders not dealing quickly with a nationwide problem, with a comprehensive plan to stop the COVID-19 spread from state to state and region to region. The problem in this pandemic is that COVID-19 reached a tipping point such that it is out of control. It surfaces in one place and moves onto another and returns to the same place when there is no national plan and it is not being fought back with policies and protocols to test, track, quarantine regularly. Over 82,000 Americans who are mainly poor, elderly or have an underlying illness have paid with their lives for a lack of a comprehensive government response. The same urgency to find a cure or a vaccine is needed to end global warming and poverty as those in poverty perish in the heat. But not a solution to profit a few large corporate interests; a cure that benefits all low- paid and other workers in these two

cities. This is the time for our Mayors to stand as an example as to what the rest of California can do as well as the nation by installing policies consistent with the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and with the goal of being carbon neutral by 2030. Our demands are consistent with the SDGs and are as follows: • Demand #1: we demand you act now to ensure ZERO utility shutoffs for anyone with a household income at or below 300% of the federal poverty line starting June 1st 2020. This year is slated to be the hottest year on record. • Demand #2: We demand you pass a resolution to define “living wages” as the ACTUAL amount needed to pay for the cost of housing, including home utilities, phone, transportation, clothing, household goods, medical, dental and optical care, school supplies and other education-related expenses and we demand the right to that actual living wages for all workers. • Additionally we demand that both Sacramento city governments only give government contracts that not only pay actual living wages but also prioritize employment from among residents of Sacramento’s and West Sacramento’s low-income communities. Demand #3: We demand you ENDORSE the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Goal #1 is to end Poverty as the first step toward combating climate change and its impacts by 2030. These demands were voted on by delegates who represent the membership of Western Service Workers Association. Since 1973 our members have joined together to aid each other survive while we organize to change the root cause of the problem we all share, poverty. These demands are only made more urgent given the current COVID-19 pandemic.

- I am writing to reinforce the demands put forth by the Sacramento Workers Benefit Council as stated at the Mayors’ Commission on Climate Change hearing on December 2, 2019 and put forth at numerous Technical Advisory Committee meetings and at Equity Roundtable meetings in 2019. The current worldwide Covid-19 pandemic is a wake-up call for the Commission to endorse and implement policies consistent with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Goal #3 is to “Ensure health lives and promote well-being for all at all ages.” Who is to say that the current pandemic affecting us all is not related to climate change? Certainly it’s true that world conditions affect the ability of certain organisms to grow and develop, and as scientists have stated, we do not know all of the effects of global warming. We call upon the Mayors’ Commission on Climate change to endorse our Workers Benefit Council demands: • Demand #1: we demand you act now to ensure ZERO utility shutoffs for anyone with a household income at or below 300% of the federal poverty line starting June 1st 2020. This year is slated to be the hottest year on record. • Demand #2: We demand you pass a resolution to define “living wages” as the ACTUAL amount needed to pay for the cost of housing, including home utilities, phone, transportation, clothing, household goods, medical, dental and optical care, school supplies and other education-related expenses and we demand the right to living wages for all workers. • We demand that both Sacramento city governments only give government contracts that not only pay actual living wages but also prioritize employment from among residents of Sacramento’s and West Sacramento’s low-income communities. • Demand #3: We demand you ENDORSE the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Goal #1 is to end Poverty as the first step toward combating climate change and its impacts by 2030. Thank you.
- I support the Equity TAC recommendations. The Equity TAC has provided critical oversight and feedback on the Mayors Commission on Climate Change and must continue to do so as the final report is implemented.
- I support the request for compensation of leaders from marginalized communities to participate in the process.
- I understand that Sacramento Mayor Darrel Steinberg supports the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted unanimously by all member states of the United Nations on September 25, 2015. The implementation of these 17 goals is intended to ensure that all human beings can fulfill their potential in dignity and equality and in a healthy environment. These represent a global response to climate change, and we are only a decade away from reaching what scientists call dangerous tipping points in global warning. I want to know why Mayor Steinberg supports a program to extend compliance with the 2030 Agenda until 2045, a quarter century away. As Greta Thunberg would say, how dare we?! The critical tipping point for saving our world is upon us now, and we must act now! I ask the Commission to adopt the demands of the Sacramento Workers Benefit Council. Also, I am enrolled in American River College and I am on the student government. We had a conference via Zoom with over 200 people and they still

managed to hear public comment. I don't see why the Commission couldn't make that happen as well. I would much rather hear the comments of the public than just see them posted.

- Plant Forward Living is a vital part of addressing the climate crisis. We must make a major shift toward Plant-based consuming in the interest of health and climate equity. The importance of local, plant forward agriculture cannot be overstated. Plant Forward Living is crucial to the future well-being of the planet and its inhabitants.
- Please keep in mind that equity includes equity for the stakeholders who are too young to vote and may even not yet be born.
- Preserving existing transportation corridors from Rio Linda thru North Sacramento to Meadowview serves and connects longstanding disadvantaged communities, improving potential access to multi-modal equitable low cost transportation alternatives.
- South Sacramento does not have any Federal Regulated Air Quality Monitors. this needs to be included as a recommendation to address this obvious inequity in South Sacramento. <http://www.airquality.org/Air-Quality-Health/Air-Monitoring>
- Thank you to the Commission and Technical Advisory Groups for all of the thoughtful work and time that has gone into the Draft Climate Commission Report. Thank you to Jackie Cole as well for facilitating the Equity TAC. We applaud the Commission's commitment to advancing equity through this urgent effort to act on climate change. We'd like to also commend SMUD for its commitment to maintaining affordable energy for low-income customers and for keeping the lights on for everyone through this time, even when some can't afford to pay their utility bills. What COVID-19 has done is put a magnifying glass on what wasn't working already, revealing the disproportionate impacts being felt in the same communities that bear the brunt of climate change impacts. These are communities that were already in crisis. Equity means the investments we make put power into the hands of our underrepresented populations AND ensure that they're first to access the benefits that will come from the City's investment in climate action.
- Walnut Grove Branch Line should be used for the benefit of disadvantaged people. Saving the planet should not be completely born on the backs of the poor. The privileged class should contribute to the shared sacrifice to save the planet. Everyone including the more affluent and well politically connected must make sacrifices to create a future for the common good of all.
- We support the language in the report on page 18 with the following addition: Provide compensation as needed so that economic hardship is not a barrier to participation. We specifically recommend \$20/hour as is being done by the City of Oakland.
- When I first looked at the Equity TAC recommendations, all goals are well-written and seem achievable. Although, the goals to the recommendations do not align up to your values about urgency, equity, and accountability. There are five fossil fuel plants in the Sacramento region which continue to burn and pollute the air in which we breathe and create a higher risk for marginalized communities. There is a new construction planning to be built in West Sacramento which is currently in delay due to COVID. Yet, it is still an ongoing process to expand an engineering warehouse from Davis, CA to West Sacramento planning to build more remotely operated underwater vehicles and other robotics which are mainly used for the subsea, onshore, offshore extraction of oil. This does not align with the plans to a growing low-carbon economy, but rather an economic development to continue business as usual. We must make a rapid change to our energy systems by 2030, not 2045.

Recommendations for Year One Projects

- Adopt all 4 Overarching Priorities set forth for Year One on p.26 of the draft April 2020 Report

- Climate Commission Comments: Year 1 Projects, Overarching Priorities. 2: Environmental Justice Collaborative Governance Committee. "What is your strategy for prioritizing equity to the communities that are primarily bearing the burden of environmental toxins, hazards, and have the capacity to inform all agencies (AQMD, SWA, City Departments, County Departments, etc." In addition, what is your plan to facilitate the intensive kinds of collaboration that are necessary for EJ, valid community engagement, and environmental remediation to really be effective. I've worked with and participated in a number of exercises in community outreach and EJ and most efforts have been disappointing at best." 3: Define marginalized populations and climate impacts. The literature is already there. We know that low income communities of color, immigrant communities, and low wage labor bear the brunt of negative impacts. No more conversations about definitions. Instead work with communities on solutions which inform the work of the EJGC that is the second priority. While simultaneously partnering with Sacramento EJ Orgs to help with communication of values and level the playing field of knowledge. 4: building decarbonization: Not a good enough solution to pursue Statewide or National Policy: Electrification on a large scale must also consider benefits and impacts to both the end use customer and to the electric grid. If not done strategically, an increasingly electrified building stock could have negative grid impacts, ranging from exacerbated system peak and ramp, to increased grid constraints where low demand converges with high supply. Electrification should be pursued in ways that avoid these impacts and help mitigate them to lower costs. COVID-19 Climate Connections: • Invest in green, innovative, entrepreneurial and inclusive workforce training programs California Mobility Center PEM Motion has demonstrated that their approach can assist with commercialization of technologies twice as fast as traditional automotive practices for one tenth of the cost. (SMUD website) How are they able to achieve this and how will this affect Sacramento workers? You say that you have an equity lens applied to everything but it seems that it's an afterthought.

 - Establish a "food recovery to food security" network Need to include urban farmers/gardeners, homesteads, community supported agriculture, and schools.
 - Establish car-free districts on weekend nights in areas that offer local commerce, recreation, and This is a solution that should be championed by the community themselves. Instead, as a year one project proposal, this is suggesting a top down car-free enforcement on neighborhoods based on random factors which will privilege wealthy neighborhoods.
 - Identify communities without access to green space within a quarter mile and expand green infrastructure This is a weak goal. "Identify" is not an action it's a simple search. What will you actually do with these neighborhoods and what will be your metrics? Why isn't the same urgency and resolve given to this aspect as the other points.
- Dear Commissioners: During Year One, the city will be facing significant budget constraints; items that can bring in new funds or which can be implemented without significant new resources while still having an impact seem especially useful to recommend. I would suggest three: First, the city should seriously consider pricing residential parking. Many other cities do so, yet Sacramento allows the use of city streets for car storage for free. This is giving up a very significant market value as a subsidy to car owners, without recovering any funds which could be used to decrease car dependency. The city should immediately direct staff to develop pricing proposals. Naturally, pricing needs to be implemented equitably; income limits for pricing should be considered. But it is clear that zero is the wrong cost for the resource. Instead, reasonable fees should be channeled back into projects that reduce the need for cars -- and hence the need for parking -- including public transit and bike/ped infrastructure. Second, the city should seriously consider eliminating or reducing parking minima throughout the city for development projects. There is no reason to channel private dollars towards parking spaces; at a minimum, parking minima should be reduced, with requirements for supporting cycling increased. Third, the city should explore speed limit reductions and lane narrowing through the city, with a special focus on major "arterials" that now disrupt neighborhoods. A citywide speed limit of 25 mph or less would reduce emissions, improve safety, and increase livability. Currently, city traffic staff have indicated (in response to inquiries) that they do not account for livability concerns, and rely on enforcement to constrain speeds. But city police report very limited speed enforcement resources. The result is excess fuel consumption and emissions as a result of bad street design and unnecessarily high speed limits. The city should ensure that the way streets affect neighborhoods is central to traffic planning -- rather than the current narrow focus on moving cars rapidly through the city. Thank you for considering these recommendations.

- Develop plans that advocate for SACOG, State and Federal support preserving and utilize existing corridors that equitably connect employment, education, health care and recreation opportunities through multimodal transportation solutions
- Federally regulated air quality monitors for South Sacramento! nothing less
- For building electrification we recommend Phase 1: New Buildings - Ordinance prohibiting new gas lines and requiring newly constructed buildings be all-electric AND prohibiting gas line expansion for new gas appliances beginning in 2021 (pass in 2020). The City of San Jose has put together these two elements in their ordinance, which is already in effect.
- GRID's mission is to make renewable energy and training accessible to underserved communities. While rising costs of energy impact everyone, low-income households face an energy burden three times higher than other households. With residential electricity usage already up 20% with the current shelter-in-place restrictions, and Summer heat waves and peak rates around the corner, our vulnerable populations are slated to get hit hardest. At GRID we champion energy equity through our no-cost solar installations to reduce energy costs for low-income families, through our clean energy workforce development program, and through our efforts to expand the reach and access to zero-emission vehicles for low-income populations and underserved communities. Our work is fully aligned with the objectives described in the draft report. Thank you for including us as a partner in your Year One project recommendations. We're ready to work alongside our fellow climate action advocates to make real progress in our community, as we have already started on through our partnership with SMUD. We are impact multipliers, and we look forward to scaling our impact with additional partners and investments to make meaningful and long-lasting improvements for our most vulnerable communities.
- Health equity now! Enable underserved communities to gain far greater access to healthy, locally sourced, environmentally friendly plant-based foods. Educate citizens on the impact of their food choices. Empower citizens to understand where their food comes from and what impact it has on their personal health and on the health of the planet and its inhabitants. Healthy food for all!
- I support all of the actions in the Year One Projects list. Obviously priorities may change with the response to pandemic, but all are important, and none should be dropped.
- I support the Year One Project recommendations. It is critical that these recommendations are implemented as top priorities for both cities.
- I'm glad that this commission was formed. I'm hoping that these suggestions are actually implemented! * Solar panels in every parking lot * free public buses (move to electric) and light rail * Encourage plant based eating * food programs that teach how to eat plant based * support local small fruit and veg farmers
- Please make sure that Grassroots Environmental Justice organizations are invited to guide this implementation process
- Pushing for legislative changes that preserve all existing transportation corridors that connect or have the potential to connect residential areas with employment, shopping and educational centers should have a high priority (#4). This needs to be done at all levels of government, including local, State and Federal.
- State and Federal legislative changes that fully preserve and protect existing Transportation priorities should be included in the Year One Overarching obligation as a priority for and to advocating for # 4. Current strategic transportation Routes now established from historical demographic essentials have served and connected need communities needs based on employment, education and shopping opportunities.
- The City should grant an easement over the short piece of embargoed track recently seized from regional transit to the State allowing the rebuilding of the Walnut Grove Branch Line with a parallel bike trail, designed to support ZEBRA principles.

- The Tree Foundation has worked with SMUD's Sustainable Communities program as well as other members of the SMUD team to develop a few additional recommendations for Year One projects related to the Community Greening element: The SMUD Sustainable Communities program and Sacramento Tree Foundation will pilot a new landlord outreach program to increase tree canopy on rental properties in North and South Sacramento. Work with the Environmental Justice task force to identify tree canopy goals and tree planting strategies that would best fit undercanopied neighborhoods. Complete and adopt the City of Sacramento Urban Forest Master Plan, including a robust canopy equity strategy to ensure neighborhoods with the least canopy are supported the most.
- We support most of the recommendations for Year One Projects with the following suggestions to modify them. P. 26, Overarching Priorities 1. Entitle the position Climate Emergency Mobilization Director to communicate the importance of the effort to the public as well as city staff. Give them clear accountability for meeting climate program goals across departments. P. 26, Overarching Priorities, Add: 5. Establish a task force to work with Sacramento and Yolo county officials, and other municipal and county entities, including SMUD SAcOG, and SAAQMD on developing a regional plan for energy use so that greenhouse gas emissions for the two counties are reduced to carbon zero by 2030. P. 26, Change target date for electrification ordinance from 2023 to 2021. P.26 Prioritize Food Recovery for Food Security Network in 2020. Work must begin on this network to not only address food waste, but help feed food insecure communities that are even more impacted by Covid 19. To assist our struggling restaurant and food industry, create new policies to reduce waste, minimize environmental impact, and create a bulk processing network for recyclable take home containers which would eliminate the use of styrofoam. Also explore a Green Certification for restaurants. Begin creation of the Food Hubs proposed by the Commission. Establish a Municipal composting program to boost carbon sequestration, and drastically reduce organic food waste introduction into the landfill. Page 26, Covid-19 Climate Connections, bullet 6, Change 2022 date in this sentence to 2021. P. 26-27, Establish a comprehensive electrification and energy-efficiency program, add bullet points: Develop a program under which cities can make bulk buys of solar energy and battery storage systems and residents and businesses can then get the advantage of discounted prices for renewable energy systems. Study the feasibility of installing solar energy systems on municipal structures and making the energy from these systems available to residents who are unable to install solar systems on their residences because of inadequate solar exposure, or because they do not own the residences (particularly helpful for marginalized communities). P 26 - 27 Establish a comprehensive electrification and energy-efficiency program These major electrification programs will have a positive effect for SMUD. SMUD should expect to see a significant increase in demand. Opportunities to grow their business and leverage scale will be plentiful. However, Sacramento cannot reduce its carbon footprint if you rely on the five carbon emitting gas plants currently in their portfolio. In fact, if they choose to use these plants to make up for the increased demand driven by these policies, overall efforts to eliminate carbon will be for naught. A first year plan needs to be developed to engage with SMUD and get them to eliminate their reliance on these five gas plants with the goal of having them offline completely by the year 2030. P. 27, Add a priority on community resilience. The existing language discusses Emergency Response Training, but does not address the necessary and perhaps more important building of resilience skills and infrastructure. Suggested language: Begin the process of identifying and procuring needed resources for neighborhood resilience hubs, to include: community food, seed, tool swaps, fix-it cafes, tool libraries, urban ag food sales, community training and information sharing on low or no-carbon alternatives. P. 27, Cities to adopt an environmentally preferable purchasing (EPP) program. See <https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/epp/lawpolicy>
- Year One Overarching priority #4 must include advocating for State and Federal legislative changes that fully preserve and protect existing Transportation Corridors due to these corridor's location that serve and connect at-need communities with employment, education and shopping opportunities.
- Year One priorities must include adoption of changes to both State and Federal legislation which would preserve and protect EXISTING transportation corridors such as the SSRR/Walnut Grove line.

- Year One Projects must include Timelines for speedy action. The report is good as far as it goes, but it is only a document that means nothing if speedy and meaningful actions do not result. Get on the ground and make it real. Give homeowners and especially homeowners associations incentives and real help in overcoming significant obstacles to updating their structures and making changes in outdated and climate-harming landscaping practices. Pour immediate funding and expertise into greatly expanded climate-related training programs at our community colleges. Put rooftop solar on every public building and parking lot, and incentivize installation on private structures. Maintain work-from-home for city employees to the very maximum extent possible. For pete's sake, do something to effectively link together the patchy network of safe bike routes through the City, and reduce human and dog threats to bikers along the American River Bike Trail. Make your list, prioritize it, and please get to work ASAP.
- Yes, the Corona virus has demonstrated our weakness as Americans. Due to our unhealthy lifestyle, i.e. reliance on meat, fast foods, lack of exercise, diabetes, asthma, etc., we have succumbed to this virus on a much more elevated level than the rest of the world. I hope the city of Sacramento will emphasize, as a first step both in addressing climate change, as well as the health of our citizens, to emphasize adopting a plant based diet. A neighbor of mine stopped by this past weekend. He said, "We should be opening up our economy! It's ridiculous to keep insisting we have to 'social distance.'" Look how well Sweden is doing and they had no lockdown." I responded that Sweden has much healthier citizens than we have in the US. My neighbor who made these remarks is obese, diabetic and has asthma. I said to him, "You should be thankful we have our lockdown or you might have died by now." He admitted he has to do something to get healthier. Emphasizing a plant based diet for our citizens is a great start. I am 73 years old, can't remember the last time I was sick, have energy, founded a non-profit at 60 to help incarcerated people and have been vegetarian and now vegan my entire life. Plus, the cruelty of animal manufacturing should not be tolerated by a populace who has any concern for at all for all sentient beings.

Draft Commission Report

- 1. Since the Sacramento City Council signed a Climate Emergency Declaration calling for the City to reach carbon zero by 2030, why hasn't the goal for the Climate Commission been changed to comply with that timeline? In other words, why hasn't the Commission modified its initial target date of 2045 to be instead 2030, given the significant climate emergency recognized by Mayor Steinberg and the Sacramento City Council? 2. I would like to see the deadline for public comment be extended for an additional 30 days minimum due to the extenuating circumstances of the coronavirus pandemic. I would like that additional time to complete my reading and review of the Supplementary Report, so I can provide comments.
- 5/11/2020 Comments on Mayors' Commission on Climate Change Draft Report, April 2020 This is an excellent report. The cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento are to be commended for working together to strategize and take action to achieve the climate change goal of reducing GHG emissions, while increasing community resilience and equity. The report rightly recognizes the opportunity in the post-COVID economic restart to establish new, greener, and more equitable changes to the natural and built environment, mobility, and energy usage. IDEA for your consideration: Add a small surcharge on each car share ride to help fund SacRT's transit capital projects. Specific suggestions to the document: Draft Summary 1) Mobility, p 5: a) Insert here the "overarching vision of reducing personal-vehicle ownership and single-occupancy vehicle trips. . ." from p 23. b) In this overview, it would lend credibility for the improvements in active transportation, transit and shared mobility, and zero-emission vehicles, to say: 1) what percentage of trips exist in 2020; I know you provide these later in the report; 2) what comprises the other, if in 2030 if it's 30% AT, 30% T&SM, and 40% other; likewise in 2045 if it's 40%, 50%, and 10% other. The 10% seems unrealistic to me... but perhaps it would not seem so if it were spelled out; 3) of the "other" in 2030 and 2045, the percentage that is ZEV; 4) where commercial vehicles (large and small) fit in to this scheme, if they do. It would help to establish up front how you are classifying vehicles. 2) Community Health, p6: a) Consider renaming this sector Ecological and Community Health and Resiliency b) First

subheading would be Urban Ecology – Greening, Forestry, Biodiversity (add narrative on biodiversity) c) For each percentage achieved by 2030 or 2045 show percentage existing in 2020 d) For Community Climate Resilience, suggest this paragraph be more specific; include an example of an investment in an existing community asset/network, like broadband expansion, flood control, etc. 3) P 13-14: percentages of GHG emissions, 48%, 42%, are not easily traceable through the narrative 4) P 18 on: switching back and forth between strategies and recommendations; can you go with strategies throughout? 5) P 20: Built Environment a) Clarify if these recommendations are only for residential buildings; if so, are commercial buildings/development dealt with elsewhere? b) Organize the info clearly: i) Land use -- where and how buildings/developments are placed (urban, suburban, rural, near transit, etc.); refer to SB375 here ii) Type, density and massing of the buildings/developments themselves iii) Then, electrification of existing and new buildings/developments; refer to power source SMUD and its current and future percentages of renewable energy sources Supplement 1) P 20 same comments as for Summary Report Built Environment, comment 5) above. 2) P 23 For the four zoning and market-responsive strategies, provide a little more info regarding how these would be done, or where they have been done elsewhere. This seems like an important message. 3) P 24 Para 1.2 is unclear 4) P 27 at bottom. Mandate all-electric ... in new buildings by 2023. Including residential, commercial (small/large) and industrial?? 5) P 44 second para. "SACOG's 2020 MTP/SCS highlights a multimodal transportation plan to achieve our region's target of a 19% reduction of GHG emissions per capita." 19% reduction from _____ by when. 6) P 45 Mobility percentages. Same comment as above. • what percentage of trips exist in 2020 • what comprises the other, if in 2030 if it's 30% AT, 30% T&SM, and 40% other; likewise in 2045 if it's 40%, 50%, and 10% other. The 10% seems unrealistic to me... but perhaps it would not seem so if it were spelled out; • of the "other" in 2030 and 2045, the percentage that is ZEV; • where commercial vehicles (large and small) fit in to this scheme, if they do. 7) P 55 Para 1.8 – mention of heavy-duty vehicles... need this to fit into a classification of vehicles so we can put this in context 8) P 67 Concerns for low-income residents: would be good to be specific about how to provide all low-income residents with access to free or affordable ZEV carshare etc. These things are discussed frequently but how would it really work, how are the people identified and then given passes, etc. 9) P 72 Congestion pricing: This is a good idea and I hope it is pursued.

- A date of May 11 is too short a time frame for public comments; please allot more time. At a minimum, Sacramento needs to set their goal to quit using fossil fuels by 2030. 2040 and 2050 are far, far too late. Initiatives around public transit, biking, and electric vehicles so far have been successful and popular. We can and must do more. No fossil fuels by 2030, please!
- A rare example of a Transportation Corridor suitable for both Active Transportation and Shared Mobility is the Walnut Grove Branch line from Downtown Sacramento to the Delta area through numerous neighborhoods, shopping complexes, schools and church locations. This is a perfect use of the ZEBRA Train concept, Zero Emission Bike Rail Alternative.
- Adopt the draft Report
- Allow input from other grassroots organizations to provide input on the final draft of this report such as the Building Healthier Communities Coalition.
- Are the future energy concerns being considered? If we restrict use of Natural gas in new homes, it will put a larger strain on energy use which is still largely supplied with Fossil Fuel energy plants.
- As identified, the Walnut Grove Branch line from Downtown Sacramento to the Delta area is a prime example of a unique and responsible Transportation Corridor suitable for both Active Transportation and Shared Mobility. It should also be referenced as a perfect use of the ZEBRA Train concept, Zero Emission Bike Rail Alternative.
- As student at Sacramento State, I took one class in climate science which was very tough and complex to understand. Although, one thing I learned is that fossil fuels are one of the biggest emitters of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. If we do not put an end to the root of the cause of climate change, can we really make a change to the way accessibility, sustainability, and equity is shown in our communities. Once upon a time, there was a small village on the edge of a river. The people there were good, and life in the village

was good. One day a villager noticed a baby floating down the river. The villager quickly swam out to save the baby from drowning. The next day this same villager noticed two babies in the river. He called for help, and both babies were rescued from the swift waters. And the following day four babies were seen caught in the turbulent current. And then eight, then more, and then still more! The villagers organized themselves quickly, setting up watchtowers and training teams of swimmers who could resist the swift waters and rescue babies. Rescue squads were soon working twenty-four hours a day. And each day the number of helpless babies floating down the river increased. The villagers organized themselves efficiently. The rescue squads were now snatching many children each day. Though not all the babies, now very numerous, could be saved, the villagers felt they were doing well to save as many as they could each day. Indeed, the village priest blessed them in their good work. And life in the village continued on that basis. One day the villagers noticed a young man running northward along the bank. They shouted, "Where are you going? We need you to help with the rescue." He responded, "I am going upstream to find the son of a gun who is throwing these kids into the river! —Christopher Cerf, former superintendent of public schools in Newark, New Jersey.

- At a minimum, you need to set your goal to quit using fossil fuels at 2030. That's a minimum. By 2045, it is way too late.
- Comments on the April 2020 draft report, Achieving Carbon Zero in Sacramento and West Sacramento by 2045, presented by the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change. Submitted by: Deborah Franklin, 2525 E Street, Sacramento, CA 95816. My comments on the April 2020 draft report are limited to the Built Environment Recommendations #2 and #3 because as a home owner for more than four decades, I have knowledge and experience related to those proposals. Equity. The word appears five times in the graphic on the first page of the executive summary and is referenced as a key priority for the Commission. But equity has to be more than a lofty goal. The depth of economic inequity in our community and the precarious nature of small business ownership have been dramatically exposed as we see daily the economic consequences of protecting our health by staying at home and closing non-essential businesses. As we work toward carbon zero by 2045, we must consider the much less equitable and far more precarious situation our less resourced individuals and families (households) and businesses are experiencing. It will take years for less resourced households and businesses to recover from the economic toll of COVID-19. Many of these households and businesses are just beginning to recover from the recent recession. Every decision made, every action taken should be reviewed with an intensified focus on the potential to add economic stress—and increase real pain and suffering in our community. Built Environment Recommendation #2: Electrification of New Construction: Mandate all-electric construction to eliminate fossil-fuel use in new buildings by 2023. I remember in the 1970s when "All Electric" homes were touted as the energy efficient homes of the future. Only they weren't. It turned out that it was actually less efficient to heat water and homes with electricity than with gas and electric dryers didn't dry clothes as quickly or efficiently as gas driers. It cost more to heat our water, warm our homes, and dry our clothes when our appliances were electric. Recommendation #2 seeks to "future-proof" buildings by mandating "all electric" appliances for all buildings, regardless of the efficiency of using electricity to power every appliance. This recommendation fails to take into account the ongoing cost incurred by households or businesses using all electric appliances that take more energy than their gas counterparts. The initial cost of building is only one factor that determines affordability for households and profitability for businesses. If new built low-income housing has high utility costs, less resourced households will still not be able to afford it. New built business properties with high utility costs and inefficiencies will cut into the profits of businesses. Households and businesses that struggle to meet their utility bills will need ongoing assistance to bear the additional costs. While such programs do exist (my own SMUD and PG&E monthly bills include a contribution toward those programs), they are not sufficient to ameliorate less resourced households and businesses. There is little likelihood that local government and community organizations will have sufficient resources in 2023 to provide assistance as those entities are also facing economic hardships due to COVID-19. Comment Summary: The additional cost of using electrical appliances when gas appliances are more efficient will need to be subsidized for less resourced households and some businesses. Local governments and community organizations are currently under economic stress and not able to provide the necessary support. Built Environment Recommendation #3: Electrification of Existing

Buildings: Transition 25% of existing residential and small commercial buildings to all electric by 2030. Recommendation #3 does not create a mandate. That is a good thing. It also offers little information about how the 25% by 2030 goal can be achieved. Substantial incentives will be necessary to support the costs of these changes for less resourced households and businesses. Households and businesses that choose to replace gas appliances with new electric appliances will incur substantial costs, including upgrading electrical panels, getting building permits, and making other changes that may be required to have the building permit signed off. Currently, if a household wants to replace a gas dryer, it's as easy as a trip to the appliance store and working out a deal for delivery and installation. If a household decides to replace a gas dryer with an electric dryer, there are many additional costs and steps required. A building permit is needed; the electrical panel has to be updated, which is a very expensive undertaking; and additional changes will likely be necessary, such as purchasing and installing additional carbon monoxide and smoke detectors, in order for the building permit to be approved. (Recently the electrical system in my house was upgraded and a new electrical panel was installed. Among other costs incurred were the costs of first removing all the ceiling insulation so the permit official could see the work that had been done and then replacing all of the insulation. This added \$2,000 to the cost of the upgrade.) Each of these costs makes it less likely that a household will opt for replacing gas appliances with electric appliances. Rebates for the new electrical appliances will not be sufficient to offset the costs of changing to gas appliances. Financial incentives will need to help cover the full costs of such changes, including unanticipated expenses related to building permits. Though the ability of local governments to provide this assistance will depend on the economic conditions between now and 2030, the true costs of meeting this goal must be determined and planned for accordingly. Comment Summary: Substantial financial incentives and support are necessary to meet this goal. A final thought: The negative environmental impacts of obtaining, storing, and distributing electrical power cannot be ignored as we move to fossil-free power.

- Dear Commissioners: Congratulations on a substantial, and thoughtful, draft report. The strategies identified are compelling, and attend in thoughtful ways to equity and ambition. In particular, the sustained focus on supporting disadvantaged communities is laudable, and many of the particular recommendations -- including aggressive building electrification, large expansions in bike and pedestrian infrastructure, congestion pricing, and bans on non-electric gas-fired small engines -- appropriately target core challenges. I would suggest that the final report sharpen this focus by attending to the following points: First, the final report should consider the ways Sacramento's complex history, including its history of racial segregation and displacement, is now reflected in a transportation infrastructure that poorly serves many communities. In particular, the old West End -- once the heart of the region, and among the densest, most diverse, areas of California -- was depopulated by Japanese internment in WWII, and then again by the construction of I-5 and Capitol Mall. Residents were displaced, in substantial part to Oak Park, and then further walled off by the construction of highways 50 and 99. Highways continue to divide the city, cutting it off from its rivers and parks, and increasing asthma risk in disadvantaged communities -- including both the descendants of those displaced or segregated by the original road construction boom and new immigrants and refugees now living in many highway-focused areas. Meanwhile, the same highways subsidized remote suburban developments, further weakening the urban core and straining county and city finances. We should, in other words, understand our sprawling regional pattern as reflecting misjudgments that warrant repair. The judgments the Commission makes are therefore not merely technical -- they need to be rooted in a sadder but wiser view of our history. Removing, narrowing, or decking many of these roads -- and providing alternate options, including public transit, carshares, and bikeways -- can begin this critical reparative work, and provide new opportunities in these communities. This brings me to a second point: As the region emerges from the coronavirus recession, there will be a real opportunity to revisit existing plans and programs, and orient them towards climate justice. The Commission should not miss the opportunity to call directly for such changes, because many existing plans miss opportunities. For instance, CalTrans continues to anticipate major line expansions on I-5, 99, and Business 80, which will further entrench the existing development pattern. The Commission should call for a new look at these choices, as the current urban form is unjust, and undermines the Commission's larger vision. The Commission should establish, as a formal recommendation, that the cities disfavor further highway investments, and actively seek ways to remove or otherwise remediate the highways that now divide the urban core, through strategies that

integrate highway remediation with expanded transit options and complete street networks. Finally, the Commission should be frank about the need to address policy choices that push in the other direction. Sacramento County communities continue to plan for unsustainable far-exurban growth -- including continued expansions of Elk Grove's sphere of influence, Folsom's push for south of 50 development, and continued advocacy for a wasteful "Southeast Connector" sprawlway on the far margin of the county. The cities' plans cannot fully succeed if the county's communities continue to execute policies that increase VMT and GHGs, and weaken urban cores. The cities -- and their voting members on regional governance bodies -- need frankly to oppose plans and patterns that are counter to the sensible recommendations in the report. We need to work towards collaborative regionalism that exposes and addresses conflicting policies, and works to justly restore our urban cores, while densifying and improving exurban and suburban communities. Thank you for considering these comments.

- Dear Mayor's Commission on Climate Change, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change's draft report for achieving carbon zero in Sacramento and West Sacramento by 2045. The Coalition for Clean Air's (CCA) mission is to protect public health, improve air quality, and prevent climate change. CCA strongly supports the Climate Commission's urgency to achieve carbon zero in order to combat climate change and protect public health. The Sacramento region has the fifth-worst ozone (or "smog") pollution in the country, according to the American Lung Association's 2019 State of the Air report. This urgency has grown more important with the current Covid-19 pandemic, where we are seeing troubling correlations between unhealthy air and higher death rates due to Covid-19. The bold, transformative action that this report calls for is important to drastically reduce pollution, improve public health, and provide equitable benefits for all Sacramentans. With transportation being Sacramento's largest source of emissions, we appreciate the Commission making mobility one of its top strategies. The hierarchy of prioritizing active transportation as the healthiest and most efficient option, public transit and pooled shared mobility for longer trips, and finally zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs) for trips where transit or active transportation is not a viable option, will significantly facilitate mode shift to cleaner mobility options. CCA recognizes the draft's comprehensive approach for significant increases of these types of trips and ZEV registrations and we applaud the Commission's actions to accelerate this mode shift through:
 - Pedestrian- centric design and improvements for walking and biking infrastructure.
 - Seamless network of active transportation corridors and providing basic amenities at the neighborhood level so that shorter trips can be taken by walking or rolling to meet daily needs.
 - Expansion and improvement of transit and shared mobility services to be more accessible, affordable, timely and attractive than single-occupancy-vehicle use.
 - A comprehensive package of incentives, disincentives and policies to encourage the adoption of zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs).
 - Creating a strategic network of public charging and hydrogen fueling stations, including the installation of chargers at workplaces, multifamily housing developments and community hubs.
 - Disincentives for driving, such as limited parking, to further reinforce motivations for choosing low- or zero-carbon transportation modes.
 - Establishing car-free districts on weekend nights in areas that offer local commerce, recreation, and arts and culture.
 In addition, we support the transition to zero-emission landscaping equipment and hand tools for municipal, residential, and private properties by 2025. Gas-powered landscaping equipment and hand tools contribute to our local air pollution and this complete transition to zero-emission landscape equipment would effectively eliminate air pollution and GHG emissions produced by these sources' fuels. This would lead to immediate air- quality improvements and support positive health outcomes, particularly for equipment operators with a high degree of exposure to equipment emissions. Finally, we support the transition to zero-emission technology for heavy-duty vehicles and towards delivery consolidation to get polluting heavy-duty vehicles out of urban areas. Heavy-duty vehicles account for 27.2% of total highway transportation energy consumption and 66.4% of total highway vehicle PM2.5 emissions. They can cause even more pollution in dense urban centers as the last-mile delivery of goods is the most polluting segment of the supply chain network. Widespread adoption of medium- and heavy-duty ZEVs can yield tremendous air quality benefits, particularly for communities near major goods movement corridor. We applaud the Commission's actions to accelerate this transition through:
 - Implementing low-carbon cargo zones in hot spots for air pollution and congestion by creating consolidation spots for delivery companies and requiring the final leg of deliveries to be completed by walking, rolling, or ZEV.
 - Partnering with the California Mobility Center, Plug-In Partnership, and similar

initiatives to incentivize innovation to deploy ZEV pilots for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, goods movement. • Engaging industry to identify the needs and barriers for adopting electrified, automated transportation beyond CARB regulatory requirements. • Establishing medium- and heavy-duty electrification zones to promote accelerated adoption and create living wage job opportunities. • Identifying solutions to address challenges in converting medium/heavy-duty vehicles to ZEVs. • Expanding “electric first” guidelines that direct city departments to purchase ZEVs and forging partnerships to pilot medium/heavy-duty ZEVs upon availability of technology and promote the electrification of school buses. We commend the Commission’s excellent work in preparing this comprehensive and thoughtful draft report and again thank the Commission for the opportunity to comment on the draft report for achieving carbon zero in Sacramento and West Sacramento by 2045.

- Electrification ordinances: The goal for requiring all-electric for all new buildings by 2023 is admirable. But, as the Report noted, more than 30 cities have already enacted electrification ordinances; with these examples, there is no need to delay for an ordinance covering low-rise residential buildings where Title 24 already provides an all-electric baseline. The other building types can follow the next Title 24 code cycle upgrades. 2. CEQA GHG Mitigation. The Sacramento Air Quality Management District recently enacted regulations requiring that all new developments in the County that are subject to CEQA GHG mitigation must not utilize any natural gas. The ruling exempts the City of Sacramento which operates under the Climate Action Plan, currently under development. The Commission should direct the CAPs in the two cities to adopt this prohibition. 3. GHG Mitigation Fee for Gas Appliance Replacement. The notion of a mitigation fee associated with natural gas should be considered as part of the initial permit fee for gas appliance replacement in existing buildings, as a financial encouragement to switch to electric heat pumps. This should be seen as a transitional step before mandating the all-electric appliances. 4. The Report clearly recognizes the urgency of replacing the large stock of existing gas appliances in buildings. The measures discussed here – permit compliance enhancement, tracking HVAC contractors, education and incentives – will all be useful. But the Report should set a date for a mandate – perhaps 2025 -- for required all-electric replacement to provide clarity to contractors. This should be followed up by the permit compliance check at point of sale. 5. Rental Insulation Requirement. This is an important measure for the large percentage of non-homeowners, many of whom are low-income. It is a very simplified version of the City’s earlier Residential Energy Code Ordinance (RECO), which builds on the city’s existing rental inspection program. In this case, it simply adds an inspection for attic insulation and a one-year requirement to meet the current Title 24 standard, now at R-38.
- Entire document: Thank-you for this opportunity to comment on all the work the Commission and the TACs have been doing. We are now in a climate emergency with ten years or less to make massive changes in the way we live. The fact that we are now in an emergency means we must move faster than we probably think is possible. Please add a statement at the beginning of the document that we are in an emergency and that, while the document’s timeline runs to 2045, we need to accomplish as many of the recommendations as possible by or before 2030. The City of Sacramento acknowledged this urgency when it declared a climate emergency. It is my understanding that Yolo county has also declared a climate emergency. Hopefully West Sacramento will do so as well. The work that has been done on equity is outstanding and pervades the document. Great thanks to the Equity TAC and to all the references to equity and ways of achieving it that occur throughout the text. I especially appreciate the discussion of the need to avoid displacement – something that is an extreme risk whenever neighborhood improvements are made or new housing is built. I have watched the displacement that has already occurred in Sacramento’s Central City where I live and I don’t want to see any more of it. Built Environment/Land Use: Two of the biggest problems we face in the Sacramento region are the failure to rein in sprawl at the county and regional levels and lack of affordable housing. Sacramento County needs a firm urban limit line as do the cities within its boundaries and it may take additional state legislation to get there. The draft document is right to call out the need for state and regional advocacy as well as look at multiple approaches to reduce sprawl and get more affordable housing built. One suggestion I have for affordable housing: The City of Sacramento currently allows major deviations in floor area ration (FAR) when it deems that a development project ‘provides a community benefit’, but it has never defined what constitutes a ‘community benefit’. In the case of residential developments it could chose to define “community benefit” as affordable housing

and allow a significant FAR deviation only for projects where the additional square footage is used for affordable housing. The developer gets the benefit of building a bigger project than he/she otherwise could and the city and public get the benefit of more affordable housing.

Built Environment/Electrification of New Construction: This proposed electrification ordinance needs to be written and adopted sooner than 2023 – the sooner the better. Until it is adopted, applicants for new construction and for major rehabs of existing buildings should be advised that, if they build using gas, at some point in the not too distant future they will have to convert to all electric and that it would be simpler and cheaper to go with all electric now. In addition to the electrification ordinance, this section of the draft document talks about the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, the benefits of using salvage materials when available and of using new building materials with low carbon footprints. These are all climate adaptive approaches to building and should to be encouraged (or possibly in the case of the new materials, mandated). The City of Sacramento already incentivizes the adaptive reuse of historic buildings. It makes sense to also incentivize adaptive reuse of non-historic buildings. With regard to salvage, both cities could benefit from deconstruction ordinances and a larger version of something like Habitat for Humanity's 'Re-Store' that sells salvaged building materials. When I served on the Sacramento Preservation Commission we discussed the need for a deconstruction ordinance, but then the economic crash happened and the discussion ended. The discussion needs to be revived.

Built Environment/Transitioning Existing Buildings to All Electric: This is clearly necessary and it's going to be a very difficult transition because of the rewiring potentially needed to support all electric (heavier gage wire as well as panel upgrades or replacements), especially for lower income home owners and small landlords. Financial incentives are going to be crucial to people's ability to act and it must be made easy for people to get information about all the incentives and types of assistance available to them to make the transition. It would be helpful if all the buildings in areas where gas lines need replacement or major repair could be transitioned at the same time so that the money PG & E would spend on repairing or replacing gas lines could, instead be used to help people pay for the transition.

Mobility/Active Transportation: Very well done. I look forward to more complete streets, hopefully with lots of trees. Would like to see 2045 goal achieved much earlier.

Mobility/Transit & Shared Mobility: Also well done and, again, would like to see goal achieved earlier. It's crucial to find more funding for RT (proposed Measure A falls short on this). As a woman who is very aware of the safety issues for women traveling alone at night, I like the idea of 'integrated mobility hubs'. Because they are likely to draw lots of people they could provide safe places for women traveling alone to transition from one transit/shared mobility mode to another. I strongly support pooled ride sharing options and the availability of different pay options including options affordable to low income people. There is a huge need for a plan to transition Uber, Lyft and any other similar service to electric as fast as possible. It will need to be done in a way that doesn't harm workers, many of whom have limited incomes.

Mobility/ZEVs: As the owner of a ZEV I hoped to see plans for more public recharging stations included like the one that is now located adjacent to Southside Park in the Central City.

Community Health & Resiliency – Urban Greening: Overall this section is outstanding and I strongly support it. My comments on trees are included in the comments from Trees4Sacramento that I submitted earlier. While I neglected to get it into the Trees4Sacramento submission that I sent earlier, Trees4Sacramento also supports updating and enforcing the Parking Lot Tree Ordinance and believes it should apply to all surface parking lots including those put in before there was an ordinance. As temperatures rise, heat island effect is simply too dangerous to public health to allow any parking lots to exist without shade. 'Cash for Grass' is a great program. Like the 40% cash for grass transition goal of 2023 and would like to see 95% transition by 2030. Grantees should be encouraged to include drought tolerant native plants to help increase the populations of pollinators and other beneficial insects. Fossil fuel powered garden tools are a huge emission source and the proposed 'Zero Emission Landscaping Ordinance' has been needed for a very long time and is very welcome. The 2021 and 2025 dates for it are reasonable and make sense. The 'Regional Open Space and Biodiversity Plan' is also badly needed, especially in light of the extinction crisis. Would like to see the plan developed and ready for implementation by 2025 rather than 2030.

Community Health & Resiliency – Sustainable Food Systems: This section is also outstanding. Very comprehensive and thoughtful. With regard to composting, Sacramento used to compost the contents of its green waste. We badly need that program again. Many of us don't have adequate space to compost all of our green waste and food scraps and it was nice to again be able to buy compost from the city at a reasonable price. I strongly support food hubs and all the

recommendations to create more opportunities to garden and places to do it. Would love to see the city of Sacramento develop more community garden areas so that people who don't have other places to garden could get a city garden plot. Community gardens and food hubs are great ways to make healthy food more available and also great ways to bring community members together. I totally agree with discouraging the use of pesticides and would love to see ordinances banning them or significantly restricting their use. Pesticides are leading to the extinction of pollinators and other beneficial insects and are also highly toxic to people, particularly children. I garden organically and have noticed a drastic drop in the number of pollinators in the nearly forty years I've been in Sacramento which I attribute in large part to pesticide use. If pesticides can't be banned outright, then at least the cities should stop using them in parks and other city owned property. We won't have a healthy food system if we don't have pollinators. Finally I am very pleased that this section includes the promotion of plant based diets. As a long time vegan, I know how wonderful a plant based diet is for health and for the climate. Schools are natural partners for promoting plant based diets as are hospitals, particularly now that more and more health care providers are recognizing the significant impact of diet on health. Another place to promote plant based options is the restaurant industry. Adding vegan and vegetarian options to restaurant menus is a great way to increase customer base. Community Health and Resiliency – Community Climate Resilience: Everything outlined in this section is badly needed. I look forward to seeing the recommendations instituted. Ever since last year's fires I have been thinking about micro-grids being key to resiliency and I'm relieved to see them included. I'm also very relieved by item 3.2 cooling (and warming) center accessibility. We will need operating thresholds for these centers before the proposed December 2020 date. This summer is predicted to be very hot and will likely be dangerous for homeless people and people who don't have air conditioning. Thank-you again for the opportunity to comment on this very important well thought out document.

- Error to fix in the draft supplemental report: Page 8, youth advocate's name should be spelled Nasma not Nasama
- First, thank you to the staff at the Local Government Commission for responding to our call today. We appreciate the efforts of this commission and respectfully request more due diligence with regards to propane; that will be impacted from the directive of this report without consideration of the true emissions, cost, fuel advancements, and role of providing clean energy to disadvantaged communities. WPGA seeks first to advise of the following: (1) Propane is NOT a greenhouse gas, (2) propane is non-toxic, (3) propane is often used as a complement for solar powered homes to provide complementary power when batteries are depleted, (4) propane provides affordable energy to low-income communities throughout the state, (5) the CEC has advised any propane emissions in aggregate for the state of California would equate to 0.055% of the total state GHG emissions, per Heriberto Rosales - CEC's lead on building decarbonization & assessment, (6) the recommendations in this report would not be cost effective, and (7) renewable propane from feedstocks like animal fat or methane capture offers even more advantages and is available in California today. All of the recommendations in this report do not apply to propane. WPGA looks forward to working with the Technical Advisory Committee on the importance of being completely transparent in this report. At the very least, this report must clearly state that "Propane was not evaluated as part of the scope of this report." Failure to acknowledge that the TAC did not include propane as part of their evaluation can have unintended consequences for many communities, including low-income residents. Our industry is very proud of the role we play, whether providing energy for pop-up hospitals or housing for the homeless during the COVID-19 pandemic to providing energy resiliency in parts of the state myriad by electrical blackouts and power for firefighters at their basecamps. Our industry also provides funding supported by many air quality management districts that helps transition citizens from wood stoves to propane. We welcome the opportunity to have further discussions and work with staff/committees on this report, as it is extremely important to substantiate any recommended actions with data.
- GRID Alternatives is happy to support the Commission's Draft Climate Commission Report and recommended investments in green, innovative, and inclusive solutions for local climate action. We're aware of the major economic strain that COVID-19 has pulled from budgets throughout the City, State, and Country, and commend your commitment to investing in a cleaner, more equitable future. GRID looks

forward to contributing to this communal effort to reduce our carbon emissions and increase community resilience to climate change impacts.

- Heat and humidity already ‘too severe for human tolerance’ in some places, new study finds, <https://www.sacbee.com/news/local/environment/article242644096.html>, City Governments are in a unique position to lead public education efforts. The report refers to specific education efforts, but does not recommend that the Cities lead the public through education and example. This needs to be amended and the roles of information sharing and public education emphasized in view of the rapid changes happening to our climate.
- How will Sacramento look and function differently? Examples of specific achievable actions (especially the low-hanging fruit) would help, perhaps in the exec. summary.
- I agree with the overall goals of the commission. However, we suggest an incremental approach to regulations that will allow the continued use of our most energy efficient gas fireplaces and heater rated products. . Yes, we can support more immediate restrictions on decorative gas appliances and gas logs. A.) Power plants use natural gas for the majority of their electrical production currently and will be using natural gas, albeit in reduced amounts, for many years to come. Heating with natural gas with furnace rated, high efficiency gas fireplaces and inserts as zone heaters is a more efficient means of generating heat than through remote electrical production and distribution. B.) Our high efficiency gas fireplaces are thermostatically controlled zone heaters. The entire residence is not heated. Typically, these fireplaces heat the central area of the house comfortable, while hallways and bedrooms remain cooler. This zone heating strategy, on average, saves 20% or more over central heating. -Our products are ductless, so no heat is lost in duct work. C.) Heating with heat pumps and electric strip heaters is not very efficient and is far more costly than heating with high efficiency gas products. Who will pay for this difference? An incremental approach that allows for better technology to be developed and for electrical production costs to go down (if this occurs) is more reasonable. We do carry and sell electric fireplaces. However, these units are primarily for decoration. They can be run with or without the heating function. However, the electric heaters they include will only heat very small spaces, are expensive to operate, and like other electric strip heaters, are not very efficient. We have been in business for over 50 years serving Sacramento and West Sacramento, are responsible community members, employ approximately 20 people, and appreciate being made part of this discussion. Sincerely, Mitchell Heller, Owner.
- I strongly support the draft Climate Commission Report. I have attended and participated throughout the entire commission effort and think that the resulting draft report is a very important contribution to move these cities forward in addresses climate change in our region. We are in a climate emergency and must not delay or "water down" these recommendations in favor of short sighted economic concerns that have been expressed recently by some. Only by aggressively implementing effective climate actions can we best protect our public health and environment as well as avoid worse economic impacts that will result from increasing climate change impacts. There is a strong linkage between or climate emergency and the current pandemic. We must take bold action to effectively address these critical global threats.
- I think most of the stated goals will provide little improvement for their high cost and difficulty. The exception is the transfer of all possible activities to an online format, from work to shopping to sales meetings. COVID-19 has shown us that everything we now do under the shutdown is the cure for global warming. Few people over 20 will ever be riding scooters. C-19 has given us a roadmap of what to do, and the plans need to be rewritten to maximize the number of shutdown characteristics that become permanent. I feel that C-19 has shown that far too much of our economy is rooted in things that are in fact non-essential (entertainment, tourism, dining out, working in an office, most transportation of physical items over long distances, etc.). The hard truth is that if we are to survive on this planet, great sectors of the economy need to be shifted into what IS essential (LOCAL farming/food, healthcare, shelter, clean water, and the movement and trade of information rather than people, goods and services). Leadership at all levels is failing to recognize these “inconvenient truths.”

- I was very disappointed to see the date of 2030 buried in the draft without any changes to the target dates through the document. You could have said; ...by 2030 and no later than 2045. It would have at least given some hope you are taking the Climate Emergency seriously. The way you have framed the draft gives the distinct impression that nothing has really changed. And we cannot expect serious changes in time to avert runaway climate change. Personally I am no longer going to use the term “Climate Change” I am now refer to the phenomena as Human Impact on Extinction. You don’t seem to grasp Human Impact and the need to do something about it immediately.
- I would like to see the mobility section moved to top, since it is the majority of emissions, and therefore the potential greatest reduction. I support all of the recommendations, but particularly Mobility #1: Active Transportation.
- June 11, 2020. Mayor’s Commission on Climate Change RE: North State BIA Comment – Mayor’s Commission on Climate Change Report. Dear Climate Change Commissioners: On Behalf of the North State Building Industry Association (BIA) we respectfully request that the Commission consider delaying the adoption of the Commission’s Carbon Zero Report (Report) until we have a chance to understand the unprecedented circumstances of the COVID-19 global pandemic. The economic impacts of responding to the COVID-19 global pandemic have been extensive for building industry. Trying to absorb the additional cost of the proposed mandates included in the Report and will raise the price of a new homes, add risk to new development projects and delay project construction, pricing new homeowners out of the market and slowing construction starts in Sacramento and West Sacramento. Given our current circumstances, and our inability to know how we safely move forward resuming normal activities it seems appropriate to delay finalizing the Report under the unprecedented impact COVID-19 has had to our regional economy. This is one area where we are in this together, and it will take our shared partnership to help build a new normal. It is in all our best interests to carefully examine every dollar that is added to the cost of building a new home. In a recent affordability study from the National Association of Home Builders for every \$1,000 increase in the sales-price of a home another 8,870 California households are priced out of home ownership, (<http://nahbnow.com/2020/01/1000-makes-a-big-difference-in-housing-affordability/>). The BIA remains concerned that some of the strategies outlined in the Mayor’s Commission on Climate Change goes well beyond the current State Construction Code mandates, resulting in additional development risk, delays and expense that will be passed onto new homebuyers. For instance, going all-electric is still problematic for large residential projects since we do not have reliable technical solutions for energy-efficient on-demand electric water heating, and home heating and cooling units (HVAC). This alone would create additional costs for homeowners, as heating and cooling electrically is not as efficient without deep subsidies to upgrade home components. The building industry is actively seeking new technology and product solutions to reduce GHG production, however we still need to analyze the state-wide electric grid to see if projects can go all-electric. To date we have only seen a few small lot all-electric pilot projects in Sacramento, and those were coordinated and heavily subsidized by SMUD to make them successful. Recent infill projects that have been constructed downtown would not be possible if this mandate was in place. Built Environment Recommendation #2: Electrification of New Construction Mandate all-electric construction to eliminate fossil-fuel use in new buildings by 2023. • This proposed mandate is hugely problematic and goes well beyond current state construction code mandates. • SB 1477 (Stern of 2018) directed the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) and the California Energy Commission (CEC) to start two pilot programs aimed at reducing greenhouse gases – which have been largely interpreted as building all-electric homes. The current focus from the state CPUC and CEC have been to focus on fiscal incentives – not mandates. A key difference to continue to encourage residential development in our current state-wide housing crisis. • AB 3232 (Friedman of 2018) directed the CEC to study the feasibility of going all electric, especially with millions of electric vehicles soon to be on our roads. However, the state identified that a state-wide study is needed before imposing all-electric mandates. • Requiring a more stringent building code by a local jurisdiction is permissible, but the local jurisdiction needs to justify the more stringent code. Specifically, the justification must identify special circumstances in the community that are based upon geographical, topographical or climatic findings. Then the jurisdiction would need to pass an ordinance and file the more stringent code with California Department of Housing and Community

Development (HCD). It may be that the Report intends to point Sacramento and West Sacramento towards fiscal incentives from the “building decarb” programs being developed by the CEC and CPUC as a way to refocus these strategies. However, without clear language linking these changes to the current construction code cycle, you are considering adopting energy mandates; ahead of state priorities, without multiple supply chains for all-electric home components, and without knowing if mandating all-electric will negatively impact the cities electrical grids. The State of California already has the most stringent laws in the country for GHG reduction for new development. The most recent set of energy efficiency building codes (2019) will add approximately \$10,000 to the cost of a new home. During the last ten years, energy efficiency standards passed by the CEC have added \$22,000 to \$30,000 in energy efficiency standards per home. The mandates included in the Report will add significantly more cost to homes during a housing crisis and will price many local constituents out of homeownership. Here is a breakdown of cumulative effect of the recently adopted state building standards: • CEC Residential Energy Efficiency Standards (effective 1/1/10): \$2,500 per home • HCD Residential Green Building Standards (effective 1/1/11): \$500 - \$2,000 per home • SFM Residential Fire Sprinklers (effective 1/1/11): \$5,000 - \$6,000 per home • CEC Residential Energy Efficiency Standards (effective 7/1/14): \$3,000 per home • CEC Energy Efficiency Standards (effective 1/1/17): \$3,000 per home • CEC Energy Efficiency and Solar Mandate (effective 1-1-20): \$8,000-\$13,500 per home. The State of California has implemented a series of new mandatory building standards resulting in the single greatest increase in code-related construction costs ever seen in the history of our state construction code. In just 10 years, the State of California has implemented mandatory building standards that have added an estimated \$22,000 - \$30,000 to cost of building a new home. The proposed Report goes beyond those state mandates. The Commission should be incentivizing all-electric construction not mandating it. Thank you for your time and attention. Sincerely, Crisand Giles

- Many restaurants use gas stoves instead of electric. We need this to be considered.
- Massive public education will be needed to get citizens and business owners to do the right thing. Few of us will do it out of personal responsibility alone. Put climate responsibility in the curriculum of every school and college. Fund the few local non-profits that teach students about their role in the ecosystem (Splash and Effie Yeaw). Use those freeway overheads to flash the message to all drivers that they can be part of the solution. Start contests for (free) media ideas. Pay actors for public performances. Educate.
- Mayor Christopher Cabaldon and members of the Mayors’ Commission on Climate Change, particularly Mayor Pro Tem Chris Ledesma, Schilling Robotics, a locally developed subsidiary of multi-billion-dollar oil and gas technology conglomerate TechnipFMC, designs and builds robotics almost exclusively for ocean-floor oil exploration and extraction. The government of the CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO IS CURRENTLY HELPING SCHILLING/TECHNIPFMC MOVE TO WEST SACRAMENTO AND BUILD A HUGE NEW OIL TECH FACTORY called Project Titan (after their flagship product, the Titan 4 robotic arm) to increase the company’s capacity to help oil companies find and extract more oil from under the ocean. At the January 15, 2020, West Sacramento City Council meeting, Mayor Cabaldon mentioned that Schilling’s technology could also be used for renewable energy. While that is theoretically possible, SCHILLING’S FOUNDER HIMSELF SAYS THAT THE COMPANY’S FOCUS IS ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY THE OIL INDUSTRY [see Tyler Schilling interviews Feb. 20, 2015 (<https://youtu.be/IDHgJWcAy8A>) and Jan. 27, 2017 https://youtu.be/_PD-8ocAm8o]]. At this point, our understanding is that the THE PROPOSED WEST SACRAMENTO FACTORY IS ALL ABOUT OIL AND GAS AND NOTHING ABOUT RENEWABLES. BUT WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TURN THIS LEMON INTO LEMONADE. Development of the oil tech factory in West Sacramento has been delayed for a few months due to the coronavirus lockdown and massive financial losses at TechnipFMC in the first quarter of 2020. This gives us a bit of time. As the draft Commission report says, practical options for green investments are plentiful. If the City of West Sacramento indeed recognizes the urgent need to act on the climate crisis, then YOU COULD TAKE BOLD ACTION NOW AND INSIST ON A GREEN DEVELOPMENT PROJECT that addresses public health, climate and social equity needs, rather than one that exacerbates the most pressing crisis humanity has ever faced. IF INSTEAD, WEST SACRAMENTO INSISTS ON PROMOTING A PROJECT THAT INCREASES OIL EXPLORATION AND EXTRACTION, THEN HAVING CITY REPRESENTATIVES SIGN A CLIMATE COMMISSION REPORT that talks about: —“addressing the largest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions”. —being “much more strategic and creative with our

investments and our core principles, focusing on high-priority projects that achieve multiple economic, social and environmental benefits’, —being “willing and capable of making significant and dramatic changes in the face of a global threat”, and —knowing “bold, transformative action is needed to drastically reduce emissions and avoid the worst impacts of accelerating climate change” ...IS PRETTY MUCH MEANINGLESS. MAYOR PRO TEM LEDESMA AND MAYOR CABALDON, WHICH WILL IT BE? You could be climate heroes, or you could leave a legacy of bypassing an opportunity to act when the world needed you most. I think you know the right thing to do, and I wish you all the courage in the world to follow through on that.

- Mayors Steinberg and Cabaldon, On behalf of the Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange (SRBX), representing nearly 1,000 construction member companies who operate in the greater Sacramento region, we thank you, your staff and the commissioners for providing the draft climate report and for your steadfast commitment to enhance and improve the environmental footprint of the Greater Sacramento Region. As California’s power grid becomes cleaner with the mandate of SB-100 (Chapter 312, 2018), which calls for 100% zero-carbon electricity by 2045, deep decarbonization is required to achieve these goals by local municipalities. As noted in the report, both cities have made substantial progress. While we recognize that building electrification is a long-term strategy to achieve carbon zero, we must point out construction companies are still required to comply with stringent pre-COVID 19 regulations restricting the use of diesel trucks and vehicles with Tier 1 engines. This will adversely impact owner and operators of 1 ton or heavier diesel trucks, which are commonplace in the construction industry. In addition, a large segment non-EV off-road equipment is scheduled to be phased out, including Gradall excavators and forklifts. The phaseout of these vehicles will create a lack of supply of alternative vehicles, especially when many automotive dealerships are closed or have limited sale options due to California’s Stay at Home order. This is further exacerbated by Ford and GMC automotive companies retooling their factories to construct ventilators to meet COVID-19 needs. For the time being, electric construction equipment is a new product category and commands a higher price tag than traditional diesel counterparts. Furthermore, since the market for this type of machinery is smaller now than the one for diesel-powered construction equipment is, the cost for repairs is consequently going to be higher and there will be limited options for buying used equipment. Greenhouse gases are emitted from cars, trucks, equipment, factories, commercial buildings, healthcare facilities, educational institutions, homes and even animals. Any efforts to reduce emissions from such sources will have a profound impact on the way we generate energy, design and operate buildings and other infrastructure, make land planning decisions and transport goods. A top concern is whether new greenhouse gas controls will stifle the economy through unwieldy and strict regulations or strengthen the economy by spurring new markets and innovations and creating jobs. Amid the political discord, the public and industry grapple to understand greenhouse gases, what guise controls of those gases may take and what it may mean to them, job creation and the economy as a whole. As both cities pursue adopting aggressive greenhouse gas emission reduction goals, including significant “disincentives” to compel the adoption of zero emission vehicles (ZEVs), it is important to recognize that only 0.005% of medium and heavy-duty vehicles registered in California are ZEVs. This is attributable to the practice of imposing disincentives upon operators of medium to heavy-duty vehicles, while providing incentives and rebates for customers of electric passenger vehicles. As evidenced by the broad market of EV passenger cars and the few options for EV medium- to heavy-duty work vehicles, the marketplace favors incentives. We do appreciate the acknowledgement in the report to the current COVID-19 crisis. This crisis has triggered the worst U.S. unemployment since the Great Depression. In our industry, 975,000 construction jobs were lost in April 2020 and 67% of construction companies report having a project canceled or delayed since the start of the outbreak in early March. By adopting more stringent and punitive regulations and policies than what is currently required by the state, local companies who operate these vehicles in your cities will be forced to sell non-compliant vehicles to buyers in surrounding jurisdictions to offset the costs of acquiring expensive ZEV equipment. This will result in the creation of an island of stricter regulatory requirements within our region, negating any GHG reductions in the process. We appreciate the bold vision of the commission and for looking for innovative ways to slash fossil fuel use and to meet California greenhouse gas reduction goals. We look forward to working with the commission, city councils, industry and community leaders to achieve these stated goals while recognizing that the construction industry is vital to

the success of California and critical to the resiliency of the state and its people. Sincerely Yours, Timothy A. Murphy, Chief Executive Officer

- New buildings: no natural gas. Mobility: A critical metric is gallons of gasoline sold in Sacramento. The city's gas stations are the spigot for vehicle emissions. The best way to know if programs and incentives are working is to see a decrease in gallons sold. EV adoption rates alone don't accurately reflect progress toward reducing GHGs without info on whether they're displacing gasoline consumption. Track total gallons sold, set a goal to reduce it by X% a year from a baseline, and publish progress toward the goal often. Encourage surrounding cities to do the same. Enforce gas station cleanup and operating laws. Many gas stations are emitting benzene at unsafe levels, and drips and leaks are contaminating soil and groundwater. Many underground storage tanks are past their 30-year lifespan. Hold gas stations accountable to clean up or shut down (and if they do shut down, incentivize housing to take their place).
- please do not require restaurants to go all electric with new construction or remodel. This would be a very painful add to a capitol intense build of any restaurant.
- Please expedite your time table to carbon neutral to 2030 for better outcomes!
- Please follow the City Council's pledge of 2030 as the date we stop using fossil fuels. It is necessary for the survival of our children & grandchildren. We are in a climate emergency and the lack of action by that date threatens the future of our species & our planet. Please vote for the people of this community and not just for the business needs which is the pattern of the City Council. Thanks for such a thorough Climate Report. A lot of good work went into all those proposals. Don't leave it as just an aspirational document. Help save your community. Do the right thing.
- Preserve the existing Walnut Grove Branch Line Rail Corridor to connect the long disadvantaged City of Sacramento Meadowview residential area to Land Park and downtown Sacramento with a state of the art, Westinghouse/BNSF battery powered ZEBRA (Zero Emission Bike Trail Alternative) Train.
- Sacramento Trailnet - Our Vision: Nearby greenways with America's best and most visited trails; 877 53rd Street Sacramento, CA 95819. May 6, 2020. To: Mayors' Commission on Climate Change Subject: Draft Report: Achieving Carbon Zero in Sacramento and West Sacramento by 2045. Dear Commissioners: Thank you very much for your work on the draft report. It's a clear document that appropriately expresses urgency. Its goals, with at least one exception, appear realistic, but will take considerable, continuous effort to achieve. We'd like you to consider additional specific recommendations and comments. To reach the transportation mode share goals, we believe that special attention needs to be given to adding bridges across the Sacramento and American rivers. We firmly believe that bicycling should be the top mode choice. Not surprisingly, we are convinced greenways with paved trails are a great way to provide low-stress bicycling and walking, healthy recreation and a connection to nature. Like having more bridges, the report should specifically highlight creation of a network of greenways. Other factors, besides the current pandemic, make achieving the transit mode share goals questionable. Transit costs and existing development patterns are major obstacles to their attainment. Common destinations must be close by, which means "mega," "hyper," or simply "big" box stores and other venues should be minimized. Complete neighborhoods with neighborhood scale destinations are important. Marketing has to be addressed. There needs to be a concerted, well-funded effort to promote the dramatic changes needed to slash the number of single occupancy vehicle trips and move those trips to other modes. Funding for all the proposed transportation improvements and for professional marketing research and strategies must be addressed. Money will always be an issue. Bridges. We recommend the report specifically call for construction of additional bridges. Sacramento and West Sacramento need to be cities linked by bridges, not cities separated by their rivers. Most of the bridges needed could be bicycle/pedestrian only bridges which would reduce their costs and eliminate vehicle traffic impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. Since bridges take so long to plan, fund and construct, beginning work on bridges should be a priority and planning should be included in year one projects. The highest priority locations probably should be where residential and employment densities are the highest, but it should be noted that many non-commute trips can be made by bicycling and walking and that most trips are not commute trips. The Sacramento and American rivers

represent the biggest physical barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel in the two cities. There is little possibility of achieving the ambitious active transportation mode share goals without addressing these barriers. The lack of convenient crossings forces out-of-direction travel for bicyclists and pedestrians. Trips that are longer in distance and more time consuming discourage or eliminate cycling or walking as options. Pedestrians in particular simply will not walk a half mile out of their way to reach a river crossing. Not only would bridges facilitate bicycle and pedestrian transportation trips, they would create many more recreation opportunities for bicyclists, walkers and joggers. They are key links in a potential network of greenways with paved trails. The existing Sacramento and American river bike paths are already among the most important, scenic and well-used amenities in the cities. Additional bridges would serve to enhance them even more. Sacramento River bridges are needed at Sutterville Road (to Linden Road in West Sacramento), Broadway, R Street, Discovery Park and from Garden Highway at the Sacramento Main Drainage Canal (to Westlake Drive in West Sacramento). American River bridges are needed at I-5, in conjunction with the light rail extension to the airport, at Capital City Freeway, at Glenn Hall Park and from Glenbrook Park to Oak Meadow Park between Howe and Watt avenues. The most egregious existing river crossing gap is between the Sacramento Northern bike/ped bridge and the H Street Bridge, a distance of nearly four miles. There are no available crossings for bicyclists or pedestrians in that stretch. Mode priority. We urge that bicycle trips, not pedestrian trips, have the highest priority, given existing development patterns. The potential for increasing bicycling's mode share is greater. The existing pedestrian networks in Sacramento and West Sacramento are more complete than the bicycle networks. It takes 20 minutes to walk a mile at three miles an hour, which is normal walking speed. The rule of thumb for walking to transit, is that most people will not walk more than a quarter mile, about a five-minute walk. While the number of pedestrian trips would increase if there were better facilities for walking, safer crossings and more accessible destinations, any increase in walking trips is likely to be marginal because of walking's inherent low speed and low population densities in much of the two cities. According to the 2009 National Household Travel Survey, 56 percent of all trips are less than four miles and 50 percent of trips are less than 3 miles. Very, very few people will walk 3 miles, taking an hour or more for one way for a trip. However, a three-mile trip can easily be made in 15-20 minutes by bike. That's a reasonable time that also requires no additional time for looking for (or paying for) parking or reaching, waiting for, and paying for transit. Bicycles also have carrying capacity for goods that pedestrians do not. Cities across the world have made bicycling a priority, among them Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Berlin, Paris, Seville, and Montreal. In Copenhagen, the mode share for bicycle commute trips is 50 percent. Greenways. As greenways advocates, it's natural that we support a greater emphasis on greenways with paved trails in the plan. Paved trails in greenways are not just low stress, they are the lowest stress bikeways. They also offer shade for users in summer and tree planting in greenways provides opportunities for carbon sequestration. They are attractive community amenities that help realize both the mobility and community health and resilience goals. There is an opportunity to call for greenways in the urban greening and forestry recommendation and the active transportation recommendations. Here is what the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy says about the benefits of greenways. They: • make communities better places to live by preserving and creating open spaces; • encourage physical fitness and healthy lifestyles; • create new opportunities for outdoor recreation and non-motorized transportation; • strengthen local economies; • protect the environment; • and preserve culturally and historically valuable areas. Villages and neighborhoods, not mega-anything. Size matters. The concept of a fifteen- or twenty-minute village, where virtually everything is within walking or bicycling distance, is a powerful and sustainable one that can be vital in meeting climate change goals. The concept goes hand-in-glove with the idea of infill and increased density, so that the economics of neighborhood-scale businesses work. If destinations are close by, you don't need to use a car to get to them. That means neighborhood scale, smaller size businesses and schools should be encouraged. Complete neighborhoods also strengthen social bonds. While huge high schools and big box stores may enjoy economies of scale, they also foster longer trips that won't be made by walking or bicycling and make for anonymous personal interactions. Land use plans should discourage giant-scale grocery stores, other big box retail such as office supply and hardware/home outlets, and mega-schools. Achievability of 2030 and 2040 transit goals. It's desirable to have challenging transit mode share goals. However, several factors make achieving a 50 percent transit/pooled shared mobility mode share problematic. Transportation funds will always be limited and transit trips are much more expensive than

pedestrian and bicycling trips. Rail transit facilities are very expensive to construct and take a long time to plan and build. Rail and bus transit are expensive to operate. Cost-effective transit requires population and workplace density. While Sacramento and West Sacramento may be denser than other parts of the region and the cities certainly can become denser yet, most of the real estate in the two cities is already developed. Changes to the existing, generally low-density built environment over the next 10 or 20 years will be marginal, and unlikely to be enough to justify the proposed mode share goal for transit when existing transit use is so low and has been further decimated by the pandemic. Marketing. At times, there has been a “build it and they will come” attitude about public transit and active transportation. That was not the way we got to a car-dominated transportation network. Even after policies and projects were put in place that favored automobile travel, such as minimum parking requirements, Level of Service (LOS) standards, inadequate gas taxes and, perhaps most significantly, completion of the Interstate Highway System (not just to cities, but through cities) automobile manufacturers continue massive spending on advertising and other marketing. According to Marketing Charts, automobile manufacturers spent \$18 billion dollars in 2018 in the U.S. market alone. Those marketing dollars glamorize car ownership, enhance the image of car owners, as they depict automobiles speeding down empty city streets or conquering pristine wilderness. Marketing not only sell cars, it sells a lifestyle. Partnerships with regional agencies, local business, nonprofit organizations and community members for education and outreach are a good idea, but not sufficient to change transportation behavior in the way contemplated. Whether you call it education, outreach or marketing, there must be professionally run campaigns to make active transportation and transit use cool and on a par with driving. That might be impossible right now for transit given the pandemic, but it has to be a long-term goal. A “Be cool” campaign might be a theme. Marketing research needs to be done to see what message and medium would be most effective. Marketing can’t be an option, it’s essential. Attitudes about smoking were changed by advertising, not just by Surgeon General warnings on cigarette packs and in ads. Vision Zero. The city of West Sacramento should adopt a Vision Zero program. Built environment recommendation #1: sustainable land use. In order to reach the ambitious mode share goals, project level VMT will need to be far lower than the modest 15 percent reduction called for in the Sustainable Communities Strategies. Funding. A Danish study showed that for every kilometer cycled, society enjoys a 23 cent profit, while driving the same distance produces a net loss of 16 cents. Berlin recognized it could save money by increasing bicycle mode share. But there has to be funding to create active transportation and transit improvements. Climate taxes could function like sin taxes. Carbon or other greenhouse gas producing substances or goods (automobiles?) could be taxed and the funds raised used to improve active transportation and transit. Since this probably can’t be done at the local level, the cities should ask for changes at the state and federal levels. Local transportation taxes, such as Measure A, need to be consistent with proposed climate mobility goals. A parks tax for sidewalks, parks and greenways should be considered. People highly appreciate the American River Parkway. The public might be willing to tax themselves to have more such resources. Thanks for considering our comments. We hope your recommendations become a reality and that Sacramento and West Sacramento can be models not only for the rest of the state, but for the nation. Yours truly, Walt Seifert, Executive Director

- Sacramento’s Climate Action Plan should have an Informed Consent to Contribute to Global Warming and Climate Change 4/18/2020 This informed consent should be filled out by the following people: - people subscribed to Covered California and other insurance carriers. To maintain their health care coverage and renew their knowledge of their CO2 emissions, people should fill out the Informed Consent to Contribute to Global Warming and Climate Change every 3 months. Landscape gardeners should give the Informed Consent to Contribute to Global Warming and Climate Change to their customers and discuss not using any gasoline powered equipment to maintain lawns and landscape. Pool maintenance people and contractors should give the Informed Consent to Contribute to Global Warming and Climate Change to their customers and discuss not using any gasoline powered equipment to maintain lawns and landscape. Below is a proposal for an Informed Consent to Contribute to Global Warming and Climate Change for Covered California Members. This informed Consent can be modified for other customers. Dear Covered California Member - Covered California is dedicated to helping you and your family be as healthy as possible now, and as far into the future as possible. Unfortunately global warming and climate change are increasing mosquito born disease like malaria and dengue fever, as well as California forest fires. In an effort to

protect the health of you and your children, Covered California may start working with other health insurers to inform every Californian when they are contributing to global warming and climate change. We are sorry to inform you that every \$100 spent in California is associated with about 35 pounds of CO₂ emissions. (3) Your office visit will require about \$75 worth of services which will be associated with about 20 pounds of CO₂ going into the air. When we emit more than 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day, we are contributing to global warming and climate change. (2) The Department of Defense says that “climate change is an urgent and growing threat to our national security, contributing to increased natural disasters, refugee flows, and conflicts over basic resources such as food and water. These impacts are already occurring, and the scope, scale, and intensity of these impacts are projected to increase over time.” Climate scientists tell us that limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees C is very important, and that the world will emit enough greenhouse gas to warm the earth 1.5 degrees C around the year 2030. Currently there is no plan to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C. This Informed Consent attempts to begin the conversation “what do we need to do to help limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C?” Would you please fill out the following Informed Consent so that we all might better protect our children and future generations from global warming? Would you read the following statements and circle A if you agree, circle D if you disagree and circle DK if you don’t know the answer? A D DK The Department of Defense says that “climate change is an urgent and growing threat to our national security, contributing to increased natural disasters, refugee flows, and conflicts over basic resources such as food and water. These impacts are already occurring, and the scope, scale, and intensity of these impacts are projected to increase over time.” (5) A D DK Scientists tell us that our carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions are a major cause of global warming and extreme weather events called climate change. How am I contributing to global warming and climate change when I see a doctor or use the services of Covered California? A D DK It takes about 15 pounds of CO₂ to grow food for the average American. (1) The green plants of the world take up about 15 pounds of CO₂ for each world citizen. (2) Thus when Californians buy their food, they have used up their CO₂ emissions budget. All their other CO₂ emissions for the day go to global warming and climate change. A D DK The average \$100 spent in California is associated 35 pounds of CO₂ emissions. (3) Health insurers can take the cost of an office visit and multiply it by 35 pounds of CO₂ divided by \$100 to find out how many pounds of CO₂ emissions are associated with that office visit. A D DK What might be our goal? California should aim to end its contribution to global warming and climate change. To limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C, everyone in the world will need to emit less than 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day, and stop emitting all other greenhouse gases. A D DK We might look to the people of Bhutan who do not contribute to global warming and climate change. All of the CO₂ emissions of Bhutan are sequestered by the trees and forests of Bhutan. (4) 70% of the people of Bhutan grow their own food. More Californians need to grow their own food to decrease California’s CO₂ emissions. A D DK You can find out how many pounds of CO₂ you emitted per day on average last year by filling out the Nature Conservancy Carbon Calculator. <https://www.nature.org/en-us/get-involved/how-to-help/carbon-footprint-calculator/> When you find out how many tonnes of CO₂ you emitted last year, you can multiply those tonnes by 2205 pounds per tonne, and divide them why 365 days per year. That will give you your average “pounds of CO₂ emitted per day.” To not contribute to global warming and climate change a world citizen must emit less than 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day. A D DK If the world does not decrease its CO₂ emissions, California will be at risk of droughts as severe as the drought that preceded the Oklahoma Dust Bowl in the 1930’s. A D DK Burning a gallon of gasoline puts 25 pounds of CO₂ into the air, when my budget is only 15 pounds of CO₂ for the day A D DK Spending the average \$100 in California is associated with putting about 35 pounds of CO₂ into the air. (3) A D DK Flying from Sacramento to New York puts about 1,213 pounds of CO₂ into the air. A D DK Elon Musk’s SpaceX Falcon 9 rocket launch puts about 968,000 pounds of CO₂ into the air. To end global warming, our goal must be for everyone to emit less than 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day. (9) A D DK Our CO₂ emissions are melting Himalayan glaciers and threatening a reliable water supply for 1.5 billion people, including the water supply of India and Pakistan. (6) A D DK Carbon Brief estimates in April of 2020 that world CO₂ emissions will decrease 5.5% in 2020 due to the Coronavirus and Sheltering in Place. Unfortunately to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C world CO₂ emissions must decrease some 7.6% every year this decade. (18) James Hanson and 17 co-authors say world CO₂ emissions must decrease 15% per year every year for the next 80 years to avoid Dangerous Climate Change. (19) A D DK Sheltering in Place has markedly decrease pollution over Beijing and Italy as of April, 2020.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l6SPsiT_9Zg A D DK The Health of Mother Earth Should be considered in the treatment of every patient. In *The Lives of a Cell* Lewis Thomas describes the interconnectedness of people and nature making the earth look like a living cell. That makes people one organelle amidst all the other forms of life and organelles we see. Unfortunately doctors have been promoting the health of people without considering the health of Mother Earth. California and other states might define a “Mother” as that which brings forth new life. Planet Earth brings forth new life all the time, and so we can begin to think about the health of Mother Earth as we treat each patient. How is the health of Mother Earth? We might think of the serum sodium of a patient and how patients are healthiest when serum sodium is between 130 and 150 mmole/L. When the serum sodium gets far above 150 mmole/L, there can be serious health consequences. serum sodium vs days before death.JPG Please e mail me at brucenburdick@icloud.com if you would like these graphs. Here is a graph of the earth's atmospheric CO₂ over the last 400,000 years. Atmospheric CO₂ has fluctuated between 160 ppm and 280 ppm for hundreds of thousands of years. In the last 80 years, atmospheric CO₂ has gotten out of the earth's healthy range. Since CO₂ traps heat, we are seeing rising global temperatures as a result of rising atmospheric CO₂. When are we contributing to global warming and climate change? The people of Bhutan can help us answer that question. All of the carbon dioxide emissions of the people of Bhutan are taken up by the trees and forests of Bhutan. https://www.ted.com/talks/tshering_tobgay_this_country_isn_t_just_carbon_neutral_it_s_carbon_negative?language=en <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Bhutan/1/Bhutan-INDC-20150930.pdf> The average citizen of Bhutan emits about 19 pounds of carbon dioxide per day. The forests of Bhutan take up about 52 pounds of carbon dioxide per citizen of Bhutan per day. Thus the people of Bhutan do not contribute to global warming. We can use similar logic to answer the question “how many pounds of carbon dioxide can the average world citizen emit per day and not contribute to global warming and climate change?” The following website (Figure 1) says the earth sequesters about half of world CO₂ emissions. <https://phys.org/news/2012-08-earth-absorbing-carbon-dioxide-emissions.html> Half of world CO₂ emissions of 36.2 billion metric tonnes of CO₂ comes to about 18.1 billion metric tonnes. If we divide that by 7.6 billion people, we each can emit about 2.38 tonnes of CO₂ per year and not contribute to global warming. 2.38 tonnes of CO₂ times 2205 pounds of CO₂ per tonne, divided by 365 days per year shows each world citizen can emit about 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day and not contribute to global warming. If everyone in the world cannot reduce their CO₂ emissions to 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per world citizen per day, countries and states would need to reduce their population so that all of their CO₂ emissions are sequestered by the green plants of the world. The following chart answers the question “how many people can live on earth emitting 9.26 metric tonnes of CO₂ per year like the average California?” We can take the 18.1 billion metric tonnes of CO₂ sequestered by the green plants of the world, and divide it by California's per capita CO₂ emissions of 9.26 metric tonnes per year. If everyone in the world emitted 9.26 metric tonnes of CO₂ per year, 1.95 billion people could live on earth without contributing to global warming. That would represent a 74% decrease in the world's population. If California's population decreased 74%, California's population would need to decrease from 39.25 million people to 7.31 million people to live sustainably on earth without raising atmospheric CO₂. If the world is going to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C as discussed in the Paris Climate Agreement, and countries cannot reduce their per capita CO₂ emissions to 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day, and scientists cannot find ways to take CO₂ out of the atmosphere, then it will be necessary to find a way to reduce the population of California and other states and nations. The following Table uses 18.1 billion metric tonnes of CO₂ sequestered (taken up) by the green plants of the world. How might this information be conveyed to patients? Health Insurers like Covered California might require members to fill out the following Informed Consent to Contribute to Global Warming and Climate Change as part of registering for health insurance. References: (1) It takes about 10 pounds of CO₂ equivalents per day to provide food for the average vegetarian in America, and 20 pounds of CO₂ to provide food for a meat loving American each day. <http://shrinkthatfootprint.com/food-carbon-footprint-diet> It takes 3.3 tonnes of CO₂ per year to provide food for a meat loving American. Multiplying by 2205 pounds per tonne, and dividing by 365 days per year gives 20 pounds of CO₂ per day to provide food for a meat loving American. It takes 1.7 tonnes of CO₂ to provide food for a vegetarian in America. Multiplying by 2205 pounds per tonne, and dividing by 365 days per year shows it takes 10 pounds of CO₂ per day to provide food for a vegetarian in America. (2) The following website (Figure 1) says the earth sequesters about half of world CO₂ emissions. <https://phys.org/news/2012-08-earth->

absorbing-carbon-dioxide-emissions.html Half of world CO₂ emissions of 36.2 billion metric tonnes of CO₂ comes to about 18.1 billion metric tonnes. If we divide that by 7.6 billion people, we each can emit about 2.38 tonnes of CO₂ per year and not contribute to global warming. 2.38 tonnes of CO₂ times 2205 pounds of CO₂ per tonne, divided by 365 days per years shows each world citizen can emit about 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day and not contribute to global warming. If everyone in the world cannot reduce their CO₂ emissions to 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per world citizen per day, countries and states would need to reduce their population so that all of their CO₂ emissions are sequestered by the green plants of the world. The following chart answers the question “how many people can live on earth emitting 9.26 metric tonnes of CO₂ per year like the average California?” We can take the 18.1 billion metric tonnes of CO₂ sequestered by the green plants of the world, and divide it by California’s per capita CO₂ emissions of 9.26 metric tonnes per year. If everyone in the world emitted 9.26 metric tonnes of CO₂ per year, 1.95 billion people could live on earth without contributing to global warming. That would represent a 74% decrease in the world’s population. If California’s population decreased 74%, California’s population would need to decrease from 39.25 million people to 7.31 million people to live sustainably on earth without raising atmospheric CO₂. If the world is going to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C, and countries cannot reduce their per capita CO₂ emissions to 14.4 pounds of CO₂ per day, and scientists cannot find ways to take CO₂ out of the atmosphere, then it will be necessary to declare World War III on climate change and reduce populations to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C. The following Table uses 18.1 billion metric tonnes of CO₂ sequestered (taken up) by the green plants of the world (3) Dividing California’s per capita CO₂ emissions per day by California’s GDP per day, we find the average \$100 spent in California is associated with 34.8 pounds of CO₂ emitted. (4) https://www.ted.com/talks/tshering_tobgay_this_country_isn_t_just_carbon_neutral_it_s_carbon_negative?language=en <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Bhutan/1/Bhutan-INDC-20150930.pdf> (5) [150724-congressional-report-on-national-implications-of-climate-change.pdf](http://www.congress.gov/115/1/colleagues/150724/congressional-report-on-national-implications-of-climate-change.pdf) (6) Our CO₂ emissions may be associated with a nuclear war between India and Pakistan over water. Global warming is melting Himalayan glaciers that provide water for India and Pakistan. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2of9A6R1zjU> Frame 32 of the following website says that 1.5 billion people depend on water from the Himalayan glaciers. http://research.bpcrc.osu.edu/blogfiles/education/2014/04/Thompson-BPRC-Understanding-CC-Risks_May_15_2014.pdf A nuclear war between India and Pakistan may lead to fires and soot that block out sunlight, decrease crop yields, and lead to the deaths of 2 billion people. <https://www.psr.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/two-billion-at-risk.pdf> Would a Covered California Informed Consent decrease our CO₂ emissions and the risk of nuclear war between India and Pakistan with by recommending a Nuclear Weapons Tariff on imports from India and Pakistan? When India and Pakistan agree to destroy their nuclear weapons, this Tariff money could be returned to help them destroy their nuclear weapons. (7) Minute 7:15 of Professor Rosina Bierbaum’s talk “Confronting Climate Change: Avoiding the Unmanageable, Managing the Unavoidable” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B0FarCSgaZI> (8) <https://space.stackexchange.com/questions/13082/calculate-falcon-9-co2-emissions> A Falcon 9 Missile launch puts 440,000 kg of CO₂ into the air. 1 kg of CO₂ = 2.2 pounds of CO₂. We can multiply 440,000 kg of CO₂ times 2.2 pounds per kg and find a Falcon 9 Missile launch puts 968,000 pounds of CO₂ into the air. (9) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Hansen (10) James Hansen and 17 co-authors state that world CO₂ emissions must decrease 15% in 2020 if we wish to avoid the risk of Dangerous Climate Change. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0081648> (11) <https://pubs.giss.nasa.gov/abs/ha04710s.html> James Hansen and 18 co-authors in a 2016 paper: Ice melt, sea level rise and superstorms: Evidence from paleoclimate data, climate modeling, and modern observations that 2°C global warming could be dangerous. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 3761-3812, doi:10.5194/acp-16-3761-2016. (12) The University Corporation for Atmospheric Research predicts that by 2060, California and most of the United States will be at risk for droughts as severe as the drought that preceded the Oklahoma Dust Bowl in the 1930’s. With continued world CO₂ emissions the risk of even more severe droughts will increase. The website has four maps that illustrate the potential for future drought worldwide over the decades indicated, based on current projections of future greenhouse gas emissions. These maps are not intended as forecasts, since the actual course of projected greenhouse gas emissions as well as natural climate variations could alter the drought patterns.

http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/cas/adai/news/Dai_Drought_UCAR.htm (13)

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/ericmack/2018/04/11/the-climate-change-atlantic-gulf-stream-science-behind-the-day-after-tomorrow-is-coming-true/#79dc29c448f6> (14)

<https://www.hakaimagazine.com/news/greenland-ice-melt-could-push-atlantic-circulation-collapse/> (15)

<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0081648>(16)

<https://www.cnn.com/2019/01/16/health/climate-change-health-emergency-study/index.html>(17)

<http://news.mit.edu/2008/footprint-tt0416>(18) <https://www.carbonbrief.org/analysis-coronavirus-set-to-cause-largest-ever-annual-fall-in-co2-emissions>(19)

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0081648#s7>Assessing “Dangerous Climate Change”: Required Reduction of Carbon Emissions to Protect Young People, Future Generations and Nature, James Hansen, Pushker Kharecha, Makiko Sato, Valerie Masson-Delmotte, Frank Ackerman, David J. Beerling, Paul J. Hearty, If you search the article for “2020” you will find "Delay of (world CO2 emissions) reductions until 2020 requires a reduction rate of 15%/year to achieve 350 ppm in 2100." In other words, world CO2 emissions must decrease 15% a year beginning this year, with a 15% a year reduction in world CO2 emissions every year for the next 80 years. This may help us avoid Dangerous Climate Change and the superstorms and sea level rise predicted in the following article. (2) (20) Ice melt, sea level rise and superstorms: evidence from paleoclimate data, climate modeling, and modern observations that 2 °C global warming could be dangerous. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 3761–3812, 2016 www.atmos-chem-phys.net/16/3761/2016/ doi:10.5194/acp-16-3761-2016 Page 3782 has a picture of a 1,000 tonne mega boulder that was moved 20 meters above sea level during a storm about 120,000 years ago. 782 J. Hansen et al.: Ice melt, sea level rise and superstorms Figure 22. Megaboulders #1 (left) and #2 resting on MIS 5e eolianite at the crest of a 20 m high ridge with person (1.7 m) showing scale and orientation of bedding planes in the middle Pleistocene limestone. The greater age compared to underlying strata and dis- orientation of the primary bedding beyond natural in situ angles indicates that the boulders were wave-transported. These articles are hard to read. It is easier to read a Forbes article talking about "Some Of The Science Behind The Ridiculous Movie 'The Day After Tomorrow' Is Now Coming True" <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ericmack/2018/04/11/the-climate-change-atlantic-gulf-stream-science-behind-the-day-after-tomorrow-is-coming-true/#510cce848f6> Slate Hanson bombshell article <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2016/03/james-hansen-sea-level-rise-climate-warning-passes-peer-review.html>

- Since a Climate Emergency Declaration was passed unanimously by the Sacramento City Council, endorsed by Mayor Steinberg, in December 2018 calling for the city to become carbon neutral by 2030, I don't understand why the target deadline for the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change wasn't modified to be 2030 as well. As written, the Mayors' Commission has a target date now of 2045. Retaining that target date would be counterproductive, highly negligent, and resulting in significant environmental and adverse financial impacts that could be mitigated by a wiser decision to adhere to the Climate Emergency Declaration's date of 2030. The scientific evidence that underpins the 2018 IPCC report indicates that 2045 is significantly insufficient and points toward a much more urgent, focused and systematic mitigation using 2030 as our target date. The Climate Emergency Declaration was written and passed with a recognition of that urgency. I urge the mayors to charge the Commission to re-consider their recommendations while modifying the target date to 2030.
- Sooner! Stronger!
- "As student at Sacramento State, I took one class in climate science which was very tough and complex to understand. Although, one thing I learned is that fossil fuels are one of the biggest emitters of climate change. If we do not put an end to the root of the cause of climate change, can we really make a change to the way accessibility, sustainability, and equity is shown in our communities? When I am old, I do not want to say to the younger generations, ""This is a problem your generation will have to deal with.""
-
- Once upon a time, there was a small village on the edge of a river. The people there were good, and life in the village was good. One day a villager noticed a baby floating down the river. The villager quickly swam

out to save the baby from drowning. The next day this same villager noticed two babies in the river. He called for help, and both babies were rescued from the swift waters. And the following day four babies were seen caught in the turbulent current. And then eight, then more, and then still more! The villagers organized themselves quickly, setting up watchtowers and training teams of swimmers who could resist the swift waters and rescue babies. Rescue squads were soon working twenty-four hours a day. And each day the number of helpless babies floating down the river increased. The villagers organized themselves efficiently. The rescue squads were now snatching many children each day. Though not all the babies, now very numerous, could be saved, the villagers felt they were doing well to save as many as they could each day. Indeed, the village priest blessed them in their good work. And life in the village continued on that basis.

- One day the villagers noticed a young man running northward along the bank.
- They shouted, "Where are you going? We need you to help with the rescue." He responded, "I am going upstream to find the son of a gun who is throwing these kids into the river!"
- —Christopher Cerf, former superintendent of public schools in Newark, New Jersey.
-
- "
- The draft Mayors' Commission on Climate Change report sets the target goal as zero carbon emissions by 2045. If the intent of this report, and the recommended actions, are to limit climate change and protect our environment, this goal is misleading and unrealistic. By 2045, it will be too late to mitigate the worse effects of carbon emissions, and the people who live here will pay the price for this delayed action for generations. The goal must be carbon free by 2030 if we are to have a chance of controlling and mitigating the damages caused by climate change. Please reconsider your target, and amend your goal. Thank you.
- "The Mayor's Climate Commission concluded that electrification is an effective way for Sacramento to work toward reaching its 2045 carbon zero goal. As a member of 350 Sacramento's reach codes campaign team, I am writing because we propose a different phasing, more in keeping with the exigency of climate change, and stronger in that we want to see enforcement go hand in hand with ordinance. The draft City Climate Action Plan is calling for four phases to completely electrify Sacramento's buildings. The four phases were described in list of key draft proposed measures for the Sacramento 2040 Climate Action Plan, which were discussed at the meeting on February 12, 2020: Phase 1: Pass an ordinance requiring newly constructed buildings to be all-electric, with first implementation being with residential buildings.
- Phase 2: Pass an ordinance prohibiting new gas lines and expansion of gas service to new appliances (2022-23) Phase 3: Pass an ordinance prohibiting the replacement of gas appliances (2025) Phase 4: Create an enforcement mechanism with a permit compliance program implemented at the point of sale (2030) In line with Sacramento's Climate Emergency Declaration, Sacramento should be in a position to start shutting down its gas lines in 2030. Therefore, all phases of the city electrification plan need to begin by 2025 at the latest. 350 Sacramento recommends: Phase 1: New Buildings - Ordinance prohibiting new gas lines and requiring newly constructed buildings be all-electric AND prohibiting gas line expansion for new gas appliances beginning in 2021 (pass in 2020). The City of San Jose has put together these two elements in their ordinance, which is already in effect. Phase 2: New & Existing Buildings - Ordinance prohibiting the sale of electric resistance water heaters beginning in 2023 or sooner (pass in 2021). Electric heat pump water heaters are more efficient and the measure would raise awareness about the city's ongoing electrification efforts and set the stage for future ordinances. Phase 3: Existing Buildings - Ordinance prohibiting the replacement of existing gas HVAC systems, water heaters and all other gas appliances beginning in 2025. Implement through a building permit process at point-of-sale with enforcement beginning in 2025 (both measures passed in 2023). It will take time for people to replace their appliances. We must start this process before 2030, and realistically, it doesn't start in earnest without enforcement. The City of Davis already has a point-of-sale permit process that can be tailored to fit these goals. Sacramento is well-positioned to take this on, and the first phase of this needs to happen soon. Cities of

similar size throughout the state have already developed models our City can lean on; and our utility, SMUD, is aggressively pursuing electrification as part of its strategy to keep rates as low as possible for their customers. As an organization, we have already started educating the community about the importance of electrification, and we will continue to advocate for, and support efforts towards the goal of electrification by 2030. Sincerely, Rosie Yacoub"

- The Mayor's Climate Commission concluded that electrification is an effective way for Sacramento to work toward reaching its 2045 carbon zero goal. As a member of 350 Sacramento's reach codes campaign team, I am writing because we propose a different phasing, more in keeping with the exigency of climate change, and stronger in that we want to see enforcement go hand in hand with ordinance. The draft City Climate Action Plan is calling for four phases to completely electrify Sacramento's buildings. The four phases were described in list of key draft proposed measures for the Sacramento 2040 Climate Action Plan, which were discussed at the meeting on February 12, 2020: Phase 1: Pass an ordinance requiring newly constructed buildings to be all-electric, with first implementation being with residential buildings. Phase 2: Pass an ordinance prohibiting new gas lines and expansion of gas service to new appliances (2022-23) Phase 3: Pass an ordinance prohibiting the replacement of gas appliances (2025) Phase 4: Create an enforcement mechanism with a permit compliance program implemented at the point of sale (2030) In line with Sacramento's Climate Emergency Declaration, Sacramento should be in a position to start shutting down its gas lines in 2030. Therefore, all phases of the city electrification plan need to begin by 2025 at the latest. 350 Sacramento recommends: Phase 1: New Buildings - Ordinance prohibiting new gas lines and requiring newly constructed buildings be all-electric AND prohibiting gas line expansion for new gas appliances beginning in 2021 (pass in 2020). The City of San Jose has put together these two elements in their ordinance, which is already in effect. Phase 2: New & Existing Buildings - Ordinance prohibiting the sale of electric resistance water heaters beginning in 2023 or sooner (pass in 2021). Electric heat pump water heaters are more efficient and the measure would raise awareness about the city's ongoing electrification efforts and set the stage for future ordinances. Phase 3: Existing Buildings - Ordinance prohibiting the replacement of existing gas HVAC systems, water heaters and all other gas appliances beginning in 2025. Implement through a building permit process at point-of-sale with enforcement beginning in 2025 (both measures passed in 2023). It will take time for people to replace their appliances. We must start this process before 2030, and realistically, it doesn't start in earnest without enforcement. The City of Davis already has a point-of-sale permit process that can be tailored to fit these goals. Sacramento is well-positioned to take this on, and the first phase of this needs to happen soon. Cities of similar size throughout the state have already developed models our City can lean on; and our utility, SMUD, is aggressively pursuing electrification as part of its strategy to keep rates as low as possible for their customers. As an organization, we have already started educating the community about the importance of electrification, and we will continue to advocate for, and support efforts towards the goal of electrification by 2030. Sincerely, Rosie Yacoub
- The Mayors Climate Commission Report sets the goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. This is far too late to reduce carbon emissions to levels that will prevent the increase in the Earth's temperature that will lead to much worse fires, droughts, and other natural disasters, as well as loss of biodiversity, social and political unrest, and displacement of many people from areas at low elevation that have already occurred. Please do the wise and right thing and take a robust and fierce stance on this most critical issue. We only have 10 years to do this right. Set the goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.
- The specific examples of a combined active transportation and shared mobility corridors should be included in the report. The best candidate for a pilot program implementing an innovative approach is the Walnut Grove Branch Line Corridor. It should be studied further and specifically included in the report.
- There is an existing transportation corridor on the west side of Sacramento that meets the objectives for what I stated above and also the concept of shared mobility. It's the trackage and right of way of the Railroad Museum's railroad. It goes at least all the way to Freeport. It's wide enough for both trains and bicycles to use it safely. They are using battery powered trains in Europe and some are built by Siemens, so

they could be manufactured here. This would meet zero emission goals and provide fast rail transportation to the west side of the City. This information needs to be included in the report.

- This is in your recent decision to extend carbon neutral to 2045. This isn't a decision I agree with. Climate is the biggest issue affecting the world and. Sacramento should be a leader! These climate goals will positively affect health, the economy, and overall quality of life. The young people in our city are inspirational and precious. We need to invest in their futures. Please make the 2030 goals a priority.
- Urban Greening and Forestry - Trees. We appreciate all the thoughtful work that has been done on this and all sections of the Climate Commission's draft report. Because the world is in a climate emergency we want to see as many of the report's post 2030 goals as possible met by 2030 (or soon thereafter) not 2045. We have been working in Sacramento City and County and are comments are based on that experience. They are as follows: 1. We believe the goals for canopy cover (25% by 2030 and 35% by 2045) are too low and need to be increased as follows: 35% by 2030 and 45% by 2040. We believe this is possible through coordination between the cities, SMUD and the Tree Foundation – the cities are lucky to have these capable partners. 2. As much as possible tree species selected should be large species that can provide maximum canopy cover, maximum carbon absorption and are well suited to what will be an increasingly hot, dry climate. 3. We have long been concerned about the large tree inequity between Sacramento's wealthier and poorer neighborhoods and are pleased that the effort to plant more trees will begin with the poorest, most treeless neighborhoods and along commercial corridors that lack trees. We also like that residents of these neighborhoods will be actively involved from the beginning. 4. We agree that maintaining the health of existing trees and newly planted trees (in target prioritized neighborhoods and corridors and every place else) is critical to success. Promoting community education, volunteerism and workforce development, as spelled out in the document, are critical to the success of this. 5. Receiving sufficient water is key to tree survival. Ways will need to be developed to help the residents/property owners of poorer neighborhoods be able to handle this including help with installing drip irrigation and possible assistance with water bills. Installing grey water systems to help save water is very promising and, again, poorer neighborhoods will need assistance. 6. Maximizing tree canopy along residential and corridor streets (planter strips and front lawns) is of special importance because it will cool hot asphalt streets and cement sidewalks and make the active transportation goals presented in this draft possible. 7. In Sacramento the trees in parkway strips are 'public trees' that the city maintains as are some front yard trees that are within city easements. It is our understanding that prior to Sacramento's 1992 tree management plan, the city maintained other front yard trees that were not within city easements and that one of the reasons many Sacramento neighborhoods no longer have tree/sidewalk canopy is that the city stopped doing this, many residents couldn't due to cost and the trees died. This situation needs to be corrected. All Sacramento property owners pay a landscape and lighting tax that includes 'public tree' maintenance and all properties in all neighborhoods should be able to benefit equally from this. 8. In Sacramento (and perhaps in West Sacramento) there doesn't seem to be a system that triggers the replacement of public trees when they have to be removed due to poor health, death or serious damage. This has resulted in unfilled gaps in the canopy. A system needs to be put in place to handle this problem. 9. In Sacramento it is far too easy to remove healthy existing trees, especially in conjunction with development projects. We can't afford any unnecessary loss because it takes decades for new replacement trees to provide the same ecosystem services that large existing trees provide. Sacramento needs to revise its tree ordinance to make it more difficult to do this. It also needs to educate the architectural/development community about the expectation that projects are to be designed (e.g. step backs, setbacks) with the goal of preserving as many existing trees as possible. Both cities also need to lead by example by finding ways to preserve as many trees as possible in their public projects, something that Sacramento has frequently failed to do. 10. Strongly support permeable pavement requirement. Among other benefits, it will allow water to pass through and filter into the ground, thus helping to maintain water table as region becomes hotter and dryer. 11. In Sacramento, many planter strips that were meant for trees have been cemented over. This significantly reduces the space available to plant street trees and it also adds to run-off/flooding problems. Need to create incentives for removal.

- Use of this existing transportation corridor is ideal for a concept called the "Zebra Train" which stands for "Zero Emission Bike Rail Alternative". This innovative concept starts with an existing transportation corridor which would be utilized for new battery-powered trains such as Zebra trains, but also include both pedestrian and bike use. Battery-powered trains are currently being built by manufacturers such as Alstom, Bombardier, and others. And the cost of implementing such trains is greatly reduced if existing corridors are available. Imagine some day soon when residents living south of the City have access to a new and affordable and efficient way to travel from the Delta to Downtown.
- We find ourselves in the midst of two global catastrophic events. Covid 19 has taken thousands of lives and continues to do so. In order to survive we have consciously altered our way of living. We no longer greet our neighbors with a handshake or hug our loved ones hello but instead we don gloves and a face mask and extend a nod from a safe distance of 6ft. If we are lucky enough to still have jobs we conduct our business through conference calling, zoom meetings or from behind a plexiglass barrier. We will survive Covid 19. Eventually we will have a vaccine and its reign of terror will come to an end. There will be no vaccine for Climate Change. Its reign of terror will continue to displace populations and take lives. Climate change will not sit idly by affording us the luxury to deal with one crisis at a time. This is why we must press forward and continue our work together right now. Life as we know it depends on it. Our survival depends on it. We would like to thank the Commission and the members of the three TACs for the excellent work included in this document. The Commission acknowledges the grave threats posed by Climate Change and takes bold action adopting the 2030 goal for carbon neutrality as a foundational principle (p19). We see that the report will be a valuable resource, guide and directory for the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento as we all move towards meeting zero carbon emission goals. We appreciate the inclusion of the equity discussion at the start of the document as well as the consideration of marginalized, low-income communities throughout. We look forward to working with the Cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento as they implement its recommendations as quickly as possible. The City of Sacramento in its December Climate Emergency Declaration acknowledged that rapid climate changes due to tipping points being activated could lead to a "hothouse" earth. With current greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions levels nine of these tipping points have been identified as already active in 2019 and it is unknown how soon their thresholds may be exceeded." Since then scientists have reported that, "heat and humidity are already reaching the limits of human tolerance." On May 3, 2020, just a week ago, the highest daily average CO2 levels ever measured were recorded at Mauna Loa observatory by NOAA (see chart below). Until we drastically change our living patterns and use of fossil fuels, GHG numbers will continue to rise, perhaps more slowly because of economic interruptions like the current pandemic, but relentlessly until we change our course and cease using fossil fuels. The Report says bold action is needed now in three different places. We agree! However, throughout the document a date of 2045 is stated or reinforced. For example the cover "Achieving Carbon Zero in Sacramento and West Sacramento by 2045" The executive Summary "develop recommendations to achieve carbon zero by 2045..." And many more. The entire document should reinforce a date of 2030 as the stated "stretch" goal. 2045 is too late. All of the lead in dates are based upon 2045, and need to be changed to reflect earlier accomplishments. The Cover and executive summary do not reflect a sense of urgency. 2045 is 25 years from now. This can certainly be read as the next generations' problem, not ours. 2030 is 10 years from now. This is our generation's problem. The responsibility to act lies with us, here and now! Here are a series of specific recommended changes to the content of the report. Add the following sentence to the first paragraph in the Executive Summary (pg. 4): Subsequently, the Sacramento City Council passed an emergency climate declaration calling for maximum feasible efforts to implement emergency-speed carbon reduction actions towards eliminating emissions by 2030. Page 4, paragraph 7, replace the date 2045 with the date 2030. Rationale: We certainly should not select a lessor goal to give us a greater chance of success. Instead we should do our utmost to achieve what is vital and necessary and if we do not succeed, we will know that we did the best that we could. Page 5, Sustainable Land Use: change the 2040 date in the first bubble to 2025. Add, "by 2023" to the end of the sentence in the second bubble in the same section, add 30% by 2026, 45% by 2029, 60% by 2032 and 75% by 2035. In Electrification of New Construction, change the date to the word "immediately." In Electrification of Existing Buildings, change the date to 2024, and add to 50% by 2028, and to 75% by 2032. Page 5, Active Transportation, change date from 2030 to 2025. In the second bubble, change 40% to 50%

and change the date from 2045 to 2030. Page 5, bubble 1 under Transit and Shared Mobility section should change from 30% to 50% by 2025, rather than 2030. Within bubble 2, the percentage should be changed to 80% and the date should change to 2030. Page 5, Zero-Emission Vehicles, change the date in the first bubble to 2025. Change the date in the second bubble to 2025. Page 6, Urban Greening and Forestry, change the date in the first bubble to 2025 and change the percent in the second bubble to 50% and change the date to 2030. Page 6, Sustainable Food Systems, change the percent to 50% and the date to 2025 in the first bubble. In the second part of the first bubble, change the percent to 80% and change the date to 2030. In the second bubble change the date to 2023 and the second date to 2026. Page 6, Community Climate Resilience, change the date to 2021. Page 6, the third paragraph below the 3 subsections above, change the date from 2045 to 2030. Page 12, add the following bullet to the list of bullets: Statistics show that African Americans and other under-represented minorities die disproportionately from coronavirus. Doctors recognize the direct link between increased likelihood of death from this disease and exposure to toxic air pollutants, especially PM 2.5. Yet exposure to these toxic particles remains high, and there is a clear link between air pollution and California's increasingly prolonged and intense wildfire season exacerbated by climate change, drought and global warming. Smoke and toxic pollutants from these present widespread threats to our health. Sacramento is one of the 25 most polluted counties in the country. P 12 In the Introduction, is a list of bullets articulating the impacts of Climate Change on the region, Specific programs to deal with two are suggested below: • Decreased efficiency of electric transmission and distribution systems from higher temperatures. A more efficient and resilient grid can be accomplished through rooftop solar and battery storage throughout the community. • Accelerated roadway deformation and track buckling resulting from extreme heat, and increased expansion and contraction at critical bridge joints resulting from temperature fluctuations. New engineering techniques will need to be implemented and infrastructure retrofitted. Less and Less reliance on individual transportation, more on multi-person transportation, and the systems that make it comfortable and feasible for the citizenry to use. Page 12, in the second paragraph below the bulleted list, change the date 2045 to 2030. Page 14, Line 2, change 2045 to 2030. Page 16: Line 9, Change "2045 mandate" to "2030 mandate". Page 17, paragraph 2, line 2; change 2045 to 2030. Page 17, last paragraph, last line ending in 2045; change to 2030. Page 18, first paragraph, end of the first sentence; change 2045 to 2030. Page 20, last paragraph, the SB100 law written in 2017 implemented in 2018 states a goal as 2045, but at the time, the urgency was not as great as today in 2020, therefore Sacramento must not confine themselves to this late date and must aim for 2030. Language should be added to reflect this urgency and the plan to accomplish the goals of SB100 earlier by 2030. Page 20 in the blue text box titled Built Environment Recommendation #1:Sustainable Land Use, at the end of the first bullet point; change 2040 to 2025. P. 21 Sustainable Land Use - change goal date from 2040 to 2030. Electrification: New Construction - change goal date of mandate from 2030 to 2021. Electrification of Existing Buildings - change percentages from 25% to 50% by 2025 and change 35% to 50% by 2030. P. 24 Opportunities for Neighborhoods and Businesses re shortage of affordable housing - Section 1.2 Accommodate and facilitate construction of 30% of the region's new living wage jobs and 35% of region's new housing units by 2040. Per report, many funding resources are available. Change date to 2030. Page 25, Community Health and Resiliency Recommendation #3: Community Climate Resilience. Change the 2022 date in the first sentence to 2021 (blue box). Page 28, Conclusion, In the first sentence, change the 2045 date to 2030. Funding in the time of Covid-19. We could not agree more with your assessment. On page 10 you state "now is the time to invest stimulus dollars into projects..." And ".....practical options for green investments are plentiful.....we must be much more strategic...focusing on high-priority project. We need to be developing "now" a strategic list of projects, prioritized by the principles in the Commission's document. We understand that \$89,000,000 of stimulus money is forthcoming. Decide what to spend it on now, and make it have the greatest impact on our goal of eliminating emissions by 2030. Any funding decisions should be made through the lens of emission reductions.

- We need to keep the oil in the ground. Look, there will be some pain, but think about all of the iconic sights we have seen, before the coronavirus and after. We see places with blue skies and clean air. The water immediately cleans up. We need to go full speed ahead with stopping the use of fossil fuels by 2030. Look at how our slow action to combat the pandemic has made it so things are worse and perhaps will be even

more catastrophic as we blithely open up for economic reasons. And then look at South Korea or other places who took it seriously and strictly and they are coming out far better. The same goes with no more fossil fuels. Our planet is in big trouble in the oceans, the air, the neighborhoods. Please be courageous and brave and ethical and realistic. 2030 is the better date.

- You can't be serious! 2045 is too late. Darrell, you and I will be dead but what about the legacy that we are leaving for all future generations including our kids and grandchildren? Get real! You folks need to educate yourselves regarding climate crisis facts! Move that date back up to 2030 .. or for god's sake 2025 if you have any concerns about the planet and humanity. Most sincerely, Vicki Marie PS Darrel, this is not what I expected when we voted for you!

Final Commission Report

- We must start requiring residential electrification immediately. Here's why: I remodeled my kitchen in 2017. The designer, contractors, all never even mentioned the idea of an induction cooktop, and I had never heard of them at that time, so a standard gas cooktop was installed. Recently I learned about induction cooktops and saw one demonstrated at AA Appliance a few months ago (note it is the only appliance retailer I could find that had one 'live' to demonstrate), and I learned SMUD provides conversion rebates. I decided to convert from gas to induction and completed that in June 2020. It cost me an additional \$2500 in materials and labor to do this; it could have happened at the time I remodeled the kitchen and upgraded my electric panel in 2017. Why was this option not even offered me? Designers, retailers, and contractors have no incentive to do so, they don't think it matters and that no one cares. The city can change that immediately. The city should adopt the Climate Commission recommendations to start requiring electrification of home appliances like cooktops, ranges, and water heaters. To delay wastes property owners' time and money and costs us MORE when the opportunity is missed when it is best taken advantage of.
- I support all of the climate commission recommendations. Not only does a healthy climate impact each of our own personal health, these recommendations will help build resilience and economic vitality in our communities. Adopting all of the climate commission recommendations will help us better respond to the next crisis. The all-electric new construction ordinance should be enacted sooner than the climate commission has proposed, in 2021 instead of 2023. All-electric construction is: cheaper to build; cheaper to operate; has substantially better indoor air quality; is safer than buildings with gas lines; avoids costly retrofit challenges in the future; and eliminates creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. The sooner we start, the fewer buildings will need to be retrofitted! The Sacramento Air Quality Management District already passed a requirement for local CEQA that favors all-electric for new construction in future developments within the County of Sacramento. Not only will the health and safety of all Sacramento residents be improved by adopting these recommendations, there is no reason to invest in infrastructure that will soon be obsolete when there is a far better alternative.
- urge adoption. Climate change is as vital an issue as there is. It must be addressed by getting to a zero emission reality as quickly as possible.
- I support the adoption of the final report. Climate change is a social justice issue
- I urge you to adopt the final report and begin implementing the recommendations as soon as possible . Thanks for your hard work!
- I am in favor of the Mayor's initiative. Please approve.
- Adopt Report. I would like to thank the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change for its hard work and commend Mayors Steinberg and Cabaldon on their creation and support for the Commission. I support the recommendations found in the final report issued by the Commission. I encourage all Commissioners to vote in favor of its adoption. I also ask that the governing entities in both cities immediately adopt the recommendations and quickly take all necessary actions to implement them. Now is the time to act. Future generations depend on us to be bold. We cannot wait. As we confront economic, health and social justice issues every day, it is important that we recognize that action on Climate Change will have positive impacts

on our economy through focusing on green technologies and our health by creating a healthier environment. Moreover, our failure to act is one of a number of factors impacting social justice in our society. Acting now not only protects our children's future, but moves our city, state and nation forward on many compelling issues of our time. As we recognize that our children will carry the burden of the deficit we are creating at this time, might we not at least provide them with a brighter future by taking action on climate change now? This is not the time to shrink from action, but to recognize these challenges have created a unique moment in our history to set a new course that cares for our environment. Our survival depends on it. If we fail now, how will we respond to future generations when they ask us why we let this opportunity escape?

- I urge that the final report be adopted, not as end to itself, but as a way to continue effective action on climate that we need. Every week of delay makes the consequences more serious. The Commission is to be commended for its formation and work. Here's to a strong regional response.
- Yes. Please adopt! I appreciate this report and all the hard work that went into it. It is a good start and I hope it is adopted.
- Vote Yes. Support efforts on climate change
- Yes. Please adopt! I appreciate this report and all the hard work that went into it. It is a good start and I hope it is adopted.
- As a Sacramento resident, I wholeheartedly support the adoption the Commission's final recommendations report to the mayors and urge the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento to also adopt the report and move forward with implementing the recommendations without delay. Thank you sincerely for your consideration.
- On behalf of the Sacramento Group of the Sierra Club, we would like to commend the work that has been done by the Commission which has resulted in positive recommendations to reduce the negative effects of Climate Change in our region. The vitality of our community's economic growth, the health of all of our residents, and resiliency in light of potential future catastrophic climate change are dependent on decisions and ordinances that support the Commission's recommendations. Areas of concern that we would like to see enhanced are enacting all-electric new construction sooner than 2023, and our region's engagement in meeting the CalGreen Tier 2 requirements for electric vehicle charging rather than 2023 in order to more rapidly improve our air quality. The benefits of electrification will increase as utilities continue to make progress on decarbonizing the grids by 2045. Sacramento should serve as a leader in Climate Change reduction. We hope that you will consider making these additional recommendations a part of the final adoption of policies that support the Commission's recommendations. Thank you for the work that has been done to date and we are looking forward to a robust plan which will allow us to reach local and Statewide goals sooner than the existing projected dates.
- I support all of the climate commission recommendations. This is an immediate action we can take to mitigate climate change, and improve our air quality. As a public transit user (who refuses to own a car for environmental reasons), the proposed mobility recommendations are exciting. However, the all-electric new construction ordinance should be enacted sooner than the climate commission has proposed, in 2021 instead of 2023. All-electric construction is: cheaper to build; cheaper to operate; has substantially better indoor air quality; is safer than buildings with gas lines; avoids costly retrofit challenges in the future; and eliminates creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. I also support the commission's recommendations that we follow the CALGreen Tier 2 requirements for electric vehicle charging.
- Last month was the hottest May in recorded history, and CO2 levels in our atmosphere registered a 3-million-year high. COVID-19 will seem like a picnic when the full imminent effects of climate change descend on the people of Sacramento. We cannot afford to waste a day, let alone two years, in taking any step that will mitigate global warming. Act!

- My name is Mathew Marion, I work in West Sacramento for Tri State Distributors. We are a hearth and outdoor distribution company that sells stoves, fireplaces, outdoor products, BBQ's and more to dealer accounts across the region. Also, my parents have owned and operated their own fireplace business for 35 years. I have made my career in this industry in the Sacramento region and have had the pleasure of managing other amazing fireplace companies. Two years ago I moved to the distribution side of the business. I now have over 100 accounts that I call on in my industry that make their livelihoods off of the Natural Gas products they sell to builders and consumers. This ban will have a drastic negative affect on our industry and many more like it that rely on clean affordable natural gas. The cost of cooking and heating will go up significantly for all sectors and be nearly unsustainable for some industries. This will further drive businesses and the general population to move out of state leaving us with less tax revenue. Adoption of an all "Electric" system is not the most responsible way of going about advancement of cleaner air. I also understand that our electric grid is fed by burning coal in Washington. PG&E is already turning our power off when it gets windy. Do we really think shutting off the power and running more generators will clean up the air. Are we ready to be backed into a unified all electric system corner? Possibly forced to make the decision to leave California altogether? I love my state and the amazing business owners and families I have met along the way in my industry! My whole industry is at risk of being wiped away. We all rely on the natural gas system and ask you to please take the time to re-consider going to a singular platform. We ask this on behalf of our families, our customers, our business and our great state. Sincerely, Mathew Hayes Marion
- Due to the Local Government Commission's acknowledgement that propane was not included as part of this commissions scope and study, we respectfully demand a disclosure statement in the report that reads: "Neither propane nor renewable propane was included as part of the MCCC's analysis for this report." Failure to include the aforementioned language demonstrates a willingness to mislead the public and opens this report to greater scrutiny and/or legal challenges regarding its veracity. The following highlights just a few points that were not evaluated as part of the report. (1) Propane is NOT a greenhouse gas, (2) propane is non-toxic, (3) propane is often used as a complement for solar powered homes to provide complementary power when batteries are depleted, (4) propane provides affordable energy to low-income communities throughout the state, (5) the CEC has advised propane emissions in aggregate for the state of California would equate to 0.055% of the total state GHG emissions, (6) renewable propane from feedstocks like animal fat or methane capture offers even more advantages and is available in California today, (7) the recommendations in this report does not present a cost effective plan to reduce GHG emissions, and (8) propane provides energy resiliency during utility blackouts, natural disasters, and during the pandemic (temporary housing for the homeless, temporary hospitals, etc.).
- The American Institute of Architects has formally adopted a policy supporting urgent climate action as a health, safety, and welfare issue, and an exponential acceleration of the 'decarbonization' of buildings. Aligned with this resolution, the 11,000 members of AIA California strongly support local "reach" codes that encourage immediate adoption of cost-effective electrification in new buildings. These reach codes will help reduce carbon emissions and other pollutants, improve health outcomes, lower energy costs, help mitigate fire risk, and aid California in meeting its legislated carbon reduction targets. We encourage reach codes that require the electrification of heating and hot water systems for all new homes, as these systems are both feasible and available today, and retrofit later for full electrification makes it often infeasible. For building types and end uses that are not required to be electric, it is critical to make them electric-ready, with panel capacity necessary to facilitate later electrification. Making new buildings completely electric-ready costs just a fraction of retrofitting later, and avoids locking customers into high-cost, high-emissions buildings or committing them to expensive and unnecessary retrofits. Allowing gas for cooking and other minor uses necessitates the installation of gas piping in streets and new buildings, costing more upfront, and requiring expensive retrofits later in order to meet California's 2045 climate goals. AIA California understands that the normal pace of code upgrades is insufficient to address the climate emergency. We support the adoption of reach codes by local jurisdictions and stand ready to help in this critical endeavor.
- Thank you for acting now to enact the all-electric new construction ordinance sooner than the climate commission has proposed, in 2021 instead of 2023.

- Please do not slow down on the progress made by the community that has worked so hard to move us to sustainable, renewable energy.
- It has been made quite obvious that our environment is in need of dire help. Our actions have caused the world to burn and ice caps to melt as the temperature rises. Any attempts to delay action are simply ignorant and foolish, and will result in even more extreme climate disasters. As the political leaders of this community, you are responsible for ensuring the well-being of your community and the world. I hope you don't take this role lightly- if we don't make change soon, there will be nothing left to do. I am counting on you to make the right choice. By voting for change, you will help to better our community, and ensure we are taking the necessary steps to achieving equity.
- Environmental justice is of utmost importance to every person on this planet and all who are to come after. However not everyone will be impacted equally. This is exactly why a proper equity framework is imperative to our transition to carbon neutrality. We must work to build movements that are able to uplift and support marginalized communities in times of societal transformation. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change explained that addressing the climate crisis will take "unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society", the transition to environmental sustainability cannot and will not be an excuse to push other aspects of social justice to the back burner but rather provide opportunities for justice movements to work in tandem to create a greener and more equitable future. These are all reasons that the "accessibility, inclusivity and shared decision-making" referenced in the 6/15 draft report are extremely important and must be taken seriously. Equity in policy change is an essential part of creating healthy communities, which lend themselves to a sustainable future.
- I am disappointed that I, a 16 year old student from C.K McClatchy Highschool, have to write this email because once again, fossil fuel interests are being prioritized over the peoples'. I am disappointed that you are failing to understand the urgency of climate change. I am disappointed that we have to fight the misinformation campaign being pushed by fossil fuel interests, and arguments for weakening the Climate Commission's draft recommendations because some of you fail to see through it. I am disappointed that Amanda Blackwood is using minority-owned businesses and COVID-19 as guise to justify giving into the special interests of the natural gas companies and killing the progress so many dedicated activists who care about their communities have achieved. If Amanda Blackwood truly cared about minority communities, she would not be pressuring the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change to allow poor communities to continue to be polluted with bad air. It is way past the time for take big strides in the fight against climate change and for us to invest in our communities, especially in marginalized communities that have people and businesses that Amanda supposedly cares about. The combustion of fossil fuels creates unhealthy levels of particulate matter that pollutes our air and leads to increased levels of asthma, disproportionately affecting historically marginalized communities. Yet, Amanda Blackwood seems to not mind. That's why I support the Commission's Equity framework. And if you care about my generation Z and our marginalized communities that are often ignored in Sacramento, you would too. Climate change is so important to me and is this urgent because it affects all aspects of society. The top scientists in the world through the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change said "unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society, including energy, land and ecosystems, urban and infrastructure as well as industry." So this is bigger than the minority-owned businesses that Blackwood claims the Commission's Equity framework would affect. Waiting till 2030 to do anything will have a worse affect on all aspects on ALL communities across Sacramento. So, we need the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change vote to approve the recommendations that the Sacramento community has labored to draft over the past 2 years. We are angry and we demand change. For too long has the corporations been in power. It is time to listen to the people, not money.
- This letter is one step, but it should not be the last step or the only one. I don't know what will fix climate change completely, however there are ways to be more proactive into finding them. Climate change is a big issue and our worlds needs a boost now more than ever. It doesn't take one thing to fix everything but it's all about the small thing we can all do to better this earth. This earth is out temporary home and we all deserve to feel safe, loved, happy and comfortable in our home. Thank you.

- 2045 is too late. My biggest concern with the draft report is that the timeline is not aggressive enough and does not adequately respond to the crisis we are in. Top climate scientists around the world agree that we have a ten-year window to make rapid reductions in our carbon pollution to avoid severely destabilizing the global climate, leading to extreme weather, droughts, floods, and sea-level rise. The City of Sacramento has already acknowledged this urgency in the Climate Emergency Resolution of December 2019, which appropriately has a 2030 target date. Though the state has committed to carbon neutrality by 2045, we need to go further. We need to be more aggressive in our plan and commit to reaching carbon zero by 2030. Our cities can be a role model for other jurisdictions around the state, but we need to have the courage to enact more aggressive goals that rise to the level of the crisis we are facing. If we act now and invest in a green future, we will create local jobs and support the Sacramento economy as we recover from COVID-19. The year one plans outlined in the draft report must be implemented immediately, integrated into our response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Importantly, the plans include establishing senior level positions within each city that report directly to the mayor and city council to oversee all aspects of climate-change planning and implementation. This is a necessary step to ensure that the cities are held accountable for meeting the goals outlined in the draft report. Without accountability and effective implementation, the targets in the report are empty promises. As steps are taken by the cities to recover from the economic devastation of COVID-19, the climate impact of all decisions needs to be a key determining factor in what policies to enact. Corporate interests cannot take priority over reducing our carbon emissions and minimizing the devastating impact that the climate crisis will have on our community if we don't act. I urge you to adopt a more aggressive timeline of achieving carbon zero by 2030. As someone under 30, my future depends on the plans that are enacted now, and I need you to consider the gravity of your decision regarding the timeline of this report.
- Please support the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change Recommendations Report for the built environment, mobility, and community health and resiliency focus areas, in full. Dear Commissioner: You've heard it all before, you know the problem, you even know the answer. But you may have already decided the solutions are just too hard to implement – and too unpopular to risk. Besides, reading that technical report is so BORING!! Still, we need to say it anyway: "...the need for immediate climate action is exemplified in the risks ALREADY impacting Sacramento's public health and safety, life-sustaining ecosystems and the region's economy – including rising temperatures and more extreme heat waves, drier landscapes and more intense droughts, increased risk of floods, and more frequent and larger wildfires." (MCCC Report page 4). Just to clarify: "Numerous studies demonstrate earlier actions to increase preparedness and resilience are far more cost-effective than taking action in response to disasters or when climate impacts worsen." (MCCC Technical Report) For instance, "All-electric construction is cheaper to build, cheaper to operate. has better indoor air quality, is safer than using gas lines, avoids costly retrofits in the future, and eliminates new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets." You raised your hand and asked to be in charge. Now that you are, your choice is: • Be a leader - no, be a hero! Take the initiative, make the hard decisions – and take credit for innovation and vision! or • Capitulate to pressure and leave the problems to your grandchildren. You won't be around for the full ferocity of their anger when Sacramento experiences temperatures over 100 degrees for a full three months per year! Perhaps you have a summer house in Tahoe so you figure it won't be their problem. Better ask them, though, if you're right about that letting you off the hook. Because supporting this Commission's recommendations are just the first step to saving their world. (For a larger view, read "The Uninhabitable Earth: Life After Warming" by David Wallace Wells.)
- I support the goal, but do not support the adoption in its present form I own a business headquartered in Sacramento serving the Sacramento and West Sacramento markets. My staff and I applaud the goals of the commission and agree that concrete action needs to be taken now to address climate change. However, we specifically take issue with some of the proposed solutions concerning building electrification for new construction and transitioning 25% of existing residential buildings with natural gas to electric only buildings by 2030. First, our high efficiency gas inserts and fireplaces are zone heaters that typically save 20% on fuel costs when compared with gas furnaces. Heat is delivered directly to the area being heated, eliminating the need to heat the entire house to the same temperature. Secondly, eliminating natural gas

should not occur while a majority of the energy being produced by SMUD (54% per their website), is being produced with natural gas. Eliminating natural gas as a choice for new construction now and removing it from existing homes by 2030 is not a reasonable time table. According to the US Energy Information Administration (EIA), the average efficiency of a natural gas power plant is 43% and there is a 5% loss rate in transmission. Our gas fireplaces directly produce heat at the source of consumption and are thus far more efficient. Carbon free energy production should come before elimination of natural gas in homes. Third, our customers are being subsidized to convert their wood burning fireplaces to high efficiency, clean burning natural gas inserts. This wood fireplace and stove change out program cleans up the air, protects the health of the public, and overall helps the environment. The Yolo Air Quality Management District covering the city of West Sacramento is offering \$1000-\$3500 rebates putting, "Cap-and-Trade dollars to work." The Sacramento Air Quality Management District has a wood to gas change out program that, "reduc(es) the emissions of particulate, NOx and hydrocarbons." A concern for us and the Air Districts is, by eliminating natural gas as an option, more people will burn wood instead of clean burning natural gas because they will chose not to convert. While there are electric inserts, they are primarily decorative and will not heat a home like a gas insert will. The public loves the option to heat or cook with gas and the beauty and comfort of our gas fireplaces. We have been in this community for 52 years, employ 20 people, and have sold tens of thousands of gas fireplaces over the years. Yet, we were not invited to the table, nor were our appliances even listed in the draft report or supplemental report as items affected by this proposed legislation. Despite assurances that electricity is cheaper, our customers have direct experience how their gas inserts have saved them money, operate during power outages thereby providing them back up heat when they need it most, and overall have made their lives better. We support climate change provisions and would like to work together to find common ground including potential restrictions on decorate gas appliance or open, inefficient gas logs. The City of Sacramento and West Sacramento represent our largest number of customers, we are the biggest company serving the market in this area, and we are proud to contribute to the local community and tax structure. We look forward to working with you to address climate concerns while maintaining sensible choices.

- I am writing to express my full support for all of the recommendations proposed and thus far adopted by the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change. The chartering of this Commission was a visionary step to activate community leaders across sectors and address this enormous challenge. As one of the co-chairs of the Community Health & Resiliency Technical Advisory Committee I witnessed the deep and impressive commitment made by so many people and organizations to this effort and their clear awareness of the need for immediate action to address harms already faced by our most vulnerable communities. COVID does not change this, nor do recent protests – in fact, the pandemic and social unrest accelerate the need for rapid policy and funding shifts to correct generations of injustice. As quickly as possible we need to electrify and steer our brittle economy away from its unsustainable reliance on the fossil fuels which undercut our health and that of the ecosystems that support us. New jobs, cleaner air and better opportunities here will follow. The concerns expressed by the representatives of the Metro Chamber at the last Commission meeting fail to recognize the savings and health benefits of electrification and the dire threat that climate change poses to the economy of the region. The GDPs of Sacramento and Yolo Counties are projected to drop by 4% with every degree of increase in average annual temperatures (°C). Without immediate actions the cost will be enormous and the livability of the region irreparably altered. The Metro Chamber would better serve its members by advocating for more ambitious climate action, not delay, and assisting them to develop their own climate action plans. The good news is that there are plenty of people and organizations here who are ready for the collaborative work necessary to bring a new, better and more inclusive reality to life. Please support them and maintain your commitment to this Commission so that its recommendations can transition from ideas into action in the coming weeks, months and years.
- We need to start action towards reducing GHGs immediately, and the Commission has done a very thoughtful job considering transportation, the built environment, and resiliency. As a parent, I see the foot-dragging that has been happening on GHG reduction since I learned about the greenhouse effect in elementary school in 1978 as dangerous. We are exposing the next generation to a level of risk we should all feel uncomfortable about. This report gives the cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento a good sense of direction about how to move forward. That said, I also think that the all-electric new construction

ordinance the report suggests for 2023 should actually be passed this year and effective next year (2021). This would be a great first-year project for a number of reasons: 1. It is cost effective: Since natural gas infrastructure has a lifetime of 60 years, all infrastructure put in now will not get its full lifetime of use, and therefore will be more expensive to the community where it is installed. This is compounded by the fact that using gas in buildings will become more expensive as electrification happens. Eliminating the installation of natural gas infrastructure reduces construction costs. 2. It is healthier: Burning natural gas in buildings affects air quality both inside and outside. In the Sacramento Air Quality District, buildings now contribute more ozone and particulate pollution than light-duty passenger vehicles. In homes where natural gas is used for cooking, 12 million Californians are breathing air that would be illegally high in NOx if it were outside (Lawrence Berkeley Labs, 2014), increasing the risk of asthma in children. The longer we wait to require new homes be all electric, the more people will be subjected to these risks. 3. We are ready: Electric appliances, including heat pump water heaters, induction stoves, and heat pump HVAC systems are all much more efficient now than they were in the recent past; and there are plenty of contractors who are familiar with their installation to do the work of installing them (and this will only increase if we start soon with new construction). The Sacramento Air Quality Management District already passed a requirement for local CEQA that favors all-electric for new construction in future developments within the County of Sacramento. There is already a cost-effectiveness study done for residential buildings in the SMUD service area (<https://www.smud.org/-/media/Documents/Corporate/About-Us/Energy-Research-and-Development/E3-Residential-Building-Electrification-in-California-April-2019.ashx>). Let's get started!

- Hello Mayors and Commissioners, My name is Vince Villegas and as a student I had the opportunity to participate in the student engagement event at Sacramento State. We are living in unprecedented times of the climate warming and that calls for unprecedented actions. Actions in all different aspects of our society. I was very proud to have gotten the opportunity to give input along with my peers on the equity portion of the recommendations. These recommendations are concrete, clear goals that can and must be attained. If there is anything these past few months have shown us it is that our communities are resilient and that drastic change is possible. As elected officials and leaders in our communities, we need the courage and conviction to make the changes that we seek. When approved, these recommendations are going to make our residents and communities healthier and stronger. With that being said, I ask that you approve the recommendations of the Commission.
- The final report needs to be adopted. I am a construction professional specializing in sustainability, and fully support the MCC recommendations.
- It is imperative that we take action to prevent and mitigate the impacts of climate change. Not when I'm graduated from college with hopefully working to facilitate international cooperation on a range of important topics, but now. Hopefully I will be building off of what current policy makers have accomplished, not desperately racing against an already expired clock to protect my future and the slim odds that my children have futures. I just turned 18 and I get to vote for the first time this November. I genuinely hope that those who I vote for, if elected, have as much interest in protecting the futures of their constituents as they do in furthering their own political agendas. I know that sounds like a dig at the important work that is done— I recognize that a lot more is going on behind the scenes than I can see, but recent events have given legitimate reason to ask that question. I have faith in our political system, faith in elected officials to, when it comes down to it, make the right, scientifically backed, choices. Climate change is the single biggest existential threat to the human race at present, and as representatives of the people, you have an obligation to act. Please, support policy and action to protect our climate. Now.
- I hope you have all had the time to consider how devastating climate change has been, and continues to be. I hope you have all seen the economic impact in every economic sector climate change has had. It is clear that if we do not take clear forceful action it will get much worse. Please adopt and act on the recommendations of the Climate Conditions. It is the ONLY responsible thing to do. I suspect you already know this. There is no way to overstate the importance of your actions. I encourage you to act. I will support you in this effort. Thanks, Kent Iacin

- As I read today about temperatures in Siberia above the Arctic circle exceeding 100 degrees in a high pressure dome that has never before existed for such long periods, I am struck by the utter lack of responsibility of those opposing electrification of our homes and transportation. The climate commission effort proposes a modest in fact insufficient time line for change. Yet, next to the glacial schedule of the City of Sacramento's Climate plan adoption the modest reform looks aggressive and still the forces of reaction are complaining. Do black and brown lives matter when they are crowded in neighborhoods baking in temperatures over 100 degrees for weeks or months? Talk is cheap and apparently their lives are cheaper still with COVID and crowding. Action is what is required now. Not delay or modesty but full throated action. Thank you s/ Harold M. Thomas
- We have one Earth. And it is beautiful. Really, truly breathtakingly beautiful. And I'd like to be able to see more of that beauty after I graduate high school and travel the world. I'd like to see a Venice that isn't half drowned. So it seems to me that if there is a plan that will help allow Earth to remain beautiful (not to mention inhabitable), it would be a pretty dang good idea to follow through on that plan. It seems to me that it's worth working through some tricky situations, worth getting a little less money perhaps, to preserve something so magnificent. To ensure a better tomorrow for future generations. Because isn't that what everyone wants? For things to get better? So please just move forward in a direction you are certain is working towards that better tomorrow. For your sake and my sake and the sake of that boy on the blue bike you passed in the street.
- One of my highlights of the 2019-2020 school year was accompanying students from Natomas Charter School to the Mayor's High School Summit on Climate Change in October 2019. On that day I witnessed over 100 students from schools around the region pro-actively work to give their input on needed environmental changes in our region. I beamed with civic pride as both Sacramento and West Sacramento's mayors visited with and exchanged ideas with these determined young people. Now I ask you to vote this week to approve this report. Even in the COVID environment, no especially in this time we must work collectively to help our environment. Approving this report will empower young people to believe their activism makes a difference. Not approving it will deflate their ambitions to become leaders in our region. I ask that you approve the report and move forward with its findings. Thank You- Jeff Pollard, Social Studies Teacher Natomas Charter School
- I am writing to you as a recent graduate of Sacramento State and future educator; I am pleading with you to approve the draft report put forth by the Climate commission. All people deserve a healthy and thriving environment protected from injustice and degradation, no matter which company or organization lobbyists are fighting to protect the status quo. Within my generation, and likely yours or your children's, we will witness devastating climatic consequences for our lack of urgency. Sacramento should be on the leading edge of carbon neutrality, and as the capital of California, should be the leading example for other county's and states to approve further actions of positive change. Help us take the first steps in saving our city, protecting at risk communities, and changing our climate for the better. Please vote to approve. - For All People
- Good afternoon, I am a 24 year old graduate student and lifelong Sacramento resident. It is clear to any Sacramento Native that disparities across neighborhoods exist. These disparities are exacerbated by climate injustice and everyone knows it. The scientists know it. The public health officials know it. And this commission knows it. What I like many young Sacramentans ask, is that you commit to supporting the Mayors' Climate Commission's Equity Framework and step up to protect the lives of your residents. We do pay attention, and as you have seen recently, we do mobilize. Please get ahead of this issue before we have to add pressure to make sure you do. Thank you and appreciatively, Noel Mora
- I am writing to urge you to approve the recommendation the Sacramento community has, specifically the entire Equity framework that was developed over the past year for the Climate Commission, because this framework prioritizing measures that will actually improve our communities and address existing disparities and inequities in our cities. We know climate change is real and it is going to impact our low income and communities of color the most profoundly - so actually do something about it.

- From "Uninhabitable Earth: Life After Warming" by David Wallace Wells: "At present, the economic impacts of climate change are relatively light: in the US in 2017, the estimated cost was \$306 billion. The heavier impacts await us... in the near climate future: disaster, drought, famine, war, global refugeeism and the political disarray it unleashes... The earth has experienced five mass extinctions before the one we are living through now; each so complete a wiping of the fossil record that it functioned as an evolutionary reset ... all but the one that killed the dinosaurs involved climate change produced by greenhouse gas... 250 million years ago carbon dioxide warmed the planet by five degrees Celsius... and ended with all but a sliver of life on Earth dead. We are currently adding carbon to the atmosphere at a considerably faster rate; by most estimates, at least ten times faster..." ### Better get busy! Solutions ARE at hand; many creative people know what to do. And you can take credit for innovation and vision! We'll be spending the money anyway on post-COVID economic stimulus. Why not be smart and build it back better? Watch this for ideas (it's short). "How we could change the planet's climate future."
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zY2ksORCLbs>
- I am writing to demand that you adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees. It has become alarmingly obvious that business interests, particularly natural gas lobbyists, are co-opting the conversation surrounding the Commission's draft report and spreading lies about electrification versus natural gas. They are hiding their greed and selfishness behind fake concerns for equity and safety. This is unacceptable, especially given that the people who are disproportionately affected by our fossil fuel society are typically those suffering from the worst impacts of environmental racism and racial injustice. We will not stand by and let business interests win at the cost of human lives. It is time to begin a just transition for our society, and passing these recommendations is the first step in a long process down that path. Regarding the timeline in the report, 2045 is too late. The timeline is not aggressive enough and does not adequately respond to the crisis we are in. Top climate scientists around the world agree that we have a closing ten-year window to make rapid reductions in our carbon pollution to avoid severely destabilizing the global climate, leading to extreme weather, droughts, floods, and sea-level rise. The City of Sacramento has already acknowledged this urgency in the Climate Emergency Resolution of December 2019, which appropriately has a 2030 target date. Though the state has committed to carbon neutrality by 2045, we need to go further. We need to be more aggressive in our plan and commit to reaching carbon zero by 2030. Our cities can be a role model for other jurisdictions around the state, but we need to have the courage to enact more aggressive goals that rise to the level of the crisis we are facing. If we act now and invest in a green future, we will create local jobs and support the Sacramento economy as we recover from COVID-19. Additionally, the all-electric new construction ordinance should be enacted sooner than the climate commission has proposed, in 2021 instead of 2023. All-electric construction is: cheaper to build; cheaper to operate; has substantially better indoor air quality; is safer than buildings with gas lines; avoids costly retrofit challenges in the future; and eliminates creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. Adopting the draft recommendations is the minimal first step towards a just transition to carbon neutrality and climate justice. You must take it.
- I am a licensed Architect and firm Principal of Sacramento based Applied Architecture, Inc. For the last 40 years, I've been leading my firm in helping over 1,600 regional area families in shaping their personal living environment to better fit their needs. I've also served as Design Principal on some of our region's best known examples of historic adaptive reuse, affordable senior and family housing such as the historic Warehouse Artist Lofts, Globe Mills, Bel-Vue, Ridgeway, Hotel Stockton, and many more. In all my work, whether it's for an individually owned home or a large complex, I've tried to use the best available methods to address climate action and energy efficiency. Until fairly recently, we found that our customers and clients included natural gas in their list of "requests" due to either cooking preference or budget considerations. Today, however, the scale has tipped, and we routinely eliminate natural gas from our projects to save money and time, as well as to minimize the negative impacts on indoor environments and climate change that are associated with fossil fuel use on site. When I look at the design and construction industry in general, however, there is momentum based on "habit" that makes change in recognizing new economic and environmental pressures slower than logic would dictate. That's why the reach code efforts in dozens of California cities to minimize or eliminate new installation of fossil fuel consumption in the built

environment are so helpful. These locally driven efforts can shift the landscape more quickly toward more efficient, healthy, and economical all electric options rather than relying on shifting habits based on word of mouth. For this simple reason, I encourage Sacramento to join what has turned into a parade of energized, informed, and insightful communities across our State who are taking action to eliminate fossil fuel combustion in new and retrofit building projects of all types.

- Carbon 0 by 2030. You know what's really bad for business? Climate change. The CA wildfires in 2017 & '18 cost \$485billion. Hurricane Harvey did \$125billion in damage to Houston in 2017. Superstorm Sandy cost NY \$70billion in 2012. Measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change now will save us billions \$\$\$. We need to do everything we can to get to carbon zero by 2030 not 2045. Electrify everything. Electric appliances are better, safer, cheaper. Stop sprawl. Improve public transport. Tax empty rental housing for revenue towards green efforts. Thank you!
- Please adopt this, although it could be bolder and audacious-er. Earth has a fever. Recent temperatures of over 100 degrees F were recorded in SIBERIA. We can do something about it, but we are running out of time. The measures that this commission have come up with show true leadership to the world on how to get this done. In my world - project by project electrification in particular - is proving to not be difficult or require sacrificing to higher budget or inconvenience. Let's get this done and bring down the fever. To repeat: We are running out of time.
- Yes Support . The timelines for adoption are too long, too slow, and implementation too far in the future. Yet the report contains many important proposals including electrification of landscaping equipment and reduction in harm from air pollution. Electrification in both buildings and transportation is critical to our future. The temperatures above the Arctic Circle reached over 100 degrees f. yesterday. The permafrost is melting and greenhouse gases are being released at levels unknown in modern times. This report is a very modest start to reducing our carbon dependent economy but it represents the community we live in and thus needs to be acted upon now. Thank you s/ Harold M. Thomas
- Please adopt the final Climate Commission report in its entirety. It is clear that we have to act in a forceful way immediately before the cascading nature of co-occurring calamities becomes too severe to stop. Everything from pandemics to species extinction, from droughts to wildfires come from our uncontrolled abuse of the environment. The scientific connections have been made over and over again. Please find the courage and resolve to not shrink away from your responsibility to protect the place we all live-this world. Surely you understand by now how important and fundamental this is. We are here to support you in taking strong action and do the right thing for your children and grandchildren. Really, it is our only hope. Thanks, Kent Lacin
- Vote to Approve! I am writing to you as a recent graduate of Sacramento State and future educator; I am pleading with you to approve the draft report put forth by the Climate commission. All people deserve a healthy and thriving environment protected from injustice and degradation, no matter which company or organization lobbyists are fighting to protect the status quo. Within my generation, and likely yours or your children's, we will witness devastating climatic consequences for our lack of urgency. Sacramento should be on the leading edge of carbon neutrality, and as the capital of California, should be the leading example for other counties and states to approve further actions of positive change. Help us take the first steps in saving our city, protecting at risk communities, and changing our climate for the better. Please vote to approve.
- Hello, My name is Rachael Dal Porto, age 23. I have served on the Community Health and Resiliency TAC for the Mayors' Commission on Climate change, am a recent Civil Engineering, Chemistry, and Environmental Studies graduate from Sacramento State, a recent graduate student in Environmental Engineering at UC Davis, a Sacramento area native, and a West Sacramento resident. Moiz Mir and I planned the Climate Change Summit hosted at Sacramento State. It took hours of each day for months to plan this event. It was the first major event I have ever planned, and it was the first event that I felt so passionate about that I was able to suppress the quieter, less vocal nature that I have instilled personally, and as a scientist and engineer. This event, the support it garnered, and the outcome of people who joined are one of the most

humbling while proud moments of my life. As an engineer and scientist, public speaking, mobilization, and event planning are my absolute weakest traits. But this event still fell into place as a success due to the passion not only that Moiz and I had, but that all students in the greater Sacramento area had. Students made arrangements to miss class, work, social events, students took time out of their day they could've been making more money to pay rent and put food on the table or studying for an upcoming exam. They chose to attend this event over coffee with an old friend, or drinks with family. The Commission reached out to our campus sustainability at Sac State to host the Climate Commission. Great work, effort, and care was put into an event and the students who participated are from a plethora of backgrounds. We had engineers, nurses, artists, musicians, environmental scientists, biologists, business students and many more in the room. There was zero incentive and zero benefit to attending this summit, other than to have their voices heard by their local government. Climate change is an imminent and existential threat. Scientists around the world have come to a consensus on this. We as a society are aware that to tackle this crisis we will need to take "unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society" as the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has stated. The Commission's work the past two years, and the voices and input from over 350 local students has cumulated to the recommendations of this Climate Commission. This is a topic that Sacramentans and West Sacramentans are passionate and serious about. We are counting on the Commission to bring forth their recommendations. The COVID-19 pandemic is reason MORE to bring forward these recommendations rather than a reason to push them back. COVID-19 and the current civil unrest of Black folks in America are expressly showing the deep inequalities that our nation suffers from. These are cuts and scars that undoubtedly affect and harm BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) and marginalized communities disproportionately. They are the folks who are contributing the least yet suffering the most from Climate Violence. Using a global pandemic amplified by a recession is not a reason to stall these recommendations. Public health, safety, and lives do not come second to the economy. I speak for myself and I am sure many others when I say the idea that these recommendations be held until the economy is "good" again is a slap in the face. Why is it that our futures (as children, teens, and young adults) are only considered and important when "business is booming." Therefore, we the students wish to let the Commission know, that if these recommendations are stalled until the economy is favorable again, that you have let us down. You have shown us with your actions that our words, our needs, and our educational input was for show. This is a crisis that the entire world needs to be on board with. But it absolutely starts with us pressuring YOU to make the changes possible. The Climate Summit at Sac State won an award at the California Higher Education Sustainability Conference this year for the CSU system as the Best Practice in Student Sustainability Leadership. Moiz and I will be presenting on this award in the coming weeks. We hope that this presentation can be one that provides hopes to other CSU's, UC's, and private California Universities, that their campus governance, and their local governance, will back them, listen to them, and act. We hope that this presentation will not end in the sorrowful note that the recommendations put together were set aside due to a recession, or the pandemic. Sacramento is the capital of California, and should be embracing this push to produce tangible progress. The recommendations are put together. They are ready. You must vote in support of them. Show our youth, our students, our young adults, show our marginalized communities, show our people that you truly care and understand the gravity of this situation. Climate Justice cannot be tossed to the wayside. It is imperative. We have proven to you we are willing to have the conversations and put in the work. You can count on students assisting in any possible way throughout this necessary transition. The end of this note will sound over-dramatized for effect, however, I hope you will recognize that while for effect, it is the exact right amount of drama. It is reality. Climate change and environmental injustice will literally be the cause of death for members of our community. It is very likely that there will be students who attended the Climate Change summit who will die due to effects of climate change or environmental injustices. The future always seems to sound like a great time to make changes. Though each and every one of us know that if "future you" did not clean out your closet as a quarantine chore, "future us" will not address the looming crisis of climate change. "Future us" is us currently. We have had decades to address climate change. We cannot wait until "business is booming", and we will not go back to "business as usual". 2045 is far too late, frankly, 2030 is too late. We cannot and will not continue to push this off. I hope that you will set the target for carbon neutrality at 2030 and adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the

TACs. Let Sacramento and West Sacramento be leaders in the fight for Climate Action. In solidarity, Rachael Dal Porto

- Honorable Mayors Cabaldon and Steinberg, Chairwoman Stausboll, & other Climate Commissioners, My name is Moiz Mir and I am 23 years old. I have been a lifelong resident of Sacramento, a student at Sacramento State University and graduate with a B.S. from its Environmental Studies Department, President of the Environmental Student Organization at Sac State, an intern in Mayor Steinberg's office, a member of the Climate Commission's Equity roundtable, then Equity Technical Advisory Committee, and the volunteer organizer and host of two Student Climate Change Summits engaging over 350 students across the Sacramento region ranging from middle school to graduate school on behalf of your Commission. You may have heard that the work of Rachael Dal Porto and I in organizing the University Student Summit recently won the Best Practice in Student Sustainability Leadership for Sac State out of the entire State of California through the California Higher Education Sustainability Conference; CHESC is a conference of independent / private colleges, California Community Colleges, California State Universities, and the University of California. We have been asked to present this effort in civic and community engagement as a model for other students across the state to affect sustainable change in their communities. I am writing this letter and listing all of these roles and experiences to you today, not representing any organization, but as an individual who has spent the majority of my energy for the past 4 years and dedicated my foreseeable life to doing everything I possibly can to affect positive change in the existential struggle to combat climate change. I have seen and heard pleas from countless people across the world, including friends in Sacramento from the Marshall Islands whose cultural heritage and entire homeland is being drowned away by rising sea levels as I write this. From residents of Sacramento who live in close proximity to fossil fuel power plants, and face increased rates of respiratory disease from degraded air quality. This is no accident, it is a result of a fossil fuel economy that has enabled Sacramento's short-term economic prosperity at the expense of the world's long-term health and survival. Our society is complicit, and only as a society can we make the transformative changes necessary to right the injustices of climate change. I am writing to voice my support of the draft report of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change and the measures as they have been developed by the Technical Advisory Committees. The adoption of these recommendations is a minimum measure that must be taken and any intention of weakening, halting, or postponing them would be a direct disservice to our community and this entire process of public engagement. As you are aware, the Climate Commission's work has spanned countless hours of discussion from the TACs, city and local government staff, and most importantly volunteer participation from members of the community to ensure that equity and climate justice are centered. As pointed out in the Commission's own draft report, systemic and institutional barriers to participation prevent the very voices that are most adversely impacted by climate change from being heard. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color face the worst impacts of institutionalized racial injustice and environmental racism, yet are too often excluded. At the same time this historically allows voices with systemic and institutionally accumulated power, and financial interest at stake, to control the conversation. However, the true power of government is derived from the people it represents, and I will not allow this conversation to be co-opted by misinformed business interests under the guise of concerns for equity and safety in the future. It is time to imagine a future in which the communities historically marginalized by our societal systems, the people who are currently disproportionately affected by the adverse impacts of every facet of our fossil fuel-based society, are finally invested in through a just transition. It is not the task of the Climate Commissioners to halt the progress we are envisioning out of fear of the unknown, or uncertainty in our ability to address the many crises we face. The climate crisis is a known challenge that I need you to fear as I do. It is your task to imagine a path to a better future. It is the task of the Mayors to lead their City Councils in setting a budget that serves the residents of our cities. I have said it before and I will continue to say it until it is acted upon. 2045 is too late. Regarding the content of the draft report, my concern is that the timeline is not aggressive enough and does not adequately respond to the crisis we are in. Top climate scientists around the world agree that we have a closing ten-year window to make rapid reductions in our carbon pollution to avoid permanently destabilizing the global climate, leading to extreme weather, droughts, floods, fires, and sea-level rise. The City of Sacramento has already acknowledged this urgency in the Climate Emergency Resolution of December 2019, which appropriately has a 2030 target date. Though

CA has committed to carbon neutrality by 2045, we need to go further. We need to be more aggressive in our plan and commit to reaching carbon zero by 2030. Our cities can be a role model for other jurisdictions around the state, but we need to have the courage to enact more aggressive goals that rise to the level of the crisis we are facing. If we act now and invest in a green future, we will create local jobs and support the Sacramento economy as we recover from COVID-19. The year one plans outlined in the draft report must be implemented immediately, integrated into our response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Importantly, the plans include establishing senior level positions within each city that report directly to the mayor and city council to oversee all aspects of climate-change planning and implementation. This is a necessary step to ensure that the cities are held accountable for meeting the goals outlined in the draft report. Without accountability and effective implementation, the targets in the report are empty promises. As steps are taken by the cities to recover from the economic devastation of COVID-19, the climate impact of all decisions needs to be a key determining factor in which policies to enact. Corporate interests cannot take priority over reducing our carbon emissions and minimizing the devastating impact that the climate crisis will have on our community if we don't act. I demand you take the minimal first step towards a just transition to carbon neutrality and climate justice. Adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees. Thank you for engaging in this critical endeavor, Moiz Mir (Equity Technical Advisory Committee / Climate Commission Student Summit Organizer)

- Dear Commissioners: Although I am writing you in my personal capacity, I have spent nearly two decades working on climate and air quality issues, and that experience informs my view. Your report and recommendations are grounded in the science, and should be finalized. It is especially important to finalize your recommendations on building electrification. I recognize you are facing some misguided opposition on that point, but the science is clear. Indeed, those recommendations are necessary not just for climate change mitigation, but to address public health issues. Gas stoves are poisonous, and they cause childhood asthma. In this time of respiratory health crisis, as covid-19 continues and fire season begins, it is especially important to stop the use of these devices. This is especially true in BIPOC communities in Sacramento, which already suffer higher exposures to air pollution, including deadly particulate matter. Residents should not then be exposed even more acutely in their own homes. As a UCLA Public Health study (<https://coeh.ph.ucla.edu/effects-residential-gas-appliances-indoor-and-outdoor-air-quality-and-public-health-california>) has demonstrated, gas appliances cause indoor air quality to violate state and federal health standards (see also <https://www.nrdc.org/experts/pierre-delforge/gas-appliances-pollute-indoor-and-outdoor-air-study-shows> and <https://rmi.org/insight/gas-stoves-pollution-health> for similar work from NRDC and the Rocky Mountain Institute). They are unsafe. The gas industry is mounting a last-minute defense to try to protect its own market-share, going so far as to hire Instagram influences to maintain an astro-turf campaign for gas stoves (<https://www.motherjones.com/environment/2020/06/gas-industry-influencers-stoves/>) but the facts are absolutely clear. Gas stoves and water heaters kill people. Replacing these deadly appliances, and barring them in new construction, protects the public, safeguards the climate, and creates good jobs for skilled workers. The Commission needs to finalize its excellent work on this recommendation. Thank you, Craig Segall
- Hello Commission, my name is Claire Tran and I am born and raised in Sacramento. Please vote to approve the recommendations that your Sacramento constituents have worked to put together over two years. Sacramento declared a climate emergency last December, and now it's time to act on that declaration. Committing to tackling climate change would be committing to a healthier, more equal city. Thank you.
- As the capital of the state and therefore the city that represents all of California, we should be setting the example when it comes to helping the environment. We cannot allow the power of corporations to stop us from moving in the right direction. These corporation's desires only benefit those who run them; their success brings them more power and money. What they want is selfish A healthy environment means healthy communities for years to come. Do not give up fighting just because those with only money to gain put on the pressure.
- Please disregard the astoundingly uninformed Building Roundtable opposition to the building electrification recommendations of the Mayors' Climate Commission. I served on the Built Environment task force which

found that electrification is the best and perhaps only option if we are to eliminate greenhouse gas in buildings by 2045. It also saves first cost for builders and home buyers, provides indoor health benefits and saves on operational costs.

- We are at an unprecedented time in a lot of ways. Our ability to make the right decisions now in regard to the climate crisis may be a key factor in helping us alleviate the stress of the pandemic and economic disaster we are already in. The equity framework that has been outlined over the past year makes it even easier to uplift our communities that have been so negatively impacted by fossil fuels and other environmental hazards. By swiftly updating our infrastructure and moving towards carbon neutral we will be able to provide many jobs for folks who have been hit hardest by our current recession. Many people have been working tirelessly to create this equity framework and to implement plans of action for our city to respond to the climate crises. We must act now because delaying any longer will simply make the job impossible. The United Nations have stated that we need unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society. Not next week, next month, or in another ten years, we need to implement these changes now! We simply can't allow more people to develop health problems in our city because it is inconvenient to move in a new direction. Not to mention that by 2030 we will be too busy dealing with the ever obvious effects of climate change due to our inability to act. This is a time where true leadership and action are needed, my hope is that you want to be remembered as such. I urge you to vote to pass the recommendations that the city of Sacramento has drafted as soon as possible. Looking forward, Anna
- Hello, Mayor Steinberg, Mayor Cabaldon, and the members of the Climate Commission. My name is Claire Tran, and I am born and raised in Sacramento, specifically Natomas and Arden-Arcade. I ask you to vote to approve the recommendations that your Sacramento constituents have worked to draft over two years. The recommendations are put together by government staff, expert Technical Advisory Committees, and substantial community input. The city of Sacramento declared a climate emergency last December. Now, you need to act on that declaration by committing to carbon neutrality. Furthermore, the climate crisis is exacerbating inequalities in our region. For example, poorer neighborhoods live closer to freeways, making residents more susceptible to asthma and other respiratory diseases. By acting on climate change, you will be committing to a more equal, most just Sacramento.
- I'm very dismayed by the last-minute short-sided attempts by some to gut or jettison the critically important work of the commission and so many engaged citizens. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has written that addressing the climate crisis will take "unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society, including energy, land and ecosystems, urban and infrastructure as well as industry." We are told by those same leading climate scientists from around the world that we have only 10 years (till 2030, not 2045) to make significant reductions in our carbon pollution to avert ecological and public health catastrophes. The TACs and the commissioners, with strong public input, analyzed our climate-related vulnerabilities, and the result is the draft Commission report. We must electrify completely, we must invest heavily in our underserved neighborhoods for environmental justice, we must end sprawl, significantly upgrade our public transport system, and we must incorporate all other recommendations in the current draft document. And we need to accelerate the timeline rather than delay it. To do otherwise would be to be penny-wise and pound foolish, leaving our younger generations with an unlivable future when we could have done so, so much better.
- Hello, my name is Whitney and I'm a Downtown resident. I'm 31 and active in local politics. One of the biggest threats right now is climate change. Please think of our future and approve the recommendations that the COMMUNITY has put forth. Many are unemployed now and are paying very close attention to elected officials. We are telling you we need to do better now so we can have a future that isn't polluted. Thank you.
- To whomever it may concern, My name is Shelby Chandar and I am a 19 year old resident of Sacramento. I currently attend Sacramento State and hope to become a nurse. Today I write to you because I am deeply disturbed and concerned as to how the planet is being treated by the government and big corporations. In my relatively short time on this planet (compared to many of you reps), I have experienced many of the California fires, heard of the higher intensities of hurricanes on the east coast, read about the polar caps

melting, and have lived through the California drought (which no one seems to talk about anymore). Environmental justice isn't confined to combatting climate change, it also combats racial inequalities. Combatting climate change isn't just about protecting the earth and our habitat, it's about also protecting minority communities which are impacted by this so much more than white communities. In a NYT article, they reported that climate change has an affect on black pregnant women (Flavelle). I will link it for further reading which I urge you to do as my reps

<https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.nytimes.com/2020/06/18/climate/climate-change-pregnancy-study.amp.html>. Lastly, I want to discuss my future and your children's future. My generation faces the threat of climate change and so will my generation's children if we are able to have them. In these dark times, the planet seems and feels doomed, but I do see a light at the end of the tunnel and as my reps, you have the power to light the tunnel up so it's not completely dark. Combatting climate change takes a lot of resources and will be quite a change, but it's an investment. I urge you to promote and pass policies that work with eco-friendly companies that work towards a healthier planet. What would be even more phenomenal is if the green new deal is promoted. But I beg of you as a young voter, bring environmental justice to the forefront of politics. Please save our lives and our planet. Best, Shelby Chandar

- Please take as many steps as you can to fighting climate change. This is an issue that can no longer be ignored. Take action and commit to making Sacramento as eco-friendly as possible in the short term and long term.
- Hello, My name is Kayla Webb and I'm a Sacramento, California, resident. I'm writing today because we must take action to protect this beautiful earth we reside on. I'm asking that the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change vote to approve the recommendations that the Sacramento community has labored to draft over the past 2 years. We must invest in our communities and our futures. Please approve these recommendations.
- If we don't address it, it will cost an incredible amount of money and resources. We can't delay! We need to upgrade public transportation! We need to electrify! We need to retain all recommendations of the Commission's Report.
- Dear Sacramento leader, Please support the plan to move Sacramento to be carbon zero by 2030. As a young woman, who wants children one day, I hope to have a home where it is safe to do grow a family. I worry about the air quality living in midtown, and what impacts that will have on prenatal health. And, I hope that my children can enjoy the beauty, diversity and passion of Sacramento and Sacramentans, but worry that rising temperatures, a megadrought and more forest fires will make their futures here unpleasant or unlikely. Please vote for a positive change, for all of our futures. Thank you.
- Hello, I am a county resident, not city, but what you in the city does affects me as well! I am 29 years old, and will probably live at least another 50 years. In the next 10 years the world is going to change dramatically. If Sacramento doesn't want to be left behind by the rest of the world, we need to act now to fight the climate emergency! I want my next 50 years to be nice, not a burning hellscape that benefits businesses but leaves behind the people who live in this region. Be brave! Act now! Don't cave to business, listen to the science and support the climate commission!
- It is essential that the report by the mayors commission on climate change be adopted. It is too late to fool around anymore, and the pandemic is not an excuse to delay.
- My name is Stephanie Segre McCall. As a Sacramento resident, recent Sac State graduate, and a mother- I am asking that the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change vote to approve the recommendations that the Sacramento community has labored to draft over the past 2 years. It is time to take larger steps towards building a sustainable future!
- I am aware you will be making significant decisions on electrification in the weeks ahead. As a state, and country, we do not have the luxury of selecting options to reverse our course. All solutions to mitigate climate change must be selected in order to achieve our goal of decarbonization. Voting in favor of banning natural gas from new construction is a very important part of this process and must be enacted now. It will

bringing Sacramento and the surrounding area closer to having an inventory of homes and offices with near-zero emissions. Natural gas contributes to rising air pollution, harmful emissions indoors, and to the climate crisis. Adopting the use of all-electric heating and appliances, infrastructure, plus building in EV charging capability in each new construction site will promote energy conservation, efficiency, and decarbonization. California set a goal to be carbon-free by 2045 and about a quarter of emissions come from energy used by buildings. Switching to all-electric buildings is a necessary step. If you do not enact codes to enforce a ban on natural gas, you run the risk that builders will continue business as usual and install gas lines. Sincerely, Donna Davies

- On behalf of RiderShip for the Masses members and like, SMART and Sac Moves, we strongly support the proposed recommendations of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change for adoption on June 29, 2020. For 19 years, RiderShip for the Masses has advocated for public transit systems that will benefit all. We know integrated mobility choices are the key to a positive quality of life. The Commission recommends those choices, and at the same time, provides straightforward answers to climate change issues that will raise the quality of life for all. A job well done by Chair Anne Stausboll and fellow commissioners! Thank you for your time and attention to our comments. Sincerely, Barbara Stanton, RFTM Director
- 1. I support all of the climate commission recommendations. Electrification is an important step towards fighting climate change and improving public health locally. 2. The all-electric new construction ordinance should be enacted sooner than the climate commission has proposed, in 2021 instead of 2023. All-electric construction is: cheaper to build; cheaper to operate; has substantially better indoor air quality; is safer than buildings with gas lines; avoids costly retrofit challenges in the future; and eliminates creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. I also support the commission's recommendations that we follow the CALGreen Tier 2 requirements for electric vehicle charging.
- I urge the Sacramento City Council and the West Sacramento City Council to adopt the report of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change and to implement the changes recommended by the Commission ASAP. If not now, when!
- Dear Mayor Steinberg, Mayor Cabaldon, and Chair Stausboll, I cannot thank you enough for your leadership and commitment to addressing climate change in Sacramento, West Sacramento, and throughout the region. I also want to extend my great appreciation to all the Climate Commissioners and the committee members providing these well-informed and thoughtful recommendations. I do not recall such a comprehensive and concerted effort on a single topic of this magnitude being under-taken in recent history. So again thank you all. It is well documented and understood that our neighborhoods and communities are already experiencing the negative impacts of climate change, in particular our disadvantaged and underserved communities. You all are more than aware of the problems ahead for our cities and our region if we do not take appropriate action now. These climate impacts and the harm being brought to especially our poorer residents will only worsen over time. I am asking you to support the recommendations of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change for achieving carbon zero by 2045. I am writing as a well-informed resident of the City of Sacramento. I am viewed an expert on matters of climate change, sustainability and health. I have led teams that were instrumental in leading policy and code changes that will improve health outcomes and mitigate climate change. I say this so you understand that I am well aware of the implications of the Commission's recommendations and the necessity for you to accept the Commission's recommendations. The recommendations are bold and will require transformative action to achieve deep reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, and we have shown we can do it as exemplified in COVID and the stay at home orders. Unfortunately, the recommendations have to be bold because inadequate action has been taken over the last 10 years to significantly address climate change. As a basic human right we need to provide an environment that will improve and sustain public health outcomes-not exacerbate them like we have been doing. We must create and support a more equitable and resilient future for all, starting with higher paid jobs to address poverty. I understand that some do not support these recommendations and that businesses may be harmed. The reason that we have failed to take the necessary actions for the past 10 years is out of fear and concern for harm. There is no good time, so the time must be now. Harm has already been happening with increasing asthma and

respiratory disease rates. Pregnant women exposed to high temperatures or air pollution are more likely to have children who are premature, underweight or stillborn, and African-American mothers and babies are harmed at a much higher rate than the population at large. How is it that this kind of harm is ok and goes on being ignored? This is the choice the Commission needs to make; who will we harm if the recommendations are not adopted, who will we help if they are. The strategies set forth in the Commission's report are both ambitious and achievable, appropriately reflecting the level of urgency necessary to address the defining crisis of our time. I also support the Commission's recommendation that the cities pursue early actions over the next year to demonstrate the benefits of reducing emissions and build momentum for their full suite of strategies. Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me at Robinsonju364@gmail.com with any questions or further discussion. Sincerely, Judy Robinson, Concerned Resident of the City of Sacramento

- The slowdown of the past few months have illustrated that it is possible to reduce the pollutants from cars and trucks by driving less. Any and all measures must be taken to lower our carbon footprint.
- I am addressing this to Mike Teel because I can find no other means to contact him. I find it incredible that Mr. Teel voted no to the adoption of this report. As a business man, this is also a terrible choice, as it tells me he may not want to run his business in a way that combats climate change. I am wondering if he has been pressured by the business community to vote in this way. It is a vote that indicts the business community if that is the case. I am a regular Raley's customer and am considering boycotting Raley's for this very reason. As a consumer, I look for businesses that have a conscience and care about our kids and grandkids. I have always liked the Raley's employees that I have encountered. My objection is about the corporate choices that are made, for all businesses. I understand the strain of the pandemic on businesses, but I have continued buying groceries from Raley's. We all have to eat, I suspect Raley's has done better than many businesses. As a Coalition member, I was responsible for researching ways to deal with food waste and some of my suggestions for climate friendly solutions were supportive of businesses that are struggling. As a member of this commission, to vote no because "we just don't know what will happen with the pandemic" is hollow reasoning. We ALL need to come together, like we have done with COVID, to help solve this climate emergency or nothing will remain, not even Raley's, in the aftermath of a lack of action. I ask that Mr. Teel rethink his decision, as a commission representative, as a business man and as a human being, no doubt with a family, on this planet, that needs to survive like the rest of us. Thank you for passing on this message.
- Adopt Final Report but CHANGE the date to 2030 as is stated on page 19 under Foundational Principles. White Sky, Red Sun / A sickening scent of incinerated plastic carrying burnt memories from a desecrated community / Etched in my brain / A Monthlong Nightmare from Paradise / This will be our year round reality. if the bottom line of Business as usual derails this great Effort to fight Catastrophic Climate Change. Dear Commissioners, Thank-you for taking on this difficult task to plan for the communities' collective safety and our responsibility to our fellow citizens of the world. We know that in this Pandemic many business interests will pressure you to back off from what you know needs to happen to save our children's future. But you must stand firm in the decisions you have collectively crafted in the report to Electrify Sacramento, Stop Sprawl, Develop Mass Transit, plant trees, care for the Vulnerable and Eliminate Fossil Fuel Use by 2030. Business as usual along with systematic disinformation by Fossil Fuel Interests has been what got us to kick forward the responsibility to get off fossil fuels since the 70's. We're in the last decade that anyone can make a change in the deadly and tragic trajectory of our fossil fuel addiction. Electrification and all of the changes you have proposed will actually be cheaper cleaner healthier for us in the long run. The Covid short term uncertainties, suffering and economic downturn will feel like a walk in the park as compared to the global Catastrophic Climate Change which is the Greatest Existential threat of our time to all life on Earth if we don't stop warming past 1.5 degrees C. By adjusting how we live, move and do business we will prevent much larger losses of property and life as we've seen in recent Superstorms and fire Tornadoes. I applaud the Vision of this Commission and ask that you consider the lives of future generations who are voiceless. I URGE you to adopt the entire report with the 2030 goal consistent with Sacramento's Climate Emergency

- Thank you for your leadership and all of your tireless efforts regarding the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change, and working on behalf of the Cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento to achieve carbon zero by no later than 2045 (and ideally sooner). Over the past year, I had the privilege and opportunity to serve as a Co-Lead for the Commission's Community Health and Resiliency Technical Advisory Committee (CH&R TAC). I am proud of the final recommendations developed by members of the CH&R TAC, and am honored to have worked with such a diverse, engaged, thoughtful, knowledgeable, and passionate group of individuals that comprised the TAC, along with my TAC Co-Lead, Kathleen Ave, and the Local Government Commission team led by Kate Meis, featuring Helena Rhim and the incomparable Julia Kim. I attended every Commission meeting since the very first one in November 2018 and followed the developments of the other TACs, and am exceedingly impressed with their efforts and recommendations as well. Today, I write to you in my capacity as both a resident of the Sacramento region for the last 21 years, and as a public health professional working on a daily basis to prevent the worst human health impacts associated with climate change, particularly on populations facing existing social, environmental, economic, and racial inequities. I also bring with me nearly two decades of prior training and experience in the fields of environmental policy and planning, sustainability, and green building and design. We are living through an unprecedented time right now, experiencing three interrelated and converging crises: COVID-19 and the associated economic fall-out; severe inequities along income, wealth, and particularly racial lines; and, the climate crisis. All of us are being affected, but those most vulnerable and historically marginalized among us are usually the ones hurt first and worst. And through all of this, we cannot escape the reality that health comes first. COVID-19 has made it painfully clear that our economy depends on the health and well-being of our people and communities. The public outrage around police brutality and racial injustice are centered around the fundamental right to live, and to be able to lead full and healthy lives no matter the color of our skin. Underlying all of this is our reliance on the health and well-being of the natural environments and ecological systems that sustain us, and the stability of our climatic conditions. Climate change has been described as the greatest public health threat of our time—even greater than the current pandemic. But the good news is that addressing climate change presents the greatest opportunity for advancing public health and equity. We see the multiple—and often mutually reinforcing—benefits of climate actions reflected in the Commission's Climate Recommendations:

 - Sustainable land use and infill growth can help shrink the distances between where we live, work, and play, making it easier to walk or bike to where we want to go, along with reducing air pollution and transportation costs.
 - Electrifying buildings and homes can reduce greenhouse gas and air pollution emissions, and protect human health. A recent report released by researchers at the UCLA Fielding School of Public found that “under a 2018 scenario where all residential gas appliances were transitioned to clean-energy electric appliances, the reduction of secondary nitrate fine particulate matter (PM2.5) and primary PM2.5 would result in 354 fewer deaths, and 596 and 304 fewer cases of acute and chronic bronchitis, respectively.” This translates to “approximately \$3.5 billion in monetized health benefits for just one year” for California[1].
 - Active transportation can increase our physical activity levels and significantly improve health outcomes. A 2017 report commissioned by the California Department of Public Health determined that for the Sacramento region, meeting state goals for increased walking and cycling levels could reduce chronic diseases and prevent between 125 - 635 deaths annually and 3,314 - 14,129 years of life lost to disability. For the state overall, the monetized value of preventing premature deaths and disability ranged conservatively from \$1 billion to \$15.5 billion per year[2].
 - Transit and shared mobility options can provide more affordable transportation options, and together with zero-emission vehicles (and active transportation), can substantially reduce carbon and air pollution emissions while increasing mobility access and equity.
 - Urban greening and forestry help reduce the urban heat island effect, provide shade, encourage outdoor activities and increased physical activity, relieve stress, sequester carbon, reduce cooling-energy loads, and lower utility bills.
 - Sustainable food systems can increase access to healthy and affordable food for all, reduce carbon emissions, support local agricultural jobs, and reduce food waste.
 - Community climate resilience can reduce vulnerabilities to climate impacts, and increase our capacity to plan and prepare for, withstand, recover and bounce forward from climate-related and other disruptions.

// The Climate Commissions' Recommendations present solutions that significantly reduce carbon emissions, provide substantial cost-savings over time, promote and protect our health and well-being, advance equity, and increase our resilience to external shocks, whether climate-related or virus-related. As such, I strongly support the adoption of the report and final

recommendations of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change, and am committed to supporting efforts to implement these actions. We must take bold and decisive action now—for all of us, particularly those most marginalized, and, for my nephew and niece, who are only starting to learn how to navigate this world. Thank you for your time and attention. In solidarity and health, and with respect, Daniel Woo, MPH, MS, LEED AP ND, BD+C, Co-Lead, Community Health & Resiliency TAC, Mayors' Commission on Climate Change/Resident of Sacramento [1] Zhu, Y., R. Connolly, Y. Lin, T. Mathew, and Z. Wang. 2020. Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health in California. UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, Department of Environmental Health Sciences. Accessible: <https://ucla.app.box.com/s/xyzt8jc1ixnetiv0269qe704wu0ihif7> [2] Maizlish, N. 2017. Increasing Walking, Cycling, and Transit: Improving Californians' Health, Saving Costs, and Reducing Greenhouse Gases. Final Report for the Office of Health Equity, California Department of Public Health. Accessible: <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OHE/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Maizlish-2016-Increasing-Walking-Cycling-Transit-Technical-Report-rev8-17-ADA.pdf>

- We are writing on behalf of Sacramento Metro Advocates for Rail and Transit (SMART) and SacMoves to register our strong support for the recommendations of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change that are proposed for adoption on June 29, 2020. For the past year, SMART and SacMoves have been leading a broad-based coalition of business, labor and community groups united behind a common vision that Sacramento should have an innovative, seamless and diversified transportation network offering a wide range of accessible, affordable and efficient mobility choices coupled with supportive land uses, better air quality, safer neighborhoods and a stronger and more equitable economy. We have been particularly focused during the past year on helping to shape the Sacramento Transportation Authority's Measure A Expenditure Plan to be consistent with this vision. To that end, we have advocated for the inclusion of projects and policies in the expenditure plan that are consistent with the groundbreaking work of the Mayors' Commission. Our goal is to ensure that these types of progressive projects and policies are adopted throughout our region. Thanks to the consistent leadership of Mayors Darrell Steinberg and Christopher Cabaldon, as well as the dedication and clear-headed guidance of the Mayors' Commission Chair Anne Stausboll and her fellow commissioners, and the strong staff work and analysis from the Local Government Commission and SACOG, the Mayors' Commission has developed a set of far-reaching yet pragmatic recommendations that will guide the future of not only our two cities, but hopefully the entire Sacramento region. It is now incumbent upon the Commission to adopt the Final Report and recommendations and for the Cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento to implement these policy recommendations by transforming them into concrete plans, projects, and ordinances that will strengthen and diversify Sacramento's economy, improve our air quality, and reduce carbon emissions. In so doing, vehicle miles traveled will be reduced by minimizing single occupancy vehicle trips, expanding and improving public transit and shared mobility services and providing safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians. Further, the implementation of the policy recommendations will help ensure that all community members, particularly from marginalized communities, have access to sustainable and affordable mobility options that facilitate positive community outcomes for public health and safety, livability and the economy. On behalf of the entire SMART/SacMoves coalition, we thank you for your consideration of these comments during these trying times.
- Thank you to the leadership of the two Mayors, the Commission, and the support from LGC and SACOG. Clean air is a matter of public health and a human right.
- Dear Commissioners, Last November 2019, I represented the seven hundred members of the Sacramento chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) during a meeting with Mr. Dennis Rogers, Chief of Staff for Councilmember Rick Jennings requesting his support of the "Climate Change Emergency Declaration". We were pleased that on December 10 the Sacramento City Council approved the Declaration which includes the goal of achieving zero fossil fuel emissions by no later than 2030. We are also excited by the recommendations of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change. PSR/Sacramento wholeheartedly support these recommendations, including electrification goals, and we urge you not to delay its implementation. As you know, we continue at a critical tipping point and emergency measures are needed if we are to mitigate the health and environmental impacts of global warming. The future of our children

and our grandchildren depends on our taking such action now. Thank you. Respectfully, Harry Wang, MD, President, Physicians for Social Responsibility/Sacramento

- Please adopt the final report and start implementing the climate solutions as soon as possible. Be mindful of the equity framework and truly center all solutions around the community. Until all of us can survive in the face of this climate crisis, none of us can. We are all in this together. Creating a plan is one thing, but follow through and implementation is EVERYTHING. Please start implementing the climate solutions, work with the community - they have very unique needs that have been unmet for decades, and re-assess the work. It's okay and encouraged to tweak your solutions to the context. Looking forward to seeing a carbon free Sac/West Sac - the time is now!
- In Support of Electrification. To Whom it May Concern: Mithun, a local Bay Area integrated architectural design firm, supports efforts by your jurisdiction to adopt 'reach codes' that will reduce carbon emissions from the building sector by requiring new buildings to be all-electric. In our professional experience, it's proven that all-electric buildings are affordable, reliable, and a good solution for our clients, developers and building owners. Mithun currently has seven all-electric multifamily developments under design or construction in the Bay Area. Our team has been conducting an R&D initiative to analyze and compile the strategies and lessons learned – from the technical, financial, regulatory and operational considerations for eliminating natural gas from this construction type. We have found that there are numerous co-benefits to an all-electric construction relative to carbon reduction, health, safety, cost, and resilience. The first-cost analysis across all of these projects has concluded that it is either cost-neutral or cost-saving (of up to about \$247,000, or \$2,352/dwelling unit) to build all-electric and eliminate natural gas. I'm happy to share with you one particular project's detailed cost breakdown, below for your use. All numbers are construction cost estimates or bids from our GC and subs between Q2 and Q3 this year, in the San Francisco market. Additional benefits of significant consideration to us, our owner/developer clients, engineers and contractors include: · Elimination of new underground gas lines in new development areas. · Reduced risk of compounded disasters; fire and explosions · Reduction of minimum energy use standards in some codes and for some green building rating systems. · Elimination of gas connection and associated time and cost of gas meter design, approval, scheduling and construction. · One less bill to pay · Projected operational cost savings on lower utility bills, based upon energy models. · "Net Zero Ready" and "Fossil-Fuel-Free Ready" as California's electric grid gets cleaner. · Battery-Ready for time-of-use and future smart grid technologies. · Buildings which are situated to benefit from future PV, battery and other innovative smart-grid technology developments. · Reduced risk of having to eliminate the gas systems in the future, as gas becomes a stranded asset, and as codes and technologies move toward low carbon options. Mithun operates under the mission of 'design for positive change' and we are proud to support measures for increased energy efficiency, building decarbonization and collective community resilience. We welcome any feedback or questions regarding our project findings. Thank you.
- Dear Mayor Steinberg, I urge you to support the move toward electrification of all sources of energy. In this way, we can transfer sourcing to non polluting means best.
- Mayor Steinberg, I am a Carmichael resident, but care very much what the City of Sacramento does in terms of fighting climate change. Your action you take effects everyone in this region. Passing an electrification ordinance is primary to lower GHG emissions. Despite the propaganda from the industry (as in the HPBA's recent flyer), my heat pump HVAC system and water heater that I had installed at the end of last summer are much more efficient and affordable. I made a major investment to combat climate change. I hope the City of Sacramento will follow suit. Thank you for your time. Ann Amato
- The globe faces a growing climate emergency. One-hundred degree temperatures and forest fires in Siberia are only the latest evidence. That requires us to begin phasing our fossil fuels to the maximum extent possible over the next two decades. That is only possible if we stop installing new natural gas infrastructure today by requiring that all new buildings use electricity only for their energy source. Numerous studies show that going all-electric is cost effective and even creates additional benefits such as reduced carbon monoxide poisoning and no gas line explosion risks. (Electricity risks also stay unchanged.) Even when the natural gas industry attacks these studies they can only show a very marginal advantage for gas. And they

ignore the savings created by avoiding the installation of gas lines. A recent study by the California Energy Commission found that electricity can replace up to 90% of the gas use by 2050, with that remainder in existing uses difficult to reach. <https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2019publications/CEC-500-2019-055/CEC-500-2019-055-F.pdf> And even a study commissioned by the gas industry itself shows that renewable natural gas, which may have lower greenhouse gas emissions, can only meet 15 % of today's gas demand. We should be retaining that gas for the most valuable uses today such as industrial applications and supporting a mostly renewable electricity grid. And we do that by requiring all new construction to use all electric appliances and space conditioning. <https://gasfoundation.org/2019/12/18/renewable-sources-of-natural-gas/> I am an economics consultant on energy, climate change, environment and water issues, particularly related to utilities with three decades of experience. I currently serve on the City of Davis Natural Resources Commission where we adopted two building code ordinances encouraging all electric construction. I previously served on the City's Utilities Commission and on the committee that recommended the formation of Valley Clean Energy Alliance in Yolo County. I also conducted the analysis that led to the closure of Rancho Seco.

- I am calling on the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change to approve the recommendations set forward in the last two years of hard work! I believe it is important to have a plan for combatting climate change and mobilizing the cities, but it is even more important to implement! We must start cutting our carbon emissions now (well, more like 10 years ago, but the second best time to cut emissions is TODAY!). More importantly, we must have the equity framework be the forefront of implementing climate solutions. Low income communities and communities of color have been disproportionately impacted by the harms of climate change. On top of that, we haven't centered our policies around these communities. A strong equity framework would allow the Cities to identify appropriate policies and implement them to repair harms to these communities as well as save them from losing their communities altogether. We are truly in a climate crisis, we have been in one for a long time now. Please don't let this work be shelved, start the climate mitigation and adaption T O D A Y. Thank you.
- Please vote to approve the recommendations that the Sacramento community has labored to draft over the past 2 years. We need to start addressing climate change so it doesn't become a problem that was ignored until it was too late, like the global pandemic we were ill-prepared to address now.
- Dear leaders, Please show that Sacramento can be a leader in addressing climate change. Climate change is still our most important challenge and we need to move as fast as we can to slow down global warming. We need to slow down the production and use of fossil fuels. We all know this. Thank you!
- Please continue to support climate action in our city. It is critical to our future. The climate actions also help address current disparities, something people are eager to see right now. Please don't let us down, these actions are vital to a sustainable Sacramento region. Sincerely, Tamara Engel
- I am asking that the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change vote to approve the recommendations that the Sacramento community has labored to draft over the past 2 years. I am in support of strong, progressive action to address the crisis of climate change. We need our governments to act ASAP, we can't use the COVID-19 pandemic as an excuse to continue to ignore our other problems. We can do better for future generations. The environment is not ours to destroy.
- Please support a fossil fuel-free all-electrification ordinance asap to replace carbon-polluting gas and other fossil fuels to address the climate emergency we now face. Thank you.
- NO - THIS IS AN OUTRAGE - PROPANE HAS BEEN THE BACKBONE TO OUR INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, WAREHOUSING, MEDICAL HOSPITALS, ETC. YET NO VOICE TO THE PEOPLE AND INDUSTRY THAT KEEP CALIFORNIA MOVING AND ALIVE. "Neither propane nor renewable propane was included as part of the MCCC's analysis for this report." Failure to include the aforementioned language demonstrates a willingness to mislead the public and opens this report to greater scrutiny and/or legal challenges regarding its veracity. The following highlights just a few points that were not evaluated as part of the report. (1) Propane is NOT a greenhouse gas, (2) propane is non-toxic, (3) propane is often used as a complement for solar powered homes to provide complementary power when batteries are depleted, (4) propane provides

affordable energy to low-income communities throughout the state, (5) the CEC has advised propane emissions in aggregate for the state of California would equate to 0.055% of the total state GHG emissions, (6) renewable propane from feedstocks like animal fat or methane capture offers even more advantages and is available in California today, (7) the recommendations in this report does not present a cost effective plan to reduce GHG emissions, and (8) propane provides energy resiliency during utility blackouts, natural disasters, and during the pandemic (temporary housing for the homeless, temporary hospitals, etc.).

- Dear Commission: Thank you for your hard work creating the report you will be voting on this coming Monday. You were given the mandate to “be bold and audacious” in your recommendations to the Mayors. Our planet is burning up and deserves no less. In many areas we applaud your efforts: in others, we are disappointed and wish to see more “bold and audacious” recommendations. We commend the following: The documented Foundational Principles: especially the language in the “urgency” section recognizing the importance of acting by 2030. The call for social equity throughout our communities. Recognizing in the revised report the role that properly handling food waste plays in controlling carbon emissions. The inclusion of Year One projects, including new building electrification, that are not expected to wait until the CAP process is done. Here’s where we see the need for improvement: The Cover and executive summary do not reflect a sense of urgency. 2045 is 25 years from now. This can certainly be read as the next generations’ problem, not ours. 2030 is 10 years from now. This is our generation’s problem. The responsibility to act lies with us, here and now and should be reflected throughout the document. Not aggressively pursuing infill within our two cities. Not including the Built Environment TAC recommendation to limit growth to existing boundaries, and recognizing the enormous impact uncontrolled growth will have on our carbon footprint. Not taking advantage of the Covid 19 pandemic. Yes, it presents economic challenges, but also wonderful opportunities. We should be institutionalizing work and cultural changes that have occurred. New working from home models, significantly reducing transportation emissions. Utilizing stimulus funds to create green jobs, and reduce social inequities. Again, thank you for your efforts during this historic moment. Time is running out for the world as we know it. We must act now!
- When used in core residential applications, such as space and water heating, propane lowers GHG emissions by 64 and 52 percent respectively when compared to electricity. In on-road engines and vehicles, using propane instead of gasoline lowers GHG emissions up to 25 percent.
- The Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS) was created by the organizers of Sacramento’s first Earth Day, 50 years ago, to achieve regional sustainability and a healthy environment for our region’s residents. In furtherance of this mission, ECOS has the following policy objective: “Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions to slow climate change.” Therefore, ECOS strongly supports the report’s recommendations regarding land use, transportation, and vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT). Also, ECOS is pleased that the report includes appropriate recommendations regarding equity, as underserved communities would suffer the most from climate change. ECOS requests that the members of the Mayors’ Commission on Climate Change adopt the report drafted by the Local Government Commission because it will benefit Sacramento’s economy. In order to achieve the vision espoused by Sacramento’s leadership and as a first step in rebounding as a region from this economic crisis, it is time to be in the forefront of implementing innovative policies and practices that enable the vision. Let’s provide a “climate” and encourage innovation. During my tenure with the California Air Resources Board’s Climate Science Section, we were required to perform a cost-benefit analysis for all proposed regulations. These cost estimates almost always turned out to be over-estimates, as businesses found innovative ways to reduce emissions at less cost. Moreover, because California implemented air pollution controls before the rest of the nation (and the world), the California economy has benefited as businesses have sold air pollution control equipment around the world. Similarly, Sacramento-area businesses will benefit by embracing the Commission’s report, and becoming leaders in the world-wide trend to limit greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Sacramento businesses have already started to benefit from being a trend-setter GHG-limiting technology: 1) The Autonomous Transportation Open Standards Lab (ATOS) is making Sacramento the epicenter of an emerging innovation ecosystem working to develop breakthrough solutions. With the leadership of Mayor Steinberg, Congresswoman Matsui, Senator Pan, and Sacramento Kings owner Ranadivé, Sacramento is becoming the country’s next real-world testbed for urban innovation. 2)

Volkswagen subsidiary Electrify America recently designated Sacramento as the first Green City in its Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Investment Plan. Under this initiative, Electrify America has been investing \$44 million in car-sharing services and ZEV charging systems throughout our region. ECOS also asks the Commission to recommend the enactment of all-electric new construction ordinances next year. All-electric construction is cheaper to build and operate, improves indoor air quality and health for residents, and is safer than buildings with gas lines. Earlier adoption of this ordinance will prevent costly future retrofits, and eliminate creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. We note that the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District already passed a requirement that favors all-electric for future construction in Sacramento County. Additionally, ECOS supports the commission's recommendation to follow the CALGreen Tier 2 requirements for electric vehicle charging.

- I strongly support adoption of all recommendations in the report; particularly those that urge immediate action. The pandemic is not a reason to hold off on these actions, and rather, they should be a reason to accelerate the transition and make some changes more quickly. I am in strong support of the electrification ordinance - at the last meeting, the new member from the Chamber of Commerce made very ill-informed comments about how electrification would impact the business community. I don't understand how limiting requirements for NEW construction to be all-electric would impact any current businesses. In any case, it is imperative we institute these changes and join many other cities that have instituted similar building codes. Mobility updates, such as slow and active streets, would increase opportunities for businesses affected by the pandemic. Higher pedestrian density makes it easier for folks to access businesses safely and frequently while maintaining appropriate physical distance. We also have an opportunity when much of downtown and midtown is not seeing usual traffic rates, so we have a golden opportunity now to invest in Slow and Active Streets, and learn from those efforts and scale them up. This is low-hanging fruit and should be something the city is already doing. Last but not least, I strongly support the equity recommendations and the establishment of Environmental Justice Collaborative Governance Committee. Now more than ever, we need to be laser focused on how these recommendations impact communities. This cannot hinder progress, but encourage us to work harder to ensure these efforts achieve the desired outcomes without adversely impacting already-disadvantaged communities. We have less than a decade to take bold action; I don't think these recommendations go far enough, but they are an important first step to mitigating the adverse effects of climate change and establishing a green recovery from the pandemic. I appreciate the diligence of the commissioners and their hard work to complete this report.
- WALKS Sacramento strongly supports the recommendations put forth in the report. Through our work at the intersection of health and the built environment, we recognize that bold climate action is necessary in order to improve community resilience and safeguard our most vulnerable residents. In particular, we strongly support the recommendation that the cities pursue early actions over the next year in order to demonstrate the benefits of reducing emissions and build momentum for the full suite of strategies. Advancing recommendations such as green workforce training programs, active transportation infrastructure, and building electrification not only makes our communities more resilient to future climate impacts, but also facilitates COVID-19 recovery by creating green jobs and improving access to essential businesses and services. Additionally, establishing an Environmental Justice Collaborative Governance Committee to shape environmental solutions is critical to ensure that investment occurs equitably and truly benefits marginalized communities. We urge the Commission to adopt all of the recommendations and lead the region towards healthy, resilient communities. Thank you for your consideration.
- For the public record, see this excellent presentation from Panama Bartholomy, Director of the Building Decarbonization Coalition. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/dfp5yppq9uu2tht/Sac%20350.pptx?dl=0#>
- Dear Commissioners, Although I write you in my personal capacity as a Sacramento resident, I write you as someone who has over a decade of experience as an advocate for local, state, and federal policies that are good for small food and farm-related businesses, community food security, and the climate. I enthusiastically support the Commission's final report and recommendations. I have attended all but one of the Commission meetings and participated in one of the technical advisory committees, so can

personally attest to how grounded these recommendations are in the expertise and input of so many community leaders and subject matter experts, including yourselves. However, I strongly encourage the Commission to accelerate its recommended timeline for enacting an all-electric new construction ordinance to 2021. Contrary to the misguided and self-serving misinformation being spread by a few businesses whose profits are tied to natural gas, an all-electric new construction ordinance will benefit all Sacramento residents and the vast majority of Sacramento businesses in the following ways:

- 1) Promotes Affordable Housing Production: Building all-electric can save \$5,000 in capital costs for new single-family homes and \$2,000 for multifamily homes. [1]
- 2) Energy Bill Savings for Residents & Businesses: SMUD estimates >\$400 annual energy bill savings for all-electric new homes and >\$600 annual energy bill savings for existing homes. This results in a lifetime of savings even after considering the cost of conversion from gas. [2]
- Building electrification also puts a downward pressure on electricity rates, which benefits all residents and businesses.
- 3) Achieves GHG Reductions in the Most Cost-Effective Manner: The California Energy Commission concluded that building electrification offers the most promising path to achieving GHG reduction targets in the least costly manner. [3]
- 4) Enhances Public Safety & Energy Resilience: Unlike gas cooking, electric cooking has no open flames, no risk of gas leaks, and does not emit carbon monoxide. Moreover, a natural gas pipeline catches fire every four days in the United States and results in an explosion every eleven days, an injury every five days, and a fatality every twenty-six days. [4] By electrifying our city and gradually de-activating our natural gas infrastructure, we can protect both residents and first responders. Finally, contrary to opponents' claims, electrification improves energy resilience, considering that: natural gas infrastructure takes longer to safely turn back on after utility shutoffs; new gas water and space heaters are inoperable without electricity; and all-electric appliances can more easily be set up to use backup power sources like generators or batteries.
- 5) Avoids the Costs of Stranded Assets: PG&E supports local governments' call for all-electric new construction because it wants to avoid investments in new gas assets that might later prove underutilized, become stranded assets, and result in more extreme cost shifts to the dwindling number of customers paying to maintain an expensive natural gas system infrastructure. [5]
- 6) Increases Investments in Our Local Economy, Including Incentives for Businesses and Low-income Households: Every dollar that we shift from natural gas use (84% of which is imported into the state) to electric energy in SMUD territory will result in more revenue going to our community-owned, not-for-profit electric utility, and is therefore more likely to circulate in our local economy. [6] SMUD is nationally-recognized for its innovative incentive programs, and plans to invest \$1.5 billion in electrification and energy efficiency incentives over the next 20 years, including targeted programs for electrifying low-income households. [7]
- For context, that's 19 times more than the City of Sacramento's Covid-19 relief grant from the federal government.
- 7) Health is Wealth: Sixty percent of homes that have gas stoves exceeded the US EPA's definition of clean air. [8]
- Children living in a home with gas cooking have a significantly increased risk of having asthma. [9]
- According to a 2010 study by Rand Health, between 2005-2007, there were 182 hospitalization events at the UC Davis Medical Center resulting from air pollution, which cost a total of \$1.9 million. [10]
- This figure only counts the cost of hospitalizations – the worst-case scenarios – at one of the area's hospitals!
- 8) The City Has Plenty of Ordinance Examples to Choose From: Over thirty California jurisdictions have passed electrification ordinances, which the City of Sacramento and West Sacramento can easily model theirs after and adopt. In sum, an all-electric new construction ordinance will help our region build more affordable housing, save residents on their energy bills, increase investments in our local economy, improve public safety and health, and avoid the costs of stranded assets. And we have ordinances from 30 cities in California to learn from and adopt! So why wait? The time is now!

Brian Shobe Sources: [1] Energy and Environmental Economics (April, 2019). Residential Building Electrification in California: Consumer economics, greenhouse gases and grid impacts. [2] SMUD Staff Presentation on Electrification (6/23/2020) [3] California Energy Commission. 2018 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update, Volume II. [4] Mall, A. Pipeline Incident Statistics Reveal Significant Dangers (January, 2019). Natural Resources Defense Council Expert Blog. [5] PG&E Staff Presentation on Electrification (6/23/2020) [6] Building Decarbonization Coalition Presentation (6/23/2020) [7] SMUD Integrated Resource Plan (April 2020) [8] Logue JM, Klepeis NE, Lobscheid AB, Singer BC (2014). Pollutant exposures from natural gas cooking burners: a simulation-based assessment for Southern California. [9] Weiwei Lin, Bert Brunekreef, Ulrike Gehring, (2013). Meta-analysis of the effects of

indoor nitrogen dioxide and gas cooking on asthma and wheeze in children. [10] Romley JA, Hackbarth A, and Goldman, DP (2010). The impact of air quality on hospital spending. RAND Corporation, TR-777-WFHF.

- Sooner is better! Please accelerate your goals to 2030. Also, added emphasis on Plant Forward Consumption would make sense given that Project Drawdown describes the huge impact switching to a plant rich diet can make on reducing GHGs and improving human health (not to mention reducing animal suffering!) Thank you for your hard work and noble efforts.
- I am urging the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change to vote to approve the recommendations that the Sacramento community has labored to draft over the past 2 years. I urge you to invest in our communities and our futures. Thank you, Nora Jang
- Dear Mayors, Chairwoman, and Commissioners, Please vote to adopt the draft report of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change as written, and the measures as they have been developed by the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). The adoption of these recommendations is a minimum measure that must be taken and any intention of weakening, halting, or postponing them would be a direct disservice to our community and this entire process of public engagement. As you are aware, the Climate Commission's work has spanned countless hours of discussion from the TACs, city and local government staff, and most importantly volunteer participation from members of the community to ensure that equity and climate justice are centered. As pointed out in the Commission's own draft report, systemic and institutional barriers to participation prevent the very voices that are most adversely impacted by climate change from being heard. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color face the worst impacts of institutionalized racial injustice and environmental racism, yet are too often excluded. At the same time this historically allows voices with systemic and institutionally accumulated power, and financial interest at stake, to control the conversation. It is time to imagine a future in which the communities historically marginalized by our societal systems, the people who are currently disproportionately affected by the adverse impacts of every facet of our fossil fuel-based society, are finally invested in through a just transition. The climate crisis is a known challenge that we need you to fear as we do. It is your task to imagine a path to a better future. It is the task of the Mayors to lead their City Councils in setting a budget that serves the residents of our cities. Although aggressive, the measures laid out in the report might not even be enough. Top climate scientists around the world agree that we have a closing ten-year window to make rapid reductions in our carbon pollution to avoid permanently destabilizing the global climate, leading to extreme weather, droughts, floods, and sea-level rise. The City of Sacramento has already acknowledged this urgency in the Climate Emergency Resolution of December 2019, which appropriately has a 2030 target date. However, if we act now and invest in a green future, we will create local jobs and support the Sacramento economy both in the short and long term. Most importantly, the year one plans outlined in the draft report must be implemented immediately, and integrated into our response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Importantly, the plans include establishing senior level positions within each city that report directly to the mayor and city council to oversee all aspects of climate-change planning and implementation. Without accountability and effective implementation, the targets in the report are empty promises. As steps are taken by the cities to recover from the economic devastation of COVID-19, the climate impact of all decisions needs to be a key determining factor in which policies to enact. Please adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees.
- Covid is no excuse, rather it should be an inspiration, to move us toward creating a healthy environment for all life.
- Karen Jacques: Comments on Final Draft of the Work of the Mayor's Climate Commission, I appreciate all the work that has been done to put this report together, particularly the way that equity is woven into every part of it. One of the foundational principles of this report is 'urgency' and that means doing everything possible to achieve all or most of the recommendations of the Commission well before 2045. The relentless increase in climate related disasters makes the need to act fast abundantly clear. The Commission's report is thoughtful and thorough. I hope both cities will adopt it in full and then act as fast as possible. In addition to the work on diversity, I particularly appreciate the Urban Greening and Resiliency Section which contains recommendations that would hugely improve resiliency, safety and the quality of

people's lives. I've submitted comments in the past about much of what is in the report. This time focusing my comments on what I think needs to be done in the first year after adoption (likely before either city will have completed updates of their Climate Action and General Plans) because getting the first year right is critical to carrying out the Commission's recommendations within and, hopefully, well before the 2045 time frame. Here are my comments.

Built Environment: Sustainable Land Use: __Immediately adopt a detailed set of policies to address displacement and gentrification. Displacement is already a significant problem in Sacramento's Central City and in the Oak Park area. The draft Commission report provides an excellent discussion on this, including information as to what other cities are doing to address these problems. __When housing developers seek to increase project floor area ratio (FAR) beyond what is allowed by the General Plan and Zoning Code, require that this additional square footage be used for affordable housing. Allowing FAR increases for market rate housing with no affordable requirement tends to increase adjacent land values which encourages land speculation and makes it even harder to construct affordable housing. __Encourage multiple housing types including pre-fab housing, tiny houses, SRO's, affordable by design projects so as to provide affordable housing in every neighborhood and allow people to live close to where they work. __Make surplus public land available to affordable housing developers, not for market rate housing developers as has happened in the past in Sacramento.

New and Existing Buildings: --Adopt electrification ordinance for new construction in 2020 with an effective date of 2021. Require electrification for major building rehabs as well as for new buildings. Immediately reach out to projects that have begun construction that include gas and provide incentives for them to switch to all electric. __Adopt an ordinance that governs the transition of existing buildings from gas to all electric. Because HVAC systems and appliances have long lives and are expensive, this will require time, but people need to know up front what will be expected and they need a date beyond which they can no longer purchase and install gas using equipment. There will be a huge need for subsidies. Depending on how much retrofit is required (new electric panel, new heavier gauge wiring, possible re-plumbing) this can be extremely expensive. It will be critical to develop as many incentives as possible, from reducing the cost of permits, to equipment rebates, to grants and low or no interest loans. Rental properties and multi-unit properties pose additional problems in that, depending on what needs to be done, tenants may need to temporarily stay someplace else or have their rent temporarily reduced, which adds to landlord expense and may force small landlords who charge reasonable rents to sell. That's why it's so important to pass this ordinance and start working now on who (utilities, state, federal) can provide financial incentives. (I'm writing this as both a climate activist who strongly supports this ordinance and as a small landlord with reasonable rents who just transitioned a two unit building historic city landmark building to all electric. We were able to get SMUD rebates to help with HVAC costs and we were transitioning a building that had undergone a major rehab, including all new wiring in the mid 1990's. Even so we still had to replace electric panels and wiring and move and re-plumb one of the two new water heaters. We were between tenants which made the rehab easier, but also left us without the income rents would have provided. Even with the rebates and not counting the lack of rents, our out of pocket costs were well over \$20,000. We could not have done it without the rebates and we are significantly better off than many of the people who will need to make the transition. I'm including this description of our experience to help you think about what will be required to make this badly needed transition reality. In my opinion, the expense involved in transitioning to all electric illustrates why requiring all electric transition be done at the point of sale would create extreme financial hardships for many sellers and should not be adopted.) __Adopt an ordinance to incentivize the adaptive re-use of existing buildings. The City of Sacramento already has such an ordinance for historic buildings and should modify it to include all suitable buildings. The re-use of existing buildings can save money and preserves the embodied energy of materials and of work done. It also keeps useable material out of the landfill. __Adopt proposed ordinance to reduce the embodied carbon emissions from building materials and construction by 40% by 2030 and incentivize construction projects to begin doing this now. __Adopt a Deconstruction Ordinance so that useable construction materials can be re-used rather than taken to the landfill. The Sacramento Preservation Commission was trying to do this before the 2008 recession because it recognized that the wood framing in older buildings is typically old growth wood that is much stronger and more durable than newer wood that can be purchased now. Work with the private sector to set up a recycling center similar to Habitat for Humanity's Re-Store only on a larger scale. __Adopt an ordinance that prohibits the construction of new gas stations. __Adopt an ordinance that

prohibits the construction of new parking garages and standalone surface parking lots. Mobility: __Adopt policies that make it possible for as many city staff as possible to continue telecommuting after the pandemic is over. __Establish and adopt clear timetables to transition city car fleets and other city vehicles to all electric. __Begin working with major employers on agreements to transition their fleets to all electric. __Adopt a date by which Uber, Lyft and other similar ride sharing services must have transitioned to an all-electric vehicles. Urban Greening/Resiliency: Green Infrastructure: __Begin working on Commission proposed ordinances on grey water (1.3), zero emission landscaping equipment (1.6) and impermeable surfaces (1.8) in the first year. __Using the cash for grass ordinance as a model, develop an ordinance to incentivize the removal of cement from parkway strips where feasible in both residential and commercial areas. This would create additional space for trees and other plantings, help reduce heat island effect and help reduce runoff in heavy rains. Food and Food Waste: __Begin efforts to partner with schools, hospitals and other institutions to add plant based diets to their offerings. I am including this as a first year item because it has the potential to significantly improve health while also reducing greenhouse gases and because an increasing number of people, particularly young people are interested in adopting plant based diets. Preparing plant based diets and discussion of what is required for a healthy, balanced plant based diet would also lend themselves classes offered at food hubs. Thank-you for the opportunity to comment.

- Why The Climate Change Commission recommendations report is flawed and you should vote NO. 1. Sustainable Land Use: Report recommends 90% of growth is established in a center corridor. a. Opposite Direction. This is exactly the OPPOSITE of what is happening in our state with our families and the people who live in our cities. The experiences in the cities have awakened people this was NOT the life they wanted for themselves and their families. They learned that driving less, spending more time with their families, cooking their own food was GOOD for them and they don't want to back to the high stress, traffic jammed grind where they never see their loved ones and they have a much higher probability of catching COVID. b. Families are moving out to the suburbs where they can enjoy safe neighborhoods, yards to play in, have pets, ride their bike to school, enjoy a lower cost of living and a return to family oriented lifestyles. In fact, the outer areas of Sacramento like El Dorado hills are experiencing a surge of people moving in from cities to smaller towns where they feel safer and can have "chickens and a garden". THIS is true sustainability, not forcing large segments of our population into central city corridors where they CANNOT sustain themselves and are completely dependent on an electricity grid and outside forces to bring them food and water. Sustainability is about being able to provide for yourself, not being totally dependent on government or corporations for basic needs. c. Fertility is dropping in cities. Cities are losing their children and becoming the domain of the educated, affluent, older generations. Consider this: San Francisco has the lowest rate of children in the nation. d. COVID Safety. The safest towns in the pandemic were the small towns of California, where people had space. The greatest number of deaths were in the most crowded cities. e. Attached Housing. Cities are where the virus spread most quickly and especially in attached housing with shared space conditioning systems such as you are suggesting in this report. Consider New York and senior living centers around the country where shared living spaces became hotspots. f. Civil Unrest. Cities are where protesting and rioting caused injury, property damage, chaos and fear. Rioting in Sacramento took place downtown in the heart of the city at Cesar Chavez Park and like many cities across America had to impose curfews to contain dangerous rioting and looting which destroyed property belonging to small business owners who are barely surviving the pandemic already. This civil unrest has caused a massive flight of our residents from cities. Many cities did nothing to stop the property damage, causing another reason for families and the businesses they own to consider moving out. 2. Mobility: The COVID Pandemic has just taught the entire world the key to climate change: a. Get the cars off the road. Working from home, encouraging sustainability from home and local resourcing rather than dependence on trucked in resources, promoting local small business, all of which promotes work centers being brought closer to living centers rather than the opposite as you are doing in this report. What we want is a village approach. Not a dense city life. Consider the enormous benefits we have witnessed from the Pandemic. b. Working from home results: i. Productivity Up/Costs Down. Businesses are benefitting in cost reductions and increased productivity by discovering employees were as or more productive working from home while reporting increased overall happiness. ii. Office building footprints are reducing in cities like New York and San Francisco as companies like Facebook and Credit Karma shift to permanent work from home positions

cutting office space needed and all the energy it takes to sustain those large buildings. iii. Working from home reduces employee COVID exposure compared with working in shared office spaces with common air space conditioning systems and multiple shared surfaces requiring costly, continuous disinfection procedures. iv. Commuting expenses and gasoline usage crashed to the floor causing a global overstock and the lowest gas prices in decades. In my job as a manufacturer's rep, I went from using 2-3 tanks of gasoline a week to using 1 tank of gasoline for an entire month. And the air cleared all over the world. v. Less cars on the road totally eliminated the traffic jams in Sacramento and the Bay Area dropping travel time to half which also reduced the gasoline usage and emissions by half! vi. Incentivize Work From Home Emission Reduction Strategies. Recent studies are showing high demand for new work from home or reduced office time job strategies. More than 40% of people say they would like the option to work remotely at least a few days a week. If half the current workforce works from home part of the week consider the staggering reduction in mobile emissions in California!!! c. Mobility: Active and Shared Transportation. Inspiring the public to walking and biking around Sacramento will require investment to clean up the Midtown and Downtown as well as the bike and walking pathways throughout the city. Even the slightest Google search will reveal that the Downtown and Midtown areas are not safe after dark and various sites will give lists of safe areas and what to do to stay safe. The American River Parkway trail has been invaded by homeless and is a terrifying and filthy area which no one sane would walk to work or school or to exercise. d. Homelessness and filth. Before ANY ideas of walking/rolling transportation can take place, you must address the homeless problem and remove all homeless from the walkways and pathways you expect our sons and daughters and wives and husbands and grandmothers to walk to and from work and school. It is NOT SAFE on the streets of California right now, from small towns to cities. I am afraid to even get gas for my car in some places like the intersection of Garfield and Auburn Blvd in Sacramento, where scary meth addicts with their pants hanging down range through asking for money and getting hostile if we say no while we try to fill our cars and escape. e. Public Transportation has Virus Exposure and Public Safety and Health problems. f. COVID Exposure. Shared transportation ridership was and still is drastically affected and shut down in the pandemic due to the crowded conditions causing COVID exposure. g. Ridership has fallen over 60% and although the lack of riders make social distancing and disinfecting easier, it is not financially sustainable. Ridership will not be able to increase for the foreseeable future with virus transmission on the rise as it could become a significant contributor. Bottom line is, no one wants to ride public transportation right now. h. In addition, Sacramento's public transportation system, especially some of the light rail stations, are currently plagued with homelessness, urine and mental health issues for the people who are trying to use them. Consider this quote: "The great thing about riding the light rail in Sacramento is that after you take a trip from Watt I-80 to downtown, you no longer fear death. In fact, right around Swanston, you long for death's sweet kiss. Anything to escape the urine-stained homeless people yelling at their imaginary parole officers." Wayne B. 1/9/2020 i. Defunding the Police. California is now discussing defunding the police which only makes the prospect of being in public spaces such as train and bus stations in cities less attractive and more threatening. The Mayor and Police Chief of Sacramento currently do not support these efforts but city council members like Katie Valenzuela believe that up to a third of police funding should be shifted to other programs. j. Riots, Protests and Looting. With all the rioting and protesting and now discussions of defunding police forces, I do not believe people who have a choice will be willing to ride public transportation for a long time. They will avoid it out of fear for catching the virus or for getting caught in a situation where they could experience bodily harm. k. I will not ride on public transportation. It is too dirty, I am terrified of catching COVID on the shared surfaces, the process is filled with scary people and I do not feel safe especially as a woman, and I cannot get to where I am trying to go without taking four times as long and then having to walk streets I am afraid to walk on. I will drive a car 100% of the time in Sacramento due to lack of safety, lack of cleanliness, and lack of time efficiency. l. Electric Vehicles are not ready yet. I would be willing to drive an electric car, provided I could find one I could afford that would drive far enough that I will not become stranded. Electric car development needs to continue before we have the vehicles we can legitimately use for life's travel. Electric vehicles are currently more expensive up front with the national average being about \$55,000 vs \$35,000 for the same gas powered four door sedan. This is being skewed higher by Tesla because they can go 200 miles but most of us cannot afford them. Once more average price long ranging models are available, consumers who can use them will naturally transition as the fuel costs provide considerable

savings over gasoline. m. Electric cars are not zero emissions vehicles. Although they do not emit CO₂ while being driven, electric cars might do it in 3 other stages: during manufacturing, energy production and at the end of their life cycle. The need for mining activities to extract the rare earth metals that are used in batteries is very energy consuming and polluting. If the car is being powered with energy from burning fossil fuels, it is still releasing CO₂ in the atmosphere, not from the tailpipe but from some distant power plant. In our case where approximately 47% of SMUD's electricity is made from burning natural gas in an approximately 43% efficiency power plant – you will be charging your vehicle at night when you get home with power from natural gas or maybe from Arizona where they burn coal. Furthermore, batteries are still an expensive and ongoing process. Most electric car batteries are not being recycled yet presenting an environmental challenge that is piling up, with the hopes of figuring out recycling in the future. n. This commission should be doing more to support renewable sources of energy with the goal of getting SMUD off natural gas FIRST to support your electric car goals. Otherwise, every electric car is about to make SMUD release MORE emissions in Sacramento, not less. o. Let's focus on designing small, safe, sustainable communities and incentivizing working from home to drastically curb gasoline emissions in the sector that really matters in California and in the entire world = MOBILITY. p. These policies would harness the true forces at work and support changes that are happening in our society and how people want to live.

3. Electrification of New Construction. Until SMUD is actually producing electricity from renewable sources it does not make any sense to increase the demand for it to burn natural gas to produce electricity. You cannot escape that nearly 50% of SMUD's electricity is produced by burning natural gas in a pretty inefficient plant at 43%. a. Net Zero Cal Green Building Codes have already mandated Solar Panels on all new construction in CA. This is a critical step in producing sufficient electrical power for all these cars and appliances. b. Solar Battery Storage is critical for moving forward to an all-electric system. Until then, electrical systems are very unstable, going out frequently, and consumers are dependent on sending solar energy to a power company who then sells it back to them at a higher cost. This is not sustainability either, this is corporations making money off solar farming California. I want to see you support standalone solar systems that sustainably power a person's own home, not make SMUD rich. c. Most consumers prefer mixed fuel homes. Studies show most consumers prefer to use a mix of gas and electric appliances based on geographic and climatic zones and fuel availability and cost in their areas. In fact, the most popular trend in kitchen ranges is a new Mixed Fuel range that has a gas burning range combined with an electric oven. This provides cooks with the best of both worlds. The reports you are being shown about heat pump ranges being the most popular appliances is flawed. d. High Efficiency Heat Pump appliances are expensive. Electric dryers, water heaters and HVACs are fairly inefficient unless you can invest in the new high efficiency heat pump types. At Lowe's, a 50-gallon heat pump water heater goes for around \$1,100, while a conventional electric water heater is closer to \$300 which is nearly FOUR TIMES more expensive up front. In addition these all require more expensive 240 volt electrical hookups. It would be better to incentivize these appliances so that people can afford new houses in California. e. California average home price is double the national average. Continuing to mandate expensive electric appliances in California is only going to drive up already outrageous home prices, drive middle and low income people out of our state and exacerbate the crisis in homelessness here. Last year 691,000 people left California for other states. Their primary reasons, high taxes, politics and high cost of living. You are just making this worse. Incentivize don't mandate and let us transition naturally.

4. Electrification of Existing Buildings a. Fragile time in Ca. Ca in the grip of the pandemic has lost thousands of jobs and income, businesses have closed and we currently face rising cases and the threat of further shutdown and restrictions on the ability of many, many people to make a living. b. Electrification is costly with questionable benefits. The cost of new high efficiency heat pump appliances is four times the cost of conventional appliances and require upgrading of electrical systems to 240 vac which trigger the need for additionally expensive new electrical panel in almost all homes (typically \$5000 according to the CEC). This is a significant capital investment for homeowners and landlords to make at a time when people struggle to pay mortgages and rent. There is no proof that forcing me to remove my kitchen range and purchase and install a new electric appliance will have actually resulted in net overall reduced emissions considering where the appliance was made (China), what materials are in it and how those were acquired and handled, how far it travelled to get to where I am and how it is installed and operated. c. SMUD burns twice as much gas to deliver the same heat as a gas appliance. Consider this: 1 kW = 3412.12 BTU. Therefore in my high efficiency (80% Steady State) natural

gas direct vent fireplace, it would take 1,250,000 BTUs of NG @ 80% efficiency to produce 1,000,000 btus for heating. However, because SMUD's natural gas combustion is half as efficient, it would take 2,325,581 BTU's burned in a power plant @ 43% efficiency to produce 1,000,000 btus. This power would come down the lines as 293kW where studies show up to 15% additional efficiency is lost in transmission. Today's efficient natural gas appliances help reduce emissions from conventional electric appliances supplied by fossil fuel combustion and keeping power costs down for consumers. d. Full electrification is not possible now. The electrical system in California is not resilient. We are plagued with power outages and fires as well as typical windstorms, earthquakes and floods. Power outages are common and can last for days in some areas. Full reliance on one form of fuel is not resilient and leaves huge populations vulnerable to power outages. We do not have the infrastructure in the ground. We do not have the smart technology to shift renewable power from source to where it is needed. We do not have the battery storage available and we can't even recycle our batteries yet. e. Gas is cleaner than other forms of fuel. Stove changeouts have been running in California including the Sacramento Metro Air District for decades. These programs changed out old non-EPA woodstoves to cleaner burning, high efficiency, direct vent appliances with significant, measurable contributions to cleaner air in the region. In fact, the Air District is currently running a clean air Stove Changeout program in Sacramento. If families cannot afford the high rates of tiered electricity and high cost of heat pump appliances, and they cannot get clean burning natural gas, they will turn back to other forms of solid fuel heating. In addition, thousands of homeowners have made the transition from wood to natural gas to support Sacramento's air quality goals. Your mandate will render their investment void, actually cost them more money than if they had not complied and communicate that you don't stand by your programs long term. You have completely reversed your direction and are now requiring them to remove the appliance at great expense to themselves. f. This is the Wrong Time. With the 2020 Pandemic affecting residents' security, health, and ability to provide for their families, this is the wrong time to be removing the value from their homes and businesses, adding to their stress, and expenses with the threat of taking away their ability to choose the best solutions for their individual homes and business. I urge you as a council to vote NO on the recommendations to this report. This is not what Californians want. I recommend you make an emergency motion to delay the final vote and extend the Commission for another six months to assess the changes in society, what we learned about the climate changes and the Sacramento region as a result of the Pandemic. Sincerely, Shannon Reyna Resident and Business Owner Nevada County, California Working Northern California from the Oregon Border to Mammoth Lakes/Fresno/Carmel

- Honorable Mayors Cabaldon and Steinberg, and Chairwoman Stausboll, I am submitting this comment in support of the draft report of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change and the measures as they have been developed by the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). The adoption of these recommendations is a minimum measure that must be taken and any intention of weakening, halting, or postponing them would be a direct disservice to our community and this entire process of public engagement. In fact, the 2045 timeline may not even be aggressive enough. The City of Sacramento has already acknowledged this urgency in the Climate Emergency Resolution of December 2019, which appropriately has a 2030 target date. I certainly understand the enormity of the task in front of us, even at the targets set. And, if you have the courage to set this bar and challenge our community to exceed them, the rewards will be enormous and much greater than the costs. In fact, since we are now facing the additional challenge from COVID-19 recovery, if we follow the equity principles laid out in the report and strive for the building and infrastructure targets set, we will be creating both short-term and sustainable longer term benefits for all the people to share in them. The key to actually meeting the targets lies in the year one plans outlined in the draft report. These must be implemented immediately, and can be integrated into our response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Importantly, the plans include establishing senior level positions within each city that report directly to the mayor and city council to oversee all aspects of climate-change planning and implementation. Without implementation and accountability, the targets in the report are empty promises. Please adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees. Signed, Jennifer Wood, Sacramento Resident/Volunteer, Sacramento Chapter Citizens' Climate Lobby
- I support the recommendations made by the Mayor's Commission on Climate Change. These recommendations are based on facts – and they include absolutely imperative steps to increasing business

prosperity, public safety, air quality and the quality of life of West Sacramento and Sacramento's residents. As a young professional expecting to dedicate the next 30 years of my life to public service, I have no problem taking my skills and tax dollars to another city that sees the benefits of making the investments required by these recommendations. I'm sure I won't be the only one. In addition to supporting the suite of recommendations, I believe the all-electric new construction ordinance should be enacted in 2021 instead of 2023. I don't think there could be a more appropriate "first year project" than this. All-electric construction is: cheaper to build; cheaper to operate; has substantially better indoor air quality; is safer than buildings with gas lines; avoids costly retrofit challenges in the future; and eliminates creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. SMUD supports this, PG&E supports this, and the Sacramento Air Quality Management District supports this. The folks who oppose this measure have resorted to false information to sow concern about electrification, for financial concern for their polluting industry only. Not out of concern for people's lives and health. The California Energy Commission concluded that building electrification offers the most promising path to achieving GHG reduction targets in the least costly manner. Electrifying residential and commercial buildings delivers the largest PM 2.5 emission reductions compared with other sectors of the economy. Why wait on electrifying all-new construction?

- Although change is hard and may be upsetting and difficult, it is less painful to change our behavior now than to be at the full mercy of the climate crisis soon. Sacramento is too hot and has markedly too high a level of air pollution in all seasons of the year. Adopting the recommendations of the commission will promote jobs in our area and make our city more livable for all but especially for those living in our poorer and more blighted areas. Adopting the final recommendations is one step towards environmental justice. Let Sacramento unleash her power and energy to be a leader in the fight against the climate crisis.
- I support the entirety of the climate commission's recommendations. I'm a recent Bay Area transplant in the health tech industry and am very excited to see the steps Sacramento is taking to reduce the impacts of climate change. I can imagine the benefits of implementing these recommendations of the populations my organization and California counties serve - the impact of access to green space could have a myriad of mental health benefits in itself. I believe the commission's recommendation that new construction be all-electric by 2023 should be expedited to 2021. All-electric construction is: cheaper to build; cheaper to operate; has substantially better indoor air quality; is safer than buildings with gas lines; avoids costly retrofit challenges in the future; and eliminates creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. At this point, knowing all that we do about the impacts of burning fossil fuels, it would be incomprehensible to build even one more gas line. Thank you for your hard work on this commission.
- I am writing to express GRID Alternatives North Valley's full support for all of the recommendations proposed by the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change. This 2-year endeavor was bold and vital for the community to come together and envision a cleaner, brighter, and safer environment for future generations. We're aware of the major economic strain that COVID-19 has pulled from budgets throughout the City, State, and Country, and commend your commitment to investment in a swift and just transition to renewable energy. GRID is ready to work alongside the Mayors and fellow climate justice advocates to take actionable next steps towards the equity, clean energy, and electrification goals from the Commission's recommendations.
- Hello, My name is Supriya Patel. I'm 14 years old, and I'm writing to you because my future is at stake. According to the United Nations, we only have a decade to take action on the climate crisis. It has been made clear that the climate crisis isn't an impending emergency- it's already impacting frontline communities, including low income BIPOC (Black & Indigenous People of Color). But you likely already know this. After all, the Mayor's Climate Commission equity framework to recognize that the climate crisis isn't merely an environmental issue, but also a justice issue. That's why I'm contacting you today- to ask you to join me in advocating for our most marginalized communities by asking that the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change vote to approve the recommendations that the Sacramento community has labored to draft over the past 2 years. Sacramento & West Sacramento must have a plan to reach carbon neutrality by 2030 in accordance with United Nations deadlines. And in that plan, we must recognize that folks of color

are disproportionately impacted by the climate crisis in comparison to their white peers. There is an active misinformation campaign being pushed by fossil fuel interests, and arguments for weakening the Climate Commission's draft recommendations parrot these talking points. Adopting bold measures to address climate change and using the equity framework to invest in our communities will work to improve existing disparities and both public and individual health. The combustion of fossil fuels creates unhealthy levels of particulate matter that pollutes our air and leads to increased levels of asthma, disproportionately affecting historically marginalized communities. I support the Climate Commission's equity framework. But the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento can't only fight for racial justice and climate justice when it's politically convenient. The decision is yours. Will you stand with us or with the fossil fuel industry? Best, Supriya Patel

- Encouraging people to switch to a Plant-Rich Diet is one of the most effective ways of addressing Climate Change! Please emphasize this as much as possible, since it enhances human health while significantly reducing GHGs. Also, please accelerate your goals to way sooner than 2045! Thank you for working so hard to make meaningful progress.
- Sacramento Transit Advocates and Riders (STAR), a regional transit advocacy organization, is pleased to support the draft report of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change, Achieving Carbon Zero in Sacramento and West Sacramento by 2045. The strategies that most strongly align with our own goals are Built Environment: Sustainable Land Use, Mobility: Active Transportation, and Transit & Shared Mobility, and Zero-Emission Vehicles. But we want to make clear that we support all the strategies, including Built Environment: Electrification, which is being opposed by private interests. We also support the equity recommendations in the report and the technical report, and know that without that lens, many of the other efforts will fail to make a difference for communities that have been underinvested and disinvested in the past. In order to have an effective and sustainable transportation system, we must stop doing much of what we've done in the past, which is to construct freeways and interchanges, and to build roadways which are clearly designed for car drivers and for no one else. It is not enough to simply add on walking, bicycling and transit, we must stop doing the wrong things. This means no more sprawl and no more added lanes. It means investing in transit, walking, and bicycling. For those investments to be most effective, we must also solve housing shortages by building infill, particularly, but not solely, focused on transit-rich areas. We can't have an effective transit system unless we have available and affordable housing, and we can't have available and affordable housing without an effective transit system. We hope that the Commission will adopt the report, and that both cities will set to work immediately on implementing the Year One projects. This will take significant new investments, and the shifting of current investments from unproductive and harmful ones to sustainable and effective ones.
- Please adopt the recommendations in this report!! It is so important that these measures be adopted at your upcoming meetings. These measures will help work towards healing our planet and will also support racial equity work. Climate change is disproportionately impacting communities of color and will continue to do so for in the coming years. It is so important that strong measures be taken NOW for our children and those most in need. Thank you for reading this and voting to approve these measures.
- Thank you to the Commission for this opportunity to submit comments for your consideration. The Western Propane Gas Association represents many retail companies that serve customers in both Sacramento and West Sacramento. We wish to go on the record to voice the following concerns. First, as a matter of fact, we have spoken with the staff of the Local Government Commission (LGC) and they have advised us that propane was not analyzed as part of the scope of study when preparing this report. The staff member then advised our organization that this is just a recommendation, which implies the report should not be given much gravity in terms of actual impact. Later, upon reviewing written comments for the first public workshop, our comments were dismissed by a staffer who shared a sentiment that propane is not used in the areas under consideration. All of these responses are deeply concerning. The work this commission is doing is important, and should be done right. Propane is used within the city limits of Sacramento and West Sacramento, and in some instances by the most economically vulnerable citizens whose rights must not be overlooked. Rather than a genuine dialog on the merit and value of propane, the

LGC staff appears more inclined to rush to publishing this report. The CEC has advised WPGA that propane accounts for less than 0.055% of the states total GHG emissions. Propane is non-toxic, and our industry has led the way for commercializing renewable propane derived from sustainable sources. I applaud the commissioners for engaging SMUD in their efforts to better understand the future of utilities and clean electricity generation. We only request the same consideration be afforded to the propane industry in an effort educate commissioners on the role of propane in clean electricity generation and other energy needs. Factors such as microgrids sourced with renewable propane providing complementary power for solar homes and netting clean electricity back to the grid were not part of the MCCC's scope of discussion. Renewable propane power generators to power electric vehicles were not considered. The role of propane to provide energy equity and resiliency to residents was not considered. Research done by Lawrence Berkeley National Lab in developing a new design for gas stovetops that dramatically reduces emissions and fuel consumption, were not considered. Innovative fuels and future propane technology will never be able to come to market if we do not leave an incentive for progress. The Energy Futures Initiative released a report last year titled, "Optionality, Flexibility & Innovation: Pathways for Deep Decarbonization in California". This organization was founded by Dr. Ernest Moniz, former energy secretary under Barak Obama. The report advises that biogas (i.e. renewable propane) has a significant role to play in California's strategy for decarbonization. All clean energy sources must be leveraged, maximizing their inherent benefits in terms of cost, life cycle emissions and greenhouse gas reductions. We implore this commission not to move forward with this report without including an important acknowledgement. Specifically, that: "NEITHER PROPANE NOR RENEWABLE PROPANE WAS INCLUDED AS PART OF THE MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON CLIMATE CHANGE'S ANALYSIS FOR THIS REPORT." Any commissioner should be empowered to make the motion to have this language incorporated in the report prior to any final vote. I ask each and every member of this commission to ask why would this commission move forward without a full disclosure of the scope of this study. The answer to this question should be shared both with the public and the commissioners, who are trusting staff to do the analytical work. Failure to include this disclosure demonstrates a willingness to misrepresent our industry and can have significant consequences in obtaining clean energy objectives. We also respectfully ask that comments be read in their entirety, since the public is restricted due to the online format chosen where attendees voices cannot be heard. I thank the commissioners for their time on this matter and our organization stands ready to help any way we can.

- Recommend Adoption of Final Report. The Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS) was created by the organizers of Sacramento's first Earth Day, 50 years ago, to achieve regional sustainability and a healthy environment for our region's residents. In furtherance of this mission, ECOS has the following policy objective: "Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions to slow climate change." Therefore, ECOS strongly supports the report's recommendations regarding land use, transportation, and vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT). Also, ECOS is pleased that the report includes appropriate recommendations regarding equity, as underserved communities would suffer the most from climate change. ECOS requests that the members of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change adopt the report drafted by the Local Government Commission because it will benefit Sacramento's economy. In order to achieve the vision espoused by Sacramento's leadership and as a first step in rebounding as a region from this economic crisis, it is time to be in the forefront of implementing innovative policies and practices that enable the vision. Let's provide a "climate" and encourage innovation. During my tenure with the California Air Resources Board's Climate Science Section, we were required to perform a cost-benefit analysis for all proposed regulations. These cost estimates almost always turned out to be over-estimates, as businesses found innovative ways to reduce emissions at less cost. Moreover, because California implemented air pollution controls before the rest of the nation (and the world), the California economy has benefited as businesses have sold air pollution control equipment around the world. Similarly, Sacramento-area businesses will benefit by embracing the Commission's report, and becoming leaders in the world-wide trend to limit greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Sacramento businesses have already started to benefit from being a trend-setter GHG-limiting technology: 1) The Autonomous Transportation Open Standards Lab (ATOS) is making Sacramento the epicenter of an emerging innovation ecosystem working to develop breakthrough solutions. With the leadership of Mayor Steinberg, Congresswoman Matsui, Senator Pan, and Sacramento Kings owner Ranadivé, Sacramento is becoming the country's next real-world testbed for

urban innovation. 2) Volkswagen subsidiary Electrify America recently designated Sacramento as the first Green City in its Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Investment Plan. Under this initiative, Electrify America has been investing \$44 million in car-sharing services and ZEV charging systems throughout our region. ECOS also asks the Commission to recommend the enactment of all-electric new construction ordinances next year. All-electric construction is cheaper to build and operate, improves indoor air quality and health for residents, and is safer than buildings with gas lines. Earlier adoption of this ordinance will prevent costly future retrofits, and eliminate creation of new gas infrastructure that will become stranded assets. We note that the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District already passed a requirement that favors all-electric for future construction in Sacramento County. Additionally, ECOS supports the commission's recommendation to follow the CALGreen Tier 2 requirements for electric vehicle charging.

- RMI supports the adoption of the final report. I submit the following comments on behalf of Rocky Mountain Institute, an independent, nonpartisan nonprofit whose mission is to transform global energy use to create a clean, prosperous, and secure low carbon future. RMI greatly admires the Mayor's Commission on Climate Change and the ambitious recommendations in its draft report, especially its recommendations to electrify the built environment. The building sector is too often neglected in proposals to reduce carbon emissions, and we applaud the Commission for acknowledging the critical role that buildings play in addressing our climate challenge. In addition to reducing emissions, electrifying buildings will reduce air pollution, improve public health, and support job creation. MIT research shows buildings are the number one source of premature deaths from combustion emissions in California [1]. According to CARB's emissions inventory, in the Sacramento Metropolitan Air District buildings emit 3 tons of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) per day, while light duty passenger vehicles emit 2 tons per day and power plants emit 0.5 tons per day [2]. In Sacramento, as well as statewide, the buildings sector emits six times as much nitrogen dioxide as the state's power plants, demonstrating California's success in regulating power plant emissions and failure to address building emissions. And building emissions do not impact everyone equally. Low-income communities and communities of color are disproportionately burdened by pollution [3]. Fossil fuel pollution from buildings is preventable through electrification, and multiple studies have shown electrifying buildings is the least-cost path to decarbonizing the building sector [4]. Now is a critical time for the cities to support building electrification. A recent UCLA study found that even when accounting for losses in the fossil fuel industry, electrifying all of California's existing and new buildings by 2045 would create over 100,000 jobs [5]. By adopting the Commission's recommendations to electrify new and existing buildings, Sacramento and West Sacramento will ensure a cleaner, safer, and healthier future for its residents and demonstrate significant climate leadership for other cities to follow. [1] <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-1983-8> [2] <https://www.arb.ca.gov/app/emsinv/fcemssumcat/fcemssumcat2016.php> [3] <https://rmi.org/insight/gas-stoves-pollution-health/> [4] https://www.ethree.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/E3_Residential_Building_Electrification_in_California_April_2019.pdf [5] <https://innovation.luskin.ucla.edu/california-building-decarbonization/>
- Natural gas accounts for nearly two-thirds of GHG emissions in Sacramento residences and the remainder from electricity use will decline significantly as SMUD continues to add renewables to its portfolio. We cannot ever achieve the 2045 goal of zero carbon without eliminating this fossil fuel from our buildings, most immediately in new construction. Do not be distracted by self-serving industry propaganda: propane and patio gas grills are tiny, insignificant contributors that are not part of electrification.
- The Final report is comprehensive, aggressive and provides sufficient guidance and must be adopted. It is critical that the State Legislative Changes that become proposed for the Year One Projects include laws that protect the future use of existing transportation corridors capable of the Zero Emission Bike and Rail Alternative. The final reports provide excellence guidance. I encourage and urge the commission members and the public to visit TheZEBRATrain.org to see what is required to meet the aggressively important Shared Mobility Goals of the MCCC. A battery powered train set silently and cleanly serving neighborhoods, business districts, schools, Churches, Libraries and entertainment venues is the future. Where ZEBRA Trains are possible the locations and corridors must be protected until the funding is provided. I've mentioned before the historic Walnut Grove Branch Line from Downtown Sacramento to the Freeport area and beyond. This exists today, a useable corridor! The future of the ZEBRA train on this corridor must be

protected by legislative action. Current plans have numerous street crossings on the historic Walnut Grove Branch line being removed which, when the ZEBRA is installed, will drastically increase the cost. Protect this corridor, protect all corridors, allow Shared Mobility to be shared with Active Transportation, provide multiple alternatives, spare the air, save the planet, ride the Zebra. I look forward to working with the necessary individuals and agencies to bring the ZEBRA to life. Visit TheZEBRATrain.org

- I was made aware of this pending legislation regarding the elimination of natural gas for residential use for new construction and potentially for resale of existing homes. I cannot share with you how strongly I disagree with the thought process and analysis. Natural gas provides a safe link to power that would only come from a single source with your potential plan. This very well could be a safety issue for residents and in particular elderly residents. I am amazed that this is even a consideration when we have so many pressing issues within the City of Sacramento that really need the attention of the City Council. You may sir, remember us my wife Virginia Varela and I are multiple property owners within the City providing safe and habitable housing. And our roles as COO of Golden Pacific Bank with my wife Virginia Varela, President of Golden Pacific Bank. We understand the challenges that face the City all too well as property owners, consumers, worshipers and supporters of the City and its management and challenges but I strongly request that more thought be invested in this proposed project. I received this information form www.savemynaturalgas.org. Respectfully, Malcolm F. Hotchkiss
- PLEASE ADOPT THIS REPORT. I encourage you all to take into consideration the bigger picture that climate change poses. Carbon Neutrality is a goal that every county, city, and state should be trying to achieve and Sacramento can help lead this movement. Even if somehow, you decide to put this issue off until 2030, youth voices like me will find a way to adopt this report whether in it is your time as a council or not. This is an issue that cannot be put on hold any longer so I STRONGLY encourage the adoption of this report. Hello, My name is Reagan Mar. I am a sophomore at C.K. McClatchy Senior High School. I want to see direct action addressing the climate crisis established upon this city. The Mayors' Commission on Climate Change has worked on a draft of recommendations that will take "unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society." Before going to an educational climate change summer camp, I was ignorant of an issue that affects my life with every action I take, but I now am able to understand that our actions—the the actions we take every day and have established as our norm—are leading to the demise of our society. We, in Sacramento, may just shrug our shoulders as it downpours one day and is 103o the next or when a friend asks whether you would like to go skiing on the fourth of July in California. We shrug it off, but I can guarantee you that the 30 million people who rely on Lake Chad—which now covers less than 10% of its size from the 1960s—or the 1.2 million Kenyans who had to abandon their nomadic lifestyle—which they had done so for generations—as they are too weak to walk with a lack of food and water from the sun's draining radiation, these people don't just shrug off the existential issue many of them are not even aware of. Our whole planet is a community. The pressure systems, ocean currents, and atmosphere work together as to moderate our planet to make it inhabitable. The numbingly cold brine that Antarctica sheds aids the unbearable heat along the equator. A sandstorm in the Sahara helps spread nutrients throughout the Amazon rainforest. Our planet has established a way for everything to live in harmony; however, we have destroyed that harmony with climate change, and this recommendation can help re-establish that harmony we once lived on. As California's capital, Sacramento should/can be leading the example that all counties, cities, and states should have in place. Carbon emissions may only sound like two words, but these two words are destroying the balance of the Earth and the lives of millions around the world. I understand that businesses have been hurt by COVID and recent break-ins, but these shouldn't stop you from realizing that, like COVID, carbon emissions face as a public health crisis to the people of Sacramento as well as the world. The combustion of fossil fuels creates unhealthy levels of particulate matter that pollutes our air. Similar to latent heat, methane, nitrous oxide, chlorofluorocarbons, and ozone; CO2 (carbon emissions) is trapping the earth's outgoing energy and destroying the atmosphere's harmony. So please, in making your decision, yes think about the businesses—but know that their fossil fuel motivated interests that push this draft till' 2030 (and if not beyond)—is not doing anything for society but putting the Earth's greatest issue on pause rather than working up the balls to face it. This issue needs to be addressed and I will not stand as nothing is being done when my future is being thrown around in your hands.

- Covid-19! Climate Change! Heart disease! Wake up! Look at how we treat animals. Oy! What do we expect when we torture animals for food? Ignorance of how we farm animals makes good people do terrible things. If factory farms and slaughterhouses had glass walls we would say "No More". This global pandemic is the perfect wake-up call for all of us to emphasize Plant Rich Diets and Plant Forward Consumption. It's good for the planet, good for us and good for the well-being of all conscious beings. Thank you for caring.
- I infer from reading the commission's summary report that the plan is to graft our existing fossil fuel lifestyles onto PVs and windmills. I don't think this is realistic. Although I did not read the technical reports, I expect they contain the same sort of well-meaning wish lists that I first saw when I was on the Sacramento Environmental Commission in the 1990s. And because the price signals are all wrong, I expect similar results, namely mostly a failure to achieve the stated goals. What's wrong with the price signals? Fossil fuel energy is far too cheap, by 2-3 orders of magnitude. Unless that changes substantially, key economic forces will remain opposed to these plans. Technologically, while it may be possible to achieve these goals for limited populations, there is no way this kind of solution can be adopted worldwide, due to resource constraints: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DU6gWZav2T8> As Einstein said, 'You can't solve a problem using the same mindset that created it.' And I fear that standard mainstream thinking is using an outdated mindset. I have created a 2-page chart that attempts to compare and contrast the outdated mechanical mindset with the biological mindset I believe is our best hope: <http://bio-paradigm.blogspot.com/> I have also written up some of these ideas in more depth in a couple of papers that I previously shared with the commission, but I am not confident that commissioners actually received the information. Admittedly, they are a bit dense, but not terribly long. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256048802_Sustainable_Investment_Means_Energy_Independence_From_Fossil_Fuels https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333581837_Is_it_true_that_'Small_Is_Beautiful' Lastly, I would like to suggest one very noticeable and feasible measure that can be implemented very soon – banning leafblowers. They are ubiquitous, very noisy, very smelly and dusty, bad for gardens – and completely unnecessary, as the tasks in question are well within human capability. Banning leafblowers and other landscaping machines is an easy first step to practice a new paradigm. If we cannot even stop using leafblowers, we deserve to be toast. So I have constructed a little plan: <http://motherearthhome.blogspot.com/> Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
- We appreciate all of the excellent work that the Climate Commission has done, particularly on the Green Infrastructure portion of the draft report. As we have said in prior comments, we work in Sacramento City and County. Our comments are based on our experience there, but many of them may also apply to the City of West Sacramento. We are very pleased that the report recognizes the critical importance of trees and of doing everything possible to retain and care for existing trees and “make it less easy to remove them without good cause”. It takes years or decades for new trees to provide the same benefits, including carbon absorption that older, well established trees provide. The City of Sacramento needs to revise and strengthen its tree ordinance so that it does a better job of protecting existing trees. The City should take action on this as fast as possible and definitely within the first year of adoption of the Commission's report. The City simply cannot afford to keep losing healthy trees that could and should be preserved. If West Sacramento has the same or similar problems, they too need to urgently address their Tree Ordinance. We remain pleased that the Commission has chosen to address the glaring inequity between wealthier neighborhoods that have tree canopy and poorer neighborhoods that don't. Trees help clean dirty air and their presence significantly reduces heat island effect. This is crucial to human health and the much worse toll that COVID-19 has taken on poor people and people of color underscores the importance of addressing the lack of trees in Sacramento's (and presumably West Sacramento's) poorer neighborhoods as fast as possible. In our previous comments we pointed out that Sacramento's existing (1992) Tree Management Plan was written in such a way that many of the front yard trees that could have provided shade to the sidewalks and streets in those neighborhoods were eliminated from city care and died even though property taxes in those neighborhoods still include the landscape and lighting fees that were once used to take care of those front yard trees. That inequity needs to be corrected. We are pleased that his final Commission draft discusses the need for a public mechanism to pay for the maintenance of front yard trees

that shade sidewalks and streets. We very much agree with all the ways the Commission recommends involving neighborhood people, including young people, around the planting, care and maintenance of trees. We hope some of them will come to see trees as a career opportunity. We are glad to see the thoughtful discussion of providing sufficient water for trees, including finding ways to provide grey water systems in poorer neighborhoods. We agree with the Commission calling out the importance of planting front yard/parkway trees and trees on commercial corridors as part of making these streets cooler, pleasanter and more walkable and bikeable. In addition to commercial corridors, we think that the removal of so many trees from Sacramento's Central Business District and the resultant heat island effect also needs to be addressed. Large numbers of people work and visit the Central Business District and will be impacted by increasing heat island effect as temperatures continue to rise. Thank-you for supporting the need for permeable pavements. Getting an ordinance in place to mandate this should be one of the things done in the first year after the Commission report is adopted. Thank-you also for supporting the cash for grass incentive to encourage people to develop drought tolerant landscapes. We would also like to see the development of a cash for removal of cement from parkway strips program to address parkway strips in both commercial and residential districts that once provided space for trees, but have since been cemented over. Sacramento was in the middle of developing a Tree Master Plan, but that work stopped more than a year ago. It needs to be resumed so that the planting and maintenance of public trees (in parkway strips, front yards in poor neighborhood that lack parkway strips, public parks and other city property is dealt with in a coherent way. West Sacramento may need to update or create a similar plan. This work should be completed in the first year after the Commission report is adopted. Finally, as we said in our previous comments we want to see a higher canopy goal than the Commission recommends. We want 25% canopy by 2025, 35% by 2030 and 45% by 2040. Thank-you for this opportunity to comment.

- I am writing to urge all commissioners to approve the draft report and recommendations at their final meeting on June 29th 2020. I have participated throughout the public process for the Mayors Commission on Climate Change and strongly support the recommendations in the Draft Report. Excellent work was done in each of the TAC groups with important oversight by the Equity committee. During this process Sacramento joined a growing number of cities in declaring that we are in a climate emergency. This further recognizes the climate crisis we are all in. A second crisis, the Covid-19 pandemic, is also underway now and further underlines the urgency for taking action. The speed and magnitude of the pandemic clearly shows us how those most vulnerable are the greatest impacted in these crises. There are strong links between these crises and we will address both with actions included in the Draft report. The great work done by the Commission and staff moves us in the right direction to address current and future impacts from these crises. There is also a critical need to implement priority actions much sooner than the current 2045 timeline. Our best available science informs us that the current decade is critical and we must do everything possible by 2030. The health and safety of our families, including our children and grandchildren, is at stake too. I urge commissioners to approve the draft report and recommendations at their final meeting on June 29th 2020. I also urge all commissioners to pledge to stay involved and make effective implementation of the recommendations in the report a top priority. Sincerely, Dale Steele
- I am writing to voice my support of the draft report of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change. The adoption of the commission's recommendations is a minimum measure that must be taken. Weakening, halting, or postponing them would be a direct disservice to the future generation of children and grandchildren who will have to most acutely live the effects of climate chaos. I am a mother of two teenagers who have grown up along the banks of the American River. I hear the worry and sense of foreboding that their future is at risk. I have promised them that I would do everything in my power to help stop climate change. Today that means writing you a letter. I ask that you boldly and bravely forge the path of strong climate action. Thank you for hearing my concerns.
- Hi, I am a Climate Change educator from UC Davis. The SCIENCE is CLEAR, the need to ACT is URGENT. Please do not be fooled by fossil fuel interests (like "SaveOurNaturalGas") challenging the need to electrify homes. We need to move AWAY from all fossil fuels and transition to alternative and renewable energy sources... IMMEDIATELY. Thank You! Tom Suchanek, Ph.D., UC Davis

- Hello I'm writing asking you to work towards fighting our climate crisis. An equity framework was created for the climate commission and prioritizing these measures will fully improve our communities. I'm getting married this Sunday and I'm hoping to maybe have children one day. But I can't even imagine if the environment will be breathable by the time my child grows up! If we don't address the climate crisis now, we are fully giving up on future generations. You're entire job is to work for the people, for your communities, to better their lives and futures. How can you say you're doing that if you're not working on fighting the climate crisis that's destined to destroy future generations if we don't fight now.
- Hello commissioners, My name is Eleanor Love, I attend CK McClatchy High and am involved in multiple youth organizations in Sacramento County. So far, this year has been no easy feat and I know each of you do not take your responsibilities lightly. The recent events occurring around the country, as well as the global pandemic, have revealed many aspects of our system - both at the national level and the local level - that have been overlooked and that can be improved upon. Sacramento's response to climate change and sustainability is just one of those issues that must be addressed and acted upon. My peers and I care greatly about sustainability in Sacramento; while we can protest, petition, and spread the word, our future ultimately rests upon the shoulders of our elected officials - the decisions you come to. Youth are exhausted of hearing empty promises from those in office, which is why I'm sending you this letter to urge you to approve the climate recommendations that are nearly two years in the making. With our elected officials, we can truly make change, and make good on those promises that have been made to the youth of Sacramento and beyond. In the era of COVID-19, we have seen a glimpse of what a sustainable future might look like. With pollution levels down and industrial waste output slowed, environments all over the world have been able to thrive and mend from the effects of humans. This is what the future could look like with your help. We're quickly running out of time for a climate solution, but you can help pave a way forward and ensure that I, along with my fellow classmates, friends, and peers, have a long, sustainable future ahead of us. We have done our part by being vocal, by marching in the streets, by contacting our elected officials - and now I'm asking you to do yours. Thank you for your time. Eleanor Love
- RMI supports the adoption of the final report. I submit the following comments on behalf of Rocky Mountain Institute, an independent, nonpartisan nonprofit whose mission is to transform global energy use to create a clean, prosperous, and secure low carbon future. RMI greatly admires the Mayor's Commission on Climate Change and the ambitious recommendations in its draft report, especially its recommendations to electrify the built environment. The building sector is too often neglected in proposals to reduce carbon emissions, and we applaud the Commission for acknowledging the critical role that buildings play in addressing our climate challenge. In addition to reducing emissions, electrifying buildings will reduce air pollution, improve public health, and support job creation. MIT research shows buildings are the number one source of premature deaths from combustion emissions in California [1]. According to CARB's emissions inventory, in the Sacramento Metropolitan Air District buildings emit 3 tons of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) per day, while light duty passenger vehicles emit 2 tons per day and power plants emit 0.5 tons per day [2]. In Sacramento, as well as statewide, the buildings sector emits six times as much nitrogen dioxide as the state's power plants, demonstrating California's success in regulating power plant emissions and failure to address building emissions. And building emissions do not impact everyone equally. Low-income communities and communities of color are disproportionately burdened by pollution [3]. Fossil fuel pollution from buildings is preventable through electrification, and multiple studies have shown electrifying buildings is the least-cost path to decarbonizing the building sector [4]. Now is a critical time for the cities to support building electrification. A recent UCLA study found that even when accounting for losses in the fossil fuel industry, electrifying all of California's existing and new buildings by 2045 would create over 100,000 jobs [5]. By adopting the Commission's recommendations to electrify new and existing buildings, Sacramento and West Sacramento will ensure a cleaner, safer, and healthier future for its residents and demonstrate significant climate leadership for other cities to follow. [1] <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-1983-8> [2] <https://www.arb.ca.gov/app/emsinv/fcemssumcat/fcemssumcat2016.php> [3] <https://rmi.org/insight/gas-stoves-pollution-health/> [4] https://www.ethree.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/E3_Residential_Building_Electrification_in_California_April_2019.pdf [5] <https://innovation.luskin.ucla.edu/california-building-decarbonization/>

- Please adopt the climate recommendations that have been in the making for nearly two years. In the era of COVID-19, we have seen a glimpse of what a more sustainable future could look like. With pollution levels down and industrial waste output slowed, environments and ecosystems everywhere have been able to thrive and mend from the effects of humans. This is what the future could look like. The future of youth ultimately rests upon the shoulders of elected officials - the decisions you make. We are quickly running out of time for a climate solution, but adopting these climate recommendations could help pave the way forward to a more sustainable future. Too many empty promises have been made to young people across the world, so today I'm asking you to please do good on your promise to us.
- My name is Emily Bein and I am about to graduate university and join my masters program in social work to become an LCSW to work with people most affected by economic injustice and emotional trauma. I AGREE that to transition society will take great speed in an unprecedented way, but never has a motivation been greater. Climate change and economic disparity and racial inequalities are inextricably linked and I agree with the equity framework. Certain groups are more vulnerable and underfunded and that must be addressed. Economic success and climate justice has to exist for all. I have fought hard to influence climate policy. To hear the goal of 2030 was wonderful but I haven't seen any actions taken. I've been involved and see small wins and big disappointments, a lot of big promises and a lot of waiting. I'm scared for my future, as we all should be. Even covid was caused by environmental distraction and worsened by air pollution. We have to act now. Please help to save the future for this needs to be addressed as the existential threat it is and ensure a livable world and just society.
- So as someone who is in high school and can't vote yet i am very passionate about the climate crisis we have going on in the world. WE NEED CHANGE. We cannot continue to support and fuel parts of the community that make this world we have burn even faster. We need changes to happen to all parts of the community. This is not something to just ignore. Me and my generation will have to deal with your choices you make. Scientists have said we have only 10 years to make drastic change to the way we live to prevent our air and oceans from pollution and plastics, the atmosphere heating up, ice caps melting, coral reefs dying, animals going extinct, and so much more damage to the earth that you won't have to deal with but i will. Acknowledge this. Know if you don't make changes you are the problem
- As we respond to the ongoing climate crisis, it is vital that we address existing disparities and inequities in our cities. This task has been made simple through the comprehensive equity framework presented in the Technical Report to the Mayor's Commission on Climate Change earlier this month. When implemented, this framework will ensure that climate action and resilience planning in Sacramento and West Sacramento takes into account the most marginalized individuals in our communities, who have been and will continue to be the most impacted by climate change. It is imperative that we confront the climate crisis on a local level, and that implement this framework immediately, so that we may begin to address the ongoing disparities and inequities in our cities. Thank you.
- We are in a Climate Emergency and must mobilize for a just transition to Carbon neutrality. Climate change and the rampant disparities in its impacts and in society overall is a crisis, one that underlies the current Covid19 pandemic. We must act now! This mobilization needs to come from the grassroots with all sectors of society and the economy engaged. Cities, counties and states are by necessity, the foundation of the movement, especially in light of the absence of leadership at the national level. I implore the Commission to adopt this plan NOW and the cities to proceed with implementation immediately. The benefits will reverberate throughout the region, the state, and the nation. I appreciated the opportunity to sit on the Community Health and Resiliency TAC.
- Please vote to approve the recommendations outlined in the Technical Report, specifically the equity recommendations. It is imperative that we protect our most marginalized groups as we address the ongoing climate crisis. Thank you.
- We are writing in strong support of the recommendations of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change. Achieving Carbon Zero by 2045 is not an aspiration. It is a necessity. We were encouraged by the Commission's position that "equity was a key priority ... and was considered across every aspect of the

initiative.” Particularly, we favor the recommendation to mandate all-electric construction to eliminate fossil fuel new in new buildings by 2023 and the recommendation to transition 25% of existing residential and small commercial buildings to all electric by 2030. We also strongly support the recommendations to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled through your tiered “modal hierarchy” that focuses first on active transportation, then public transit, and finally on zero-emission vehicles. Lastly, we urge you to take seriously your pledge to “ensure fair and equitable outcomes while avoiding unintended harm to marginalized communities.” We note the recent UCLA study, reported last week in the Los Angeles Times, that found: “... people living in areas more likely to be ‘disadvantaged communities’ — defined by state officials as having high levels of unemployment, poverty, pollution and/or health conditions such as heart disease and asthma — use half as much energy, on average, as people in wealthier areas.” You took to heart your mandate from the Mayors to be “bold and audacious.” To do anything less would be a disservice to our communities. Thank you for setting our two cities firmly on the path to “sustainable, equitable, and responsible growth.”

- YES [to adoption of final report]! Especially the Year One Projects! As we look towards implementation of the Cities' climate strategies and actions to reach carbon zero, I offer the following resources and tools, and strongly encourage the Commission, Mayor Steinberg, Mayor Cabaldon, and the climate staff of both cities to utilize and/or incorporate the following in your work, to the furthest extent possible. These can support and supplement the Equity Recommendations, the Foundational Principles, and help center meaningful community-driven decision-making by, and engagement and empowerment of, those most disadvantaged and historically marginalized in our communities. The tools/resources include: 1) U.S. Call to Action on Climate, Health, and Equity: A Policy Action Agenda - lists ten policy recommendations to provide a roadmap to develop coordinated strategies for simultaneously tackling climate change, health, and equity (see: <https://climatehealthaction.org/>) 2) A Green Stimulus to Rebuild Our Economy - a "menu" of solutions, you can adapt for Cities' purposes (see: https://medium.com/@green_stimulus_now/a-green-stimulus-to-rebuild-our-economy-1e7030a1d9ee) 3) Five Principles for a Just Recovery - from the People's Bailout (see here, scroll down: <https://thepeoplesbailout.org/>) 4) Health (and Equity) in All Policies (HiAP) - an approach to policy- and decision-making that works to incorporate health and equity considerations in all policies (see model ordinance: https://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/HiAP_ModelOrdinance_FINAL_20150728.pdf) 5) Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) - a tool/method to evaluate policy and planning decisions and actions through a public health and equity lens (learn more about HIAs here: <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/health-impact-project/health-impact-assessment>) Thank you again for your leadership and for taking bold, necessary, strong actions now!
- Support!!!! Please adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees. Mayor Steinberg recently pledged to "dedicate the remainder of [his] elected service over the next four and a half years to doing all [he] can to end systemic racism in Sacramento." Following through on his commitment to climate action is an essential part of this pledge. Black, Indigenous, People of Color are subject to disproportionate impact from one or more environmental hazards, likely to experience disparate implementation of environmental regulations and socioeconomic investments, and are underrepresented in the policy setting or decision-making process. In California, according to a recent study from UCLA, people living in disadvantaged communities — defined by state officials as having high levels of unemployment, poverty, pollution and/or health conditions such as heart disease and asthma — use half as much energy, on average, as people in wealthier area. In order to dismantle systemic racism in Sacramento, the Mayor and this Commission must address environmental racism. I hope that you will take the minimal first step towards a just transition to carbon neutrality and climate justice. Adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees.
- I love Sacramento, and the potential that our magical city has to be a true leader on the global stage in climate action. The Sacramento community is very supportive of all the goals and targets outlined in the Climate Commission recommendations. We need to make this transition as quickly as possible. We MUST pass an electrification ordinance by 2021, so that new buildings don't have to incur the unnecessary cost of adding gas lines, so that we can lower the cost of new buildings, and slow the use of natural gas. This is just

the first, easy step, it's a low hanging fruit that many other California cities have already enacted. It's really a no-brainer. There's no need to wait. Even PG&E supports the electrification ordinance. I also support the commission's recommendations that we follow the CALGreen Tier 2 requirements for electric vehicle charging. Please take this easy and impactful step for our community. We need this NOW. Thank you.

- To the Commission, My name is Pat Lopez. By trade I am a self-employed fireplace technician, We have thousands of clients who have hearth products, many of which who have gas operated fireplaces. With relation to gas fireplaces, great strides have been made over the past decades to make these products more than just aesthetically pleasing. There are energy efficiency benefits as well, which include heating for homes and closed combustion chambers so that there is no cold air infiltration to the home while they are in use. The Hearth, Patio & Barbecue Association (HPBA), a not for profit organization has been heavily involved in the advancement of "environmentally responsible" hearth products for years. They work with hearth manufacturers in evolving products so that they create far less emissions than what hearth products have produced in the past. In fact, they have an affiliate based here in California, of which I am a board member of. Should you need to contact them, their number is (626) 237-1200, All of that said however, I would rather speak to you about the proposal to adopt the final report in relation to Climate Change. Although we can all agree that global warming is real and needs to be addressed, I question that the aggressive stance being taken here isn't without negative consequences. I ask you to please consider these factors: With the intent to convert to electricity solely produced by wind and solar - in order to do this and keep up with demand, we become dependent on favorable weather patterns. Numerous days with cloudy weather and no wind will create shortages. If we eliminate gas we no longer have that option as a backup. Admittedly, California has an aggressive strategy for reducing greenhouse gases. Due to the COVID 19 Pandemic, this strategy has been greatly effected. In a letter obtained by CalMatters, California EPA Secretary Jared Blumenfeld laid out plans for re-examining the program and whether it's likely to meet its goals. Please read this article: <https://www.cbs8.com/article/news/local/california/california-re-evaluating-its-landmark-climate-strategy/509-53bbc7b8-ea9e-4e37-a4d9-ac932522546e?fbclid=IwAR0oUI5nX5F9WGH3j-lkAHltowfIGfajGoTuMmKUCShidbbm5XgHsjToPTc> In an article written by Rob Nikolewski In The San Diego Union Tribune dated Sunday, May 7th, 2020 he points out a lot of problems across the board that have come about due to the COVID 19 Pandemic. These problems are very concerning. Please read this article: <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/business/energy-green/story/2020-05-15/is-the-covid-19-pandemic-good-news-or-bad-news-for-renewable-energy> Thank you for your time. I am always available for further discussion. My number is (858) 663-5072. Sincerely, Pat Lopez
- Honorable Mayor and Climate Commissioners, I am writing to voice my support of the draft report of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change and the measures as they have been developed by the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). The adoption of these recommendations is a minimum measure that must be taken and any intention of weakening, halting, or postponing them would be a direct disservice to our community and this entire process of public engagement. I have lived in Sacramento since September when I moved here to serve as a CivicSpark Fellow at the California Energy Commission. As part of my volunteer engagement project, I worked with the City of Sacramento to host a 12 hour livestream event for Earth Day. Even though I just moved here, I love this City and have been excited by the work being done locally to address the climate crisis through a just, equitable framework. I believe Sacramento can be a leader on climate action for mid size, growing cities across the country. The first step to earning this title is for the Commission to adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees. As you are aware, the Climate Commission's work has spanned countless hours of discussion from the TACs, city and local government staff, and most importantly volunteer participation from members of the community to ensure that equity and climate justice are centered. These recommendations come from the people of Sacramento and you should listen to them. The year one plans outlined in the draft report must be implemented immediately, integrated into our response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Importantly, the plans include establishing senior level positions within each city that report directly to the mayor and city council to oversee all aspects of climate-change planning and implementation. This is a necessary step to ensure that the cities are held accountable for meeting the goals outlined in the draft report. Without accountability and effective implementation, the targets in the

report are empty promises. As steps are taken by the cities to recover from the economic devastation of COVID-19, the climate impact of all decisions needs to be a key determining factor in which policies to enact. Corporate interests cannot take priority over reducing our carbon emissions and minimizing the devastating impact that the climate crisis will have on our community if we don't act. Mayor Steinberg recently pledged to "dedicate the remainder of [his] elected service over the next four and a half years to doing all [he] can to end systemic racism in Sacramento." Following through on his commitment to climate action is an essential part of this pledge. Black, Indigenous, People of Color are subject to disproportionate impact from one or more environmental hazards, likely to experience disparate implementation of environmental regulations and socioeconomic investments, and are underrepresented in the policy setting or decision-making process. In California, according to a recent study from UCLA, people living in disadvantaged communities — defined by state officials as having high levels of unemployment, poverty, pollution and/or health conditions such as heart disease and asthma — use half as much energy, on average, as people in wealthier area. In order to dismantle systemic racism in Sacramento, the Mayor and this Commission must address environmental racism. I hope that you will take the minimal first step towards a just transition to carbon neutrality and climate justice. Adopt the draft recommendations as developed by the Technical Advisory Committees. Thank you for your time, Hannah Schanzer, CivicSpark Fellow

- Yes, please finalize [the report] *including* the commitment to cutting out deadly gas appliances. Thank you for all your great work on this, it is an excellent step forward for Sacramento. It is especially important to finalize your recommendations on building electrification. This is an absolute must for the community and the world. Gas appliances poison people and the environment. It is long past time to remove them. It *especially* doesn't make sense to cause respiratory harm during this respiratory pandemic. Stand up for BIPOC folks and the environment and make sure we electrify the region, especially in houses.
- My name is Vi Than. I am a college student and have lived in the United States for more than half my life. In the time spent living here, I have had the chance to be more aware of the privileges I have that some people in certain communities do not have. Sometimes I feel helpless and overwhelmed when seeing the incredible task we have at hand of bettering the earth and our communities. But in the end, the sense of urgency still remains. We have to do something - anything - now. Therefore, I ask of you to take the steps needed towards a future with substantially lower levels of air pollution that only we can control, and I ask of you to take on the responsibility of investing in communities that have the right to have a life with the basics of health and home. Please approve the Climate Commission's draft report and the recommendations provided by the Sacramento community, for the sake of ours and the environment's welfare. I look forward to the future of Sacramento with your help and guidance. Sincerely, Vi Than
- I strongly support the recommendations of the Commission. The Commission has called for bold, transformative action to achieve deep reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, improve public health outcomes, and create a more equitable and resilient future for all. The strategies set forth in the Commission's report are both ambitious and achievable, appropriately reflecting the level of urgency necessary to address the defining crisis of our time.
- As a resident of Sacramento, and a public health professional working at the intersection of health, equity, and climate change, I implore you to keep in mind the original purpose of this Commission was to develop strategies to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045. If you believe this can be achieved without simultaneously cutting emissions as well as providing more equitable, targeted resources and support to the most impacted communities (low-income and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) you do not understand the true task at hand. Do not allow the uproar of the most powerful to sway your stance on this matter. Yes, COVID-19 has changed our reality, but only to allow millions of Americans and Sacramento residents to wake up to the fact that our current systems were designed to oppress low-income and non-white communities so White men could profit. We need bold leadership, not more of the same, with 'leaders' succumbing to the demands of corporations and businesses. Please approve these recommendations, and do your part to ensure the Equity framework is upheld and accountability and transparency are incorporated into the implementation of these measures. Sincerely, Trinity Smyth, MPH

- Yes, Adopt the Final Report, but include a Plan to Limit Global Warming to 1.5 Degrees C. Thank you for the Final Mayor's Commission on Climate Change Report. I am sad it does not address the questions I asked in previous comments, but this Final Report appears to be the best that you can do at this time. We need a Plan to Limit Global Warming to 1.5 Degrees C. Climate Scientist Peter Kalmus has given us a book that can help us develop a Plan. I hope reading and discussing Being the change: Live Well and Spark a Climate Revolution will become part of the recommendations of the Mayor's Commission on Climate Change report. Peter Kalmus is an atmospheric scientist at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory. With the help of meditating 2 hours a day Mr. Kalmus has found ways to decrease his CO2 emissions from 20 tonnes a year to 2 tonnes a year. He and his family live on one tenth (10%) of the fossil fuels that the average American emits. According to the following article, the world must decrease world CO2 emissions 7.6% a year in 2020 and every year for the next 10 years to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C.

<https://www.carbonbrief.org/analysis-coronavirus-set-to-cause-largest-ever-annual-fall-in-co2-emissions>

Luckily Sheltering in Place for the Coronavirus has helped the world decrease world CO2 emissions 8% in 2020. What are we going to do in 2021 to decrease world CO2 emissions 7.6% a year? I believe the world and Sacramento must Shelter in Place as much as possible for at least the next 10 years in order to protect us from Covid19 and protect us from Dangerous Climate Change. Hopefully the recommendations in the Mayor's Commission on Climate Change Report and the ideas in Being the change: Live Well and Spark a Climate Revolution will help us decrease world CO2 emissions 7.6% a year for at least the next 10 years as shown in the following table. The number below the year is the percent of 2020 CO2 emissions that must be reached to be on track to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees C according to the above Carbonbrief article.

2020	100	2021	92.4	2022	85	2023	79	2024	73	2025	67	2026	62	2027	58	2028	53	2029	49	2030	45	2031	42	2032	39	2033	36	2034	33	2035	31	2036	28	2037	26	2038	24	2039	22	2040	21	2041	19	2042	18	2043	16	2044	15	2045	14	2046	13	2047	12	2048	11	2049	10	2050	9
------	-----	------	------	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	---

Thank you for trying to do our part to limit global warming to 1.5 Degrees C, Sincerely, Bruce Burdick, M.D.
- Adopt the Final Report and include nuclear war as a threat to climate change. Thank you for the Final Mayor's Commission on Climate Change Report. Nuclear War is a threat to Climate Change. If you look at minute 44 of Dr. Tillman Ruff's Deakin Oration at the following website:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c5PT6CKryw> you will see that a nuclear war between India and Pakistan with just 100 nuclear weapons would lead to 1 degree C of global cooling. If the United States and Russia were to have a nuclear war, there would be 10 degrees of global cooling. A nuclear war between India and Pakistan with just 100 nuclear weapons might lead to the deaths of 2 billion people.

<https://www.psr.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/two-billion-at-risk.pdf> All the nations with nuclear weapons have more than 13,000 nuclear weapons. At minute 3:40 of the following website climate scientists Lonnie Thompson discusses how our CO2 emissions are melting Himalayan glaciers. India and Pakistan depend on water from these glaciers. As the glaciers get smaller, India and Pakistan may have a nuclear war over water.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2of9A6R1zjU> It is time to protect our children from nuclear war, and get rid of all nuclear weapons. The Mayor's Commission on Climate Change should encourage Sacramento residents to call their Congresspersons and Senators, pressuring them to negotiate with other countries to end nuclear weapons. Sacramento residents can ask their Congresspersons and Senators to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons that was adopted by a United Nations Conference vote of 122 States in favor (with one vote against and one abstention) at the United Nations on 7 July 2017, and opened for signature by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 September 2017. Sacramento can define a (science based) Ruler of the Universe as "that which established the laws of science" in this universe. Sacramento residents can read in Isaiah 2 that "In the last days" .. the (science based) Ruler of the Universe will judge between the nations and will settle disputes for many peoples. They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation will not take up sword against nation, nor will they train for war anymore. What evidence is there that these are the last days? The (science based) Ruler of the Universe has spoken through 20,000 world scientists giving us a World Scientists Warning to Humanity: A Second Notice.

<https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/67/12/1026/4605229> Their graphs show decreasing freshwater per capita, decreasing fish and other animals taken from the oceans, decreasing vertebrate species, decreasing forests, increasing dead zones in the ocean, increasing CO2 emissions, and increasing

global temperatures. Their graphs could have included decreasing top soil associated increasing world population. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/only-60-years-of-farming-left-if-soil-degradation-continues/> Their graphs could have included decreasing insect populations with their graphs: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/feb/10/plummeting-insect-numbers-threaten-collapse-of-nature> More than 40% of insect species are declining and a third are endangered, the analysis found. The rate of extinction is eight times faster than that of mammals, birds and reptiles. The total mass of insects is falling by a precipitous 2.5% a year, according to the best data available, suggesting they could vanish within a century. The planet is at the start of a sixth mass extinction in its history, with huge losses already reported in larger animals that are easier to study. But insects are by far the most varied and abundant animals, outweighing humanity by 17 times. They are “essential” for the proper functioning of all ecosystems, the researchers say, as food for other creatures, pollinators and recyclers of nutrients. Sacramento can call on Sacramento Area Congregations Together to advocate signing of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Sacramento can call on Sacramento Area Congregations Together to discuss the World Scientists Warning to Humanity: A Second Notice. Is the (science based) Ruler of the Universe speaking to us through these 20,000 world scientists that have co-signed the Warning? To put the information of the World Scientists Warning together, one might say that the forests have been taking CO2 out of the air. With more people, more forests have been cut down to build homes and cities and grow food. With fewer trees to take CO2 out of the air, atmospheric CO2 rises. The CO2 in the air also comes from burning coal, oil and natural gas. The Warning could have shown rising CO2 emissions from burning more coal, oil and natural gas. The rising CO2 in the atmosphere traps heat, and that leads to rising global temperatures. The paper has several suggestions for addressing these problems. One includes charging the true price of things. If you google “the true price of gasoline \$15 a gallon”, there is a video with 4 U.C. scientists listed as references.

- We need to move toward all electric. Gas appliances are deadly. They literally cause asthma in kids and can make indoor air so bad it violates national health standards. Additionally, electric can become a renewable resource, moving toward all electric would create jobs and cut emissions.
- Local noise ordinances and business hours should be updated for our changing climate. Earlier start times will prevent heat illness and staggered office hours will alleviate traffic congestion.
- Dear Mayor Steinberg: I am writing to you to urge you to support an electrification ordinance in Sacramento to electrify our homes and utilities. This would take a significant step towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improve indoor air quality, which would, consequently, improve public health. I am sure you have heard that the Arctic is experiencing record high temperatures, temperatures that are in the triple digits, and know the devastating consequences of this. Every municipality, city, township across this nation has to take a strong stand on climate change. There is no time to lose. Already 30 cities in California have passed an electrification ordinance. I hope Sacramento will be added to this list. SMUD and PG&E are onboard. Let's get this show on the road! Sincerely, Carmen Pereira
- Requires amendment. Anthem is currently working on two new mixed-use multifamily rental and retail projects in downtown Sacramento. We aim to do the right thing for the physical place we build in, the community we operate in and the people who use our buildings. To that effect we are not opposed to the principle of reducing greenhouse gasses. However, we have to balance that principle within the harsh realities of the market. We chose to eliminate the use of natural gas in the residential rental portion of our projects by utilizing the rebate programme for induction cooktops that is offered by SMUD. However, in the retail portion of the project we will, for the time being, continue to offer natural gas. It is still the preferred energy source for restaurant establishments. It also allows us to meet Title 24 compliance without burdening the project with additional envelope upgrades. A policy that mandates the elimination of natural gas in the retail portion of mixed-use buildings, will reduce the viability of mixed-use projects in Sacramento. Firstly, it will make it harder for new retail spaces without natural gas to compete with existing spaces that do have gas. Secondly, having to rely solely on electrical energy in retail areas, will increase the electrical load in the project. The higher electrical loads in turn can trigger costly building envelope upgrades to ensure compliance with current Title 24 requirements. The current approach of providing

incentives, such as the induction cooktop rebate offered by SMUD, is a win-win approach that allows developers to offer a better product to the market, while benefitting the environment through the reducing greenhouse gasses. Our experience in other jurisdictions has been that mandated solutions that reduce market choice, almost always also lead to increased cost, reduced project desirability, and unforeseen consequences once layered in with existing legislative requirements from other jurisdictions. Finally, in the current climate of economic hardship that resulted from Covid 19, new policies that will increase cost can stall or cancel projects. The economic viability of mixed use residential and retail projects has taken a significant turn for the worse in the past three months, with revenues and yield having been rapidly compressed while costs continue to increase. We do not expect a quick recovery, but rather a gradual improvement over time. Adding new legislated cost burdens to projects in the current climate will send the wrong message to the market. We respectfully request that the following be considered: 1. That council opt to expand current incentive programmes to encourage positive behaviour change instead of mandating change by limiting choice. 2. That retail uses be specifically be allowed to continue to use natural gas, until alternative energy sources become more viable. 3. That any new policies be thoroughly vetted for multiplication and layered cost impacts when applied in conjunction with regulations from other jurisdictions (example: Title 24). 4. That, in the current economic climate, council explicitly avoid new policies that increase the cost of building projects, in order to send a positive message to the market about Sacramento remaining open for business.

- I support the adoption of active steps lined out in the final report. Last minute concerns about its relationship to the recent COVID-19 virus are missing the mark. The devastating economic impacts of COVID-19 have taught us that delay and inaction causes far greater costs to society and business than aggressive action. The damage to business and jobs by shutting down our community could have been dramatically reduced had we taken earlier action. The increase in wildfires in recent years and anticipated this year are just one example of the cost of inaction on climate change that has personally touched members of SacEV through loss of life and property. If we attack climate change the global economy should grow BY \$336 trillion in the next 80 years. If we don't, it could shrink by \$600 trillion.
- I also support the comments from SacEV related to Adopting CALGreen Tier 2 standards (Section 3.2 of the Technical Report).
- Reject Built Environment Recommendation #2: Electrification of New Construction: Mandate all-electric construction to eliminate fossil-fuel use in new buildings by 2023, and instead adhere to the state objectives for 100% electrification by 2030. On behalf of the membership of the Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange, we would like to thank the Members of the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change for undertaking this most important issue. The objective to reach a Carbon Zero community is admirable and will lead to many social and environmental benefits. However, our organization has considerable concerns regarding the specific recommendation of a mandate requiring 100% electrification of new construction by 2023. It is our position that the marketplace will more readily adopt changes in behavior through incentives rather than restricting choice. This is especially of concern to the Commercial Construction industry in light of the current COVID-19-induced economic recession. The impact of COVID-19 has caused the first major drop in the national Commercial Construction Index, according to the United States Chamber of Commerce. In Q2 of 2020, the index dropped from 74 points to 56, the single largest quarterly drop in the history of the index. The key drivers to the 18-point drop in the index is the lack in both confidence in the construction market and revenue expectations, which each decreasing by 26 points. A top concern cited by contractors due to COVID-19 is a reduction in the number of construction projects. Unlike many other industries, only about one-third of contractors have reported lay-offs, furloughs or salary reductions, indicating construction has helped to sustain the U.S. economy. While construction has indeed bolstered the Sacramento Region's economy during these uncertain times, the Index's report of the major drop in confidence demonstrates the industry is seeking signs of certainty over the next 12 months to determine how it can best weather the continuation of the coronavirus economy. The recommendations of the commission report requiring 100% electrification of new projects will result in an unfavorable market condition for development interests, and they will respond by building outside of the Cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento. This redirection of investment is likely to disproportionately impact disadvantaged

neighborhoods from enjoying new construction opportunities that would help revitalize their communities, much as the Golden 1 Center sparked a revitalization of Sacramento's urban core. Mandates upon commercial construction will likely redirect Opportunity Zone investments in the regional core, seeing investment moving instead to communities with less stringent building requirements. However, rather rely on speculation, the Commission only need look to Santa Monica for an idea of how this will impact development in Sacramento and West Sacramento. In 2017 the Santa Monica City Council voted to require single-family, duplex, and low-rise multi-family dwellings built in the municipality to achieve net-zero energy (NZE) performance. This was the first ordinance of its kind in the world—and certainly the first in California. However, with its new Santa Monica ordinance, the response from the development community was clear. In 2018 & 2019, the number of single-family housing permits per 1,000 residents decreased to 0.3 permits. However, for the county overall, it increased to 2.2 permits per 1,000 residents. The number of multifamily permits per 1,000 residents decreased to 0 permits. For the county overall, it increased to 1.6 permits per 1,000 residents. When the city council adopted a new mandate to force developers to build all electric, the marketplace responded by going elsewhere. Our concern over strategies outlined in the report go well beyond current State Construction Code mandates, and will result in additional development risk, delays and expense that will be passed onto new homebuyers, similarly impacting disadvantaged families. For every \$1,000 increase in the sale price of a home, 8,870 California households are priced out of home ownership. (<http://nahbnow.com/2020/01/1000-makes-a-big-difference-in-housing-affordability/>) For these reasons, we strongly recommend the commission reject Built Environment Recommendation #2: Electrification of New Construction: Mandate all-electric construction to eliminate fossil-fuel use in new buildings by 2023, and instead adhere to the state objectives for 100% electrification by 2030. Thank you again for your collective efforts. Timothy Murphy, CEO, Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange

- Approximately half of California's residents live in apartments or other multi-unit dwellings (MUD) or homes without garages without access to charging. This is still one of the most significant barriers to greater EV adoption in the region. Lining up Sacramento and West Sacramento with the July 2020 Cal Green Building Codes (Tier 2) relating to EV charging infrastructure in new construction will allow these residents to embrace clean vehicles. They should be able to charge their EVs near their homes while they sleep with the same convenience as residents of single family homes.
- In general, I believe we need to act boldly to quickly address the climate emergency. Listen to local, national, and international experts about the magnitude of changes required to reverse the damaging effects of climate change. We need to invest in our urban and rural landscapes, renewable resources, and public transit. We need to redesign our cities to make them livable for all who wish to thrive here. We also need to stop letting polluters and manufacturers offset the damage they create in the name of consumerism, put a price tag on the damage that they do to our environments and health. Create labor opportunities for residents in 'green' jobs.
- We support the active portions of the final report. Now is the time to move forward with the recommendations made in the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change report. The benefits to the community, including the business community, from today's actions will be substantial. Inaction, on the other hand, will yield damage to our community that makes COVID-19 seem mild in comparison.
- Report Page 10: Please do not call the American River Trail a bike trail. It is for shared use with pedestrians. Calling it a bike trail communicates it is not for pedestrians.
- June 11, 2020 Mayor's Commission on Climate Change RE: North State BIA Comment – Mayor's Commission on Climate Change Report Dear Climate Change Commissioners: On Behalf of the North State Building Industry Association (BIA) we respectfully request that the Commission consider delaying the adoption of the Commission's Carbon Zero Report (Report) until we have a chance to understand the unprecedented circumstances of the COVID-19 global pandemic. The economic impacts of responding to the COVID-19 global pandemic have been extensive for building industry. Trying to absorb the additional cost of the proposed mandates included in the Report and will raise the price of a new homes, add risk to new development projects and delay project construction, pricing new homeowners out of the market and slowing construction starts in Sacramento and West Sacramento. Given our current circumstances, and our

inability to know how we safely move forward resuming normal activities it seems appropriate to delay finalizing the Report under the unprecedented impact COVID-19 has had to our regional economy. This is one area where we are in this together, and it will take our shared partnership to help build a new normal. It is in all our best interests to carefully examine every dollar that is added to the cost of building a new home. In a recent affordability study from the National Association of Home Builders for every \$1,000 increase in the sales-price of a home another 8,870 California households are priced out of home ownership, (<http://nahbnow.com/2020/01/1000-makes-a-big-difference-in-housing-affordability/>). The BIA remains concerned that some of the strategies outlined in the Mayor's Commission on Climate Change goes well beyond the current State Construction Code mandates, resulting in additional development risk, delays and expense that will be passed onto new homebuyers. For instance, going all-electric is still problematic for large residential projects since we do not have reliable technical solutions for energy-efficient on-demand electric water heating, and home heating and cooling units (HVAC). This alone would create additional costs for homeowners, as heating and cooling electrically is not as efficient without deep subsidies to upgrade home components. The building industry is actively seeking new technology and product solutions to reduce GHG production, however we still need to analyze the state-wide electric grid to see if projects can go all-electric. To date we have only seen a few small lot all-electric pilot projects in Sacramento, and those were coordinated and heavily subsidized by SMUD to make them successful. Recent infill projects that have been constructed downtown would not be possible if this mandate was in place.

Built Environment Recommendation #2: Electrification of New Construction Mandate all-electric construction to eliminate fossil-fuel use in new buildings by 2023:

- This proposed mandate is hugely problematic and goes well beyond current state construction code mandates.
- SB 1477 (Stern of 2018) directed the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) and the California Energy Commission (CEC) to start two pilot programs aimed at reducing greenhouse gases – which have been largely interpreted as building all-electric homes. The current focus from the state CPUC and CEC have been to focus on fiscal incentives – not mandates. A key difference to continue to encourage residential development in our current state-wide housing crisis.
- AB 3232 (Friedman of 2018) directed the CEC to study the feasibility of going all electric, especially with millions of electric vehicles soon to be on our roads. However, the state identified that a state-wide study is needed before imposing all-electric mandates.
- Requiring a more stringent building code by a local jurisdiction is permissible, but the local jurisdiction needs to justify the more stringent code. Specifically, the justification must identify special circumstances in the community that are based upon geographical, topographical or climatic findings. Then the jurisdiction would need to pass an ordinance and file the more stringent code with California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). It may be that the Report intends to point Sacramento and West Sacramento towards fiscal incentives from the "building decarb" programs being developed by the CEC and CPUC as a way to refocus these strategies. However, without clear language linking these changes to the current construction code cycle, you are considering adopting energy mandates; ahead of state priorities, without multiple supply chains for all-electric home components, and without knowing if mandating all-electric will negatively impact the cities electrical grids. The State of California already has the most stringent laws in the country for GHG reduction for new development. The most recent set of energy efficiency building codes (2019) will add approximately \$10,000 to the cost of a new home. During the last ten years, energy efficiency standards passed by the CEC have added \$22,000 to \$30,000 in energy efficiency standards per home. The mandates included in the Report will added significantly more cost to homes during a housing crisis and will price many local constituents out of homeownership. Here is a breakdown of cumulative effect of the recently adopted state building standards:
- CEC Residential Energy Efficiency Standards (effective 1/1/10): \$2,500 per home
- HCD Residential Green Building Standards (effective 1/1/11): \$500 - \$2,000 per home
- SFM Residential Fire Sprinklers (effective 1/1/11): \$5,000 - \$6,000 per home
- CEC Residential Energy Efficiency Standards (effective 7/1/14): \$3,000 per home
- CEC Energy Efficiency Standards (effective 1/1/17): \$3,000 per home
- CEC Energy Efficiency and Solar Mandate (effective 1-1-20): \$8,000-\$13,500 per home.

The State of California has implemented a series of new mandatory building standards resulting in the single greatest increase in code-related construction costs ever seen in the history of our state construction code. In just 10 years, the State of California has implemented mandatory building standards that have added an estimated \$22,000 - \$30,000 to cost of building a new home. The

proposed Report goes beyond those state mandates. The Commission should be incentivizing all-electric construction, not mandating it. Thank you for your time and attention. Sincerely, Crisand Giles

- SRBX strongly recommends the commission reject Built Environment Recommendation #2: Electrification of New Construction: Mandate all-electric construction to eliminate fossil-fuel use in new buildings by 2023, and instead adhere to the state objectives for 100% electrification by 2030.
- I support adoption, in full.
- I support the committee's adoption of the report and urge the commission to reject proposals to weaken the recommendation to require zero carbon construction in new buildings. The time for excuses from the Natural Gas industry has passed. Electrification is the best, most scalable building decarbonization technology, and even in West Sacramento, this technology is lower cost, cleaner, and safer than other options. It is also especially notable that PG&E, which serves West Sac and provides gas in Sacramento has expressed support for an update to Title 24 to require all electric new construction.
- I'm appalled that an outside business group is attempting to commandeer the hard work and efforts of the local Mayors' Climate Commission members and disappointed that the Chamber of Commerce is supporting this outside group's effort. The flyer being circulated by the group has flimsy rationale for their position. For example, all electric homes are worth less. I sold my all electric home in Campus Commons and the fact that it was all electric factor was never brought up by my realtor or any of the buyers that were interested in purchasing it. In fact, SMUD has a study that shows the market value of the 2000 all electric homes in their service territory is on par with homes with gas. Or, the suggestion by this industry group that electricity only comes from one source. Electricity comes from a myriad of sources: hydropower, sun, wind, some fossil fuel (which needs to be eliminated), and smaller amounts of geothermal and biogas. This Commission has done exhaustive work and their recommendations must begin to be implemented by our cities to meet the 2030 emergency deadline to mitigate catastrophic climate change--and by waiting, things will exponentially get worse. I was pleased the Commission included this 2030 date and would have liked for them to expedite their implementation schedule, but I plan to work with the Cities, agencies, nonprofits and community groups to the best of my ability to address our warming climate. Outside groups attempting to stand in the way of this noble effort are heartless. Sincerely, Inga Olson
- Furturist Alex Steffen has used the term "predatory delay" to describe the slowing of needed change to prolong a profitable but unsustainable and unjust status quo that will be paid by other people eventually. We must ensure predatory delay does not influence this process as we move forward.
- Thank you Commissioners and all involved in this process for helping our Cities achieve carbon zero. I'm a Sacramento resident and veterinarian passionate about public health, food safety, and climate smart, sustainable agriculture; without significant, rapid action to address climate change, we cannot protect the diverse people, animals, and ecosystems that make our city and State amazing. I strongly urge you to adopt the Commission's Final Report, and in particular, please make sure that the Year One Projects are implemented ASAP. It is critical to ensure healthy and low-carbon food systems for the health of our communities (particularly those most disadvantaged), as well as for the health of our natural and working lands. Local food systems, food waste reduction, and healthy soils are critical components in helping to achieve our climate, environmental sustainability, and public health goals. Please help us be an example of strong, positive change.
- *In-meeting poll results:*
 - Support
 - Sacramento Tree Foundation
 - SMUD
 - 350 Sacramento

- City of Sacramento
- City of Sacramento - DOU
- SacEV
- Sierra Club/Member
- Coalition for Clean Air
- Kaiser Hospital
- Sac State/UC Davis Student - West Sacramento Resident
- Friends of Sutter's Landing Park
- Southside Park resident
- Sacramento resident
- Sacramento Resident
- Private Citizen
- Sacramento Trailnet
- WALKSacramento
- Sacramento DOU
- Sunrise Movement Sacramento, Equity TAC
- SacEV
- NextGen California
- Community Member
- Passionate Citizen
- Self
- self
- Resident of the City of Sacramento
- Sunrise Movement Sacramento
- Sacramento Chapter Citizens' Climate Lobby
- Sacramento Resident
- Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates
- Cool Davis Foundation
- Architect educator Cosumnes River College
- Oppose
 - HPBA-Pacific
 - SRBX
 - Sacramento Resident

Other

- Wouldn't it be great if Sacramento could be the first city of its size to become carbon neutral.!

- Please get serious about air quality improvements. People are leaving Sacramento because of our frequently unhealthy air. It's a coughing shame.
- Please consider employing some homeless to clean the city. Thank you
- Leaf blowers do nothing to enhance the quality of life in our neighborhood. Why does the city allow PM2.5 and PM10 particles to fill the air, our lungs, and houses. What's the point? To punish us for living in an otherwise terrific neighborhood? To keep us busy vacuuming and sweeping--which is how leaves and dust should have been collected in the first place? That must be it! A full employment program for Midtown and pulmonologists at the medical centers.
- No protests, hearings, rallies, marches, UN reports, laws or regulations speak as loudly as the money we spend on gasoline. We have to stop funding oil companies and their politicians at the pump.
- Thanks for opening this discussion up to the public.
- Let's look at how we will finance, in a socially sensitive, inclusive manner, the transition to Carbon Zero. Through public sector finance mechanisms & also very carefully, skillfully chosen public-private partnerships including partnerships with NGO's and with certain crowdsource platforms that may not be based in the Sacramento region, but can help us craft regionally targeted responses. Apologies for submitting more than once; I neglected to add that "financing the transition" includes in-kind measures along with dollar-denominated activity. We have much to learn from the Slow Money Movement and the Sustainable Economies Law Center. There may be some useful framework thinking through the Next System Project, though I am not as confident of this. Please note that in some other localities, innovative financing at large project scale has occurred with unions and pension funds in Cleveland, OH and the Province of Quebec.
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256048802_Sustainable_Investment_Means_Energy_Independence_From_Fossil_Fuels
- More focus on safety please - it wasn't clear to me as a single woman that I could return home in the evening safely, much less by bike, or that there'd be a way someone would know. And give us a way to text message the SacPD please, sometimes audio doesn't seem like a good idea.
- A SeeClickFix for letting people make location-based C-zero suggestions would be great.
- Invite a Brent Toderian to sit down with Sacramento google map and sketch out a city makeover.
- Outreach. Basically it's as if there isn't any. Plus outreach is really easy to f up, esp. since there are interests who really want to f it up. Think about what you can do for visual reminders to create awareness & understanding of urgency, that isn't just PR that the fossilfuelfolk could duplicate the look of.
- Please consider livestreaming or otherwise enabling 'remote attendance' options. Or at the least, take very good notes. Not everyone who is interested can be there.
- Don't work with Carbon 0 as the goal, work toward minimizing *per-resident* carbon emissions. This helps more toward the global goal. With a plain C-0, any people you can keep from moving in, is progress toward goal. Not helpful.
- I am concerned that kids are not "sent out to play" due to an increase in closed school yards. The song wasn't "Me and Julio down at the Starbucks". Parks and greenspace help with improved physical health and anxiety. We need to make sure they remain an integral part of greater Sacramento.
- Great first meeting. I encourage the commission and the TACs to start by defining their risk tolerance. For example, we heard a lot about solar and electric cars, but those are no longer innovative. The woman who talked about being meat free--that's risky! What is the Commission's line between big and bold, and silly and wishful?
- I feel that the next meetings should have been scheduled so people have an understanding of what next. I feel that the public should be able to contribute to all technical groups. I don't know what the end goal is,

are we going to make a plan, or are we going to implement action? It appears that it's hard to follow a plan, and as people change positions, priorities will change. The environment always ends up last on the list, we need a way to bring it up to the most important.

- Yes, It is time to change to whole food plant based diet to help curb climate change and help all of us be healthy. Right now, big pharma, hospitals and many doctors are receiving too much money and using drugs and surgery to take care of preventable diseases, diseases that are prompted by eating animal products.
- Think big. This requires everything on the table and actions at every level.
- What is "carbon zero" and how will you measure progress to your goal of carbon zero? Please post your answer on the home page of your website.
- Sacramento could save billions of KWHs and millions of tons of carbon pollution by getting SMUD to adopt a modern rate structure. Similar to the way the CPUC requires pge, sce, sdge to operate (zero fixed charge, incorporate infrastructure into the electric rate) . SMUD says "We're not regulated, so we can do whatever we want". SMUDs regressive rate structure is opposed by Sierra club, NRDC, and many other groups all over the country. Just google fixed utility rate. SMUD is on the verge of doubling the fixed charge and implemented their "war on solar" - an extra fee on all existing and new solar panels. Jennifer Gress knows all about this issue.
- The planning process and timelines as currently set do not reflect the urgency with which reductions are required to avoid catastrophic loss to our community.
- Please achieve carbon zero by 2030!!
- google fixed elec rate - nationwide controversy
- electrify everything
- Please conduct this commission in an open manner: was any notice given of the TAC meetings? Who is on these TACs? Will members of the public be able to attend? How did you choose TAC members? Do they have the expertise that the commission lacks?
- Focus friendly pedestrian walkability and easy cycling routes when new projects are proposed. When Sacramento is designed with pedestrians and cyclists in mind, many carbon reductions will follow. Sacramento has a proven record of flooding dating back to 1851. Climate change will increase this. It's not fear, it's reality. That puts us in the top of the list of communities that will pay the price for climate change. So we need to be leading the way and taking this very, very seriously.
- This 14 min. video explains the source of wasted electricity, the technology and market in more detail: <http://VortexGreenEnergy.com/video> Our technology is fuel source agnostic, meaning regardless of how electricity is generated, we make it go further, last longer, and serve more customers. Regardless if generation comes from wind, solar, natural gas, hydroelectric, or batteries, the technology increases the efficiency of each. That means installing this technology today helps the Greater Sacramento Area take a leap forward in reducing climate impact while still being relevant and viable in 20 years as sources of electrification change to cleaner sources.
- I am so glad that our local governments are making climate change action a priority. We have the opportunity and obligation to make life for our children and grandchildren better than the future they will face if we continue on our current course of behavior without change.
- It was very disappointing to hear the commissioners talking about needing to balance the economic impact of the climate change recommendations - that's the job for the City. Unless I'm mistaken, the role of this commission is to make the best climate recommendations possible to the city, who will then make their decision based on budgets and feasibility. Additionally, to hear commissioners, especially Vice Mayor Hansen, treat the volunteer TAC members as though they were consultants and expecting them to have a detailed analysis at their fingertips, shows that the commissioners clearly have no respect for the work of the volunteer experts, nor do they understand what they're doing.

- Emitters, Enablers and the Empowered and defining Carbon Zero. With an urgent need to take action, Mayor Steinberg and Mayor Cabaldon are leading the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change to develop a common vision and set of strategies for both cities to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions, referred to as Carbon Zero, by 2045. Will carbon dioxide offsets (Enablers) be available to offset carbon dioxide (Emitters) to net zero (Carbon Zero)? What will Enablers cost? Every pound of carbon dioxide emitted will require an enabling offset to reach net zero or Carbon Zero. If you want to go "all electric" for energy use in the region, first benchmark emitters of carbon dioxide for electricity generation. Data availability and proper use of data will make you empowered in your decision making. This report <http://ugemrp.com/1066/0001/0-016-2017.htm> looks at 2017 data sorted by highest carbon dioxide emitters in the state for electricity generation. You will be competing with electricity users outside of the region for required enabling offsets. Note the total output of carbon dioxide and carbon oxide per kilowatt hour (kWh) in the report. Did you notice PG&E as a generator is high on the list as an emitter of carbon dioxide, while being relatively low in pounds of carbon dioxide per kilowatt hour of electricity? Please note how SMUD compares with PG&E. I am using the above linked set of reports by generator as well as the other reports (<http://wwmpd.com/irp/ghg/index.svg> and http://wwmpd.com/irp/ghg/p_003267-003126.svg) looking at carbon dioxide by county that I listed in my first comment to your website. I use them to better understand how to reduce carbon dioxide in my life. They empower me. California's Power Source Disclosure (PSD) and Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) programs are intended increase renewables and inform the public of progress in greenhouse gas reductions for electricity generation. Power Source Disclosure program will be including carbon dioxide equivalent greenhouse gas emissions per kilowatt hour in the future in the Power Content Label. Renewables Portfolio Standard program tracks renewables generation. These two reports track SMUD's renewables progress, <https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=215379> and <https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=226538>. The first Renewables Portfolio Standard three year period, January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2013 SMUD achieved 20 percent renewables generation. The second Renewables Portfolio Standard three year period, January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2016 SMUD achieved 21.62 percent renewables generation for a 1.62 percent increase. In defining Carbon Zero, please consider identifying the Emitters, Enablers and the Empowered in all areas of design. What percentage will each be? What percentage of electricity that will come from emitters will you allow in 2025 and in 2045? The higher the percentage of emitters, the more enablers you will require to meet your goal, you will be in more competition with the rest of the state and others around the world. The Empowered may prove to be most valuable, you can empower at very low cost through the use of profound knowledge (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6nZYeZWbco> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tsF-8u-V4j4>) and empowering regulations. The defect in the system is carbon dioxide emitters and lack of enablers. The Empowered have little need for Emitters and Enablers.
- Climate change is the issue of our time and requires leadership. Sacramento is ideally positioned to become a leader in this fight.
- Hello SMUD Directors; I have attended two rate meetings and have some comments on the issue of the fixed charge. The fixed charge has some ramifications that I did not hear discussed but that I think are significant. California state energy policy seeks to encourage conservation, solar (batteries) and equitable treatment of customers. The fixed charge is detrimental to those goals. And the assumption that "all users share the infrastructure equally" is not necessarily the only way to allocate infrastructure costs according to NRDC. 3/4 of California is served by pge, sce, sdge and they have no fixed charge per CPUC. I understand that developing rates these days are challenging but I think understanding the side effects of fixed charges are worth the effort. A few discussion points: 1) My editorial on fixed charge <https://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/smud-isnt-as-green-as/content?oid=27623584> 2) video (2 minutes) on fixed charge - this model is used by dominion energy Virginia in my sisters area - \$6.70 / customer charge <https://medium.com/getting-it-right-on-electricity-rate-design/new-explainer-video-on-utility-fixed-charges-and-donuts-b97095d0b71e> 3) NRDC explains that SMUDs assumption that "all users share the infrastructure equally" is not necessarily the only way to allocate - <https://www.nrdc.org/experts/samantha-williams/there-war-attrition-electricity-fixed-charges> "To push

monthly fixed charges higher, utilities need a justification. Many, including Xcel Energy in Minnesota last year, assert that a portion of their electricity distribution system — poles, wires and transformers — are another “fixed cost” to recover via the monthly customer charge. But they aren’t. As the Regulatory Assistance Project has pointed out, the costs of power plants, transmission lines, and distribution facilities end up varying with energy use when viewed over the long run. In other words, more energy usage over time — and not the mere fact of a household being connected to the grid — is what drives needs for investments in generation and delivery system infrastructure. The Minnesota Commission understood these dynamics and rejected Xcel’s proposed fixed fee hike last year. Unfortunately, some utilities have made this arena unnecessarily complicated by advancing a range of different economic theories aimed at supporting higher mandatory fees for utility customers. The theory used by Xcel in Minnesota is but one. However, a simple and very straightforward approach continues to be best: to leave the customer charge low by basing it on the actual and projected costs of meters, meter reading, and billing in a given utility territory. All costs that vary over the long-term — including distribution system-related costs — are then recovered volumetrically. This is the basic recipe that gets the customer charge right.” 4) synapse energy video on fixed charge - first 15 min are good. The customer fact sheet illustrates how the fixed charge negatively affects low use consumers. Maybe SMUD can hire synapse to consult on the current rate issues to help develop a state of the art rate structure that sends the right incentives. Fixed Charges: Impacts and Alternatives | Synapse Energy 5) utility dive on fixed charge history <https://www.utilitydive.com/news/are-regulators-starting-to-rethink-fixed-charges/530417/> “After the financial crisis, U.S. electricity sales flattened, due primarily to reduced demand and accelerated by the impacts of EE and DER. In response, utilities requested higher fixed charges that provide revenue independent of usage. 6) fixed charge increases energy use, energy Alabama <https://alcse.org/are-fixed-charges-bad-for-customers/> “In a report conducted by the Kansas Corporation Commission, they concluded that increased fixed charges in Kansas would increase electricity use by 1.1 to 6.8%, varying by utility and season. This means the projected increase would be greater than all the energy savings from all the energy efficiency programs in the state. The same report found that such a change in rate structure and consumption would offset the financial benefits of decades of energy efficiency efforts and penalize customers who have already invested in or installed energy efficiency measures under the previous rate structure. The increase in fixed charges would weaken the incentive for future investors in energy efficiency, which could have negative impacts on the local economy and environment.” 7) fixed rate New York <https://lowerfixedcharges.org/> 8) solar united neighbors <https://www.solarunitedneighbors.org/learn-the-issues/fixed-charges/> 9) Sierra club opposes fixed charge <https://www.sierraclub.org/press-releases/2019/02/sierra-club-expert-iurc-should-reject-nipsco-rate-cost-shift>

- I would appreciate the opportunity to talk with commissioners and/or staff about additional ways Sacramento can set an example to reduce the harmful effects of gas-powered leaf blowers in our community.
- Until public transportation can get most people to work or school in close to the same time a personal vehicle would, the majority of people won’t use it. only those who have to will use it. Few use it because it takes much too long for a car owner to consider using it.
- Dear Mayor’s Commission on Climate Change, You have asked for ways to bring money to Sacramento for building. Would you ask UC Davis Law students to help Sacramento City Lawyers work with the California Attorney General’s Office to block FEMA from spending money to rebuilt homes in fire prone areas like Paradise? It may cost FEMA \$300 million to fix the benzene contaminated water system in Paradise. <https://www.sacbee.com/news/local/environment/article228969259.html> The article “Rare ‘toxic cocktail’ from Camp Fire is poisoning Paradise water. It could cost \$300 million to fix. “None of us were prepared for this” by Tony Bizjak discusses the \$300 million dollars FEMA may need to spend to rebuild the Paradise water system. In the coming years, the federal government will not have the money to rebuild water systems and re-build homes in fire prone and flood prone areas. Consider the \$69,000 house in Mississippi that has flooded 34 times in 32 years and has received \$663,000 in payments. If you have that kind of backstop, why not build a \$69,000 house in a flood zone? <https://www.vox.com/2017/8/31/16227802/weeds-federal-flood-insurance-hurricane-harvey> The homes

should not be rebuilt in Paradise, Instead homes should be built in areas where people will emit less CO2 like in Sacramento. This would help bring FEMA money into Sacramento to rebuild homes for the Paradise residents displaced by the fires. Can Sacramento City lawyers work with the California Attorney General's Office to block FEMA from spending money to rebuilt homes in fire prone areas like Paradise? FEMA's commitment to rebuild homes in high fire danger areas and flood prone areas infringes on the rights of young people. In the year 2060 and beyond, there will be massive claims for FEMA to rebuild homes in high fire danger areas and high flood risk areas, and FEMA and young people will not have the money to meet all these obligations. To protect the rights of young Californians and the financial integrity of the United States of America for young people in the years 2060 and beyond, Sacramento City lawyers and the California Attorney general's office should join forces to prevent the rebuilding of homes in Paradise and other high fire danger areas, and instead spend that money building homes for these people in safer areas like Sacramento. Every generation should feel an obligation to pay off its debt, and not leave it for future generations. Right now FEMA is being handles like a Ponzi scheme in which we pay people with money from this year's taxes, while incurring debt beyond what future generations can pay. And future generations will need to pay off this debt without being able to burn as much coal, oil and natural gas. this will limit their ability to make money and pay off this debt. FEMA money should not be spent rebuilding homes in areas that are not sustainable. FEMA money can only be spent in areas where an equal amount of money is being spent by private insurers to insure other homes not covered by FEMA. FEMA money should not be spent building homes for populations that are not sustainable. The World Scientists Warning to Humanity: A Second Notice has asked for estimates of a sustainable population. <https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/67/12/1026/4605229> These estimates should be sought, and used to decide where homes can be built that are sustainable.

- Reduce plastic usage, period. Encourage reducing and reusing before recycling. This is an emergency and as a region we need to act now.
- More projects to plant trees citywide; Publicly endorse the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend resolution now in the US House of Representatives (HR763).
- The California Chapter of the Congress for the New Urbanism <http://cnucalifornia.org/>, with the assistance of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research will hold a volunteer charrette staffed by its members, representatives from the State, and others interested in seriously exploring the ways to adapt to a changing climate. Over three days this Fall, at a Sacramento location to be determined, Andres Duany will lead a team in an iterative, comprehensive planning process of adaptation at the regional, community, neighborhood, block and lot scales. Comprised of skilled architects, community and regional planners, water, stormwater, and energy engineers, architects, financial, real estate professionals and policy makers, the charrette team will research, assess, decide and produce a series of scenarios, physical, regulatory and market strategies, programs, and actions, with freeze-frames at 2030, 2050 or 2060 and 2090. I will update you this event if one you and your colleagues at might want to find out more.
- The City planning department is working hard to meet multiple objectives and they can be directed to prioritize climate change initiatives while still providing judicious protection to historic districts.
- Prior to going to your website and seeing this form, I put together a detailed list of comments that are my response to reading the on line report of the work of the Built Environment Technological Advisory Committee. My comments overlap the different categories that you have established above so I am attaching them here. Mayor's Climate Commission Comments on Recommendations Developed by the Built Environment Technological Advisory Committee I appreciate the hard work that went into the recommendations developed by the Built Environment Technological Advisory Committee. The following are my comments and suggestions. 1. According to the IPCC, the world is now in a climate emergency and we have less than twelve years to make massive reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and build climate resilience. The Mayor's Commission should acknowledge this, develop timelines in accordance with this and strongly recommend that the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento declare climate emergencies. 2. Trees provide an important means of addressing the climate crisis. Cities all over the world are planting more trees, but Sacramento's tree canopy is shrinking. This must change. Trees play a critical role in

sequestering carbon and provide a means of dealing with both the increased heat and the episodic torrential rains that are predicted for the Sacramento region. They counter heat island effect, reduce the need for air conditioning, provide the shade that allows people to walk and bike on very hot days, clean the air that is predicted to grow more polluted as heat increases, reduce the damage that excessive heat does to soil, and provide habitat for a variety of endangered species – something that is critical given the extinction crisis. Tree leaves absorb rainwater and help to reduce flooding during heavy rains and their roots keep soil from washing away. It takes years or decades for new trees to provide the benefit that large mature trees provide and, because we are now in a climate emergency, we don't have years or decades. We can't keep removing large, healthy trees as we are currently doing. Many cities view trees, particularly public street trees as a key part of urban infrastructure. Sacramento needs to adopt this view. Davey, the consultant for Sacramento's Tree Master Plan estimates that the City of Sacramento can accommodate a canopy cover of 45 percent. The City needs to adopt that goal and develop policies to make it happen: - Parkway strips throughout the city should have trees planted close enough together that, in most places, they are able to provide continuous shade - Environmental justice communities are often the places that have the fewest trees. As part of its Environmental Justice Plan, the City should work with residents of these communities to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to plant and maintain trees, both street trees and in people's yards. - Many neighborhoods and commercial corridors and even parts of the CBD have parkway strips where gaps where there is space for trees, but no trees have been planted. These gaps need to be filled. Neighborhood leaders and PBIDS could be recruited to help identify these locations - Healthy trees, both public and private, should be retained. It is currently much too easy for both the City and developers to remove trees. Instead, they should be required to design projects in ways that allow space for trees and retain the majority of existing, healthy trees. In those cases where it is impossible to do a project without removing some trees, the smallest number of trees possible should be removed and clear, verifiable evidence must be provided to show that each proposed tree removal is necessary. - New state projects in the CBD have led to the removal of multiple City street trees. This is unnecessary and unacceptable. The City needs must work with appropriate State officials to find ways to avoid this. This problem has become much worse recently as construction of new State offices has begun. - There are many places in the City where parkway strips have been concrete over. The City should create a program to incentivize the removal of this unnecessary concrete. completely or , at a minimum create tree wells in the concrete large enough to accommodate the planting of large, canopy trees. - The planting of small or cylindrical shaped trees should not be allowed in any parkway strip or other public space large enough to accommodate a canopy tree. - Developers should be incentivized to design new buildings that have either setbacks or upper story setbacks to accommodate large canopy trees. - Rules requiring the planting and maintenance of shade trees in surface parking lots are not systematically enforced and this must change. Parking lot are giant heat islands that will only grow worse as the climate emergency worsens. Far too often parking lot owners let trees die, don't replace them and experience no consequences. - The City needs to do a better job of educating residents about both how to care for trees and the important role they play as a means of addressing the climate emergency. - The City has lost a number of relatively new street trees (trees older than three years when regular City watering stops, but not full grown) in times of multi-year drought. Urban Forestry needs to develop a program to address this, particularly in the case of rental properties with absentee owners who consistently fail to maintain outdoor space or care for their trees. 3. Predictions say that Sacramento faces a future of droughts alternating with extremely heavy rains (atmospheric rivers that can drop inches of water in just a few hours. As the City becomes more dense with more land covered by buildings and concrete, we need to look at how to give excess water someplace to go. As discussed above, large trees/canopy cover provides part of the solution because their leaves can absorb large amounts of water, but there are other things that could be done as well including: - Mandating space for small yards and rain gardens in areas with dense, new development. It's possible to achieve density without covering every inch of ground with buildings or concrete. This will also help with heat island effect. - Removing concrete from parkway strips that have been concreted over not only creates room for more trees, but also creates spaces where water can be absorbed into the ground. Swales and rain gardens in parkway strips and wherever there is space for them should be encouraged and incentivized. The same comments apply to properties with front or back yards covered in concrete. - Requiring permeable concrete for new sidewalks and replacement sidewalks and for parking pads and

walkways on private property should be mandatory. All of these measures would also help replenish the water table that would in turn help protect trees during drought. 4. I completely agree with the Advisory Committee's call for an urban limit line/growth boundary beyond which new development may not expand is essential. Sprawl is a major issue in the Sacramento area and I hope identifying this as an issue that impacts local efforts to address the climate emergency will up pressure on those jurisdictions that keep approving sprawl. While beyond the scope of the Commission, efforts to preserve farmland need to find ways to incentivize more farmers to move to an organic, regenerative agricultural model that uses healthy soil to sequester carbon and that protects beneficial insects and other wild species that live in farmland areas. 5. It is critical to recognize that just that increased density alone won't reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). There must also be strong mandates and incentives in place to assure that new projects above a certain size (perhaps 10 or 15 units) must include a specified percentage of units that meet federal affordability standards and will remain affordable for at least 50 years. Sacramento's Central City is a prime example of how density alone doesn't reduce VMT. It has lots of new infill development, but the bulk of it is market rate and not affordable to the majority of people who have jobs in the Central City and are being forced to move to outlying areas and commute, often by car. "Trickle down" housing – the idea that by building more luxury housing, affordability will trickle down to the less affluent masses – isn't working any better than "trickle down" economics has and research shows that it hasn't worked at all. 6. There also needs to be recognition that, while mid and high rise buildings create the greatest density, the steel frame construction required for them is by far the most expensive than for other forms of construction. Significant density with greater affordability can be achieved by smaller, wood framed projects and by the adaptive re-use of existing buildings. Adaptive re-use is also extremely sustainable because it preserves both the materials and the embodied energy of the original building. 7. The City of Sacramento allows developers who want to build projects with a floor area (FAR) ratio greater than allowed by the General Plan to have their projects approved if those projects provide a "community benefit", but it has never defined what it means by "community benefit" If it wants to incentivize affordable housing it could define "community benefit" as the provision of affordable housing and set up a program whereby developers would be able to increase FAR by a specified percent in trade for building a specified percent of housing units that meet federal standards for affordability and must continue to meet that standard for a specified number of years (e.g. 50 years). 7. The Advisory Committee is right that being able to live without a car is both a climate issue and a social equity issue. Making streets more walkable and bikeable and building housing, including affordable housing, near jobs and transit go a long way in reducing the need to own a car, as do LYFT and UBER. But in order to help still more people live without cars, a better transit system is needed and RT is among the worse funded public transit programs in the state. The Sacramento Transit Authority is considering putting a transportation sales tax measure on the 2020 allot. Past tax measures have provided the bulk of funding for roads while providing relatively little for transit. This needs to change. To address this problem, the Mayor's Climate Commission should recommend that any new transportation tax allocate the bulk of its money to transit while providing funding for needed road repairs but not for new roads or road expansions. 8. Even though there won't be a formal requirement that buildings be all electric until 2023, there should be incentives to encourage applicants who submit plans for new buildings prior to 2023 to make those buildings all electric. Retrofit will be time consuming and expensive and the more projects that are all electric starting right now, the better. 9. The state legislature is currently considering a bill, AB 857, that would allow municipal governments to establish public banks. This would provide a cost effective way to fund projects that address the climate crisis. If the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento are not already on record supporting this bill, the Commission should recommend that they do so. This could also help provide money to help fund projects that provide affordable housing, expand green energy and promote climate resiliency.

- I appreciate your efforts and process to reach out to the public. Thank you.
- I know that much of what I've outlined above is expensive and may seem a bit radical. Some also would require working with agencies outside of Sacramento's jurisdiction (such as local cities, regional cities, Caltrans, Amtrak, and CalHR). However, if you are serious...and I mean REALLY serious...about achieving zero carbon within a meaningful time frame, then what I've outlined above is the MINIMUM of what needs to be done to get there. There is probably more than just what I outlined above that can, and should be

done. We also need to make all of this happen sooner rather than later. Planning timelines need to be shortened so that they don't take any longer than construction (preferably less). The light rail extension to the airport needs to be built by 2025, not 2036! We need to stop wasting time and money on insanely long planning timelines that have to be reworked constantly because things changed during the insanely long planning timeline! Politicians can't rely on their tired, worn out response of "funding sources need to be identified" anymore. I find it curious how they never say that for roads, but for just about everything else, that's the default answer. If you guys can't be bothered to spend the money to achieve the above, and go after the rich guys for the money to spend, then you can just forget about it. I'm serious, don't even bother trying. As the old saying goes: "Go big! Or go home." Time for Sacramento to go big!

- I am so disappointed we have lost Flojaune Cofer as a board member. She was a very smart & savvy individual, with a sense of humor and willing to speak up when she saw something nonsensical. (ie Mr. Corliss's paragraph that he insisted need to be in the plan.)
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333581837_Is_it_true_that_'Small_Is_Beautiful'
- 1. We need more public gardens and parks. More green spaces in general as density increases. Low lying areas that would be prone to flooding are good choices as well as creek drainages that could connect many neighborhoods to parks and shopping/service areas. Lighting and Park police for safety are a must if these areas are not to become Gang controlled, crime-ridden areas or homeless camps that other citizens refuse to use. 2. We need to invest in green Voluntary housing for the mentally ill with supervised medication and services, that allow some freedom and pets. This will take some of the mentally ill off the streets. 3. Homeless Veterans need to get treatment for PTSD and can take advantage of Homeless vet programs that need expansion into the inner city. Currently, there is one at Mather AirBase.
- Set goals with anticipated dates and track progress for all to view.
- Meat consumption is a major driver of climate change. Fortunately, there are innovative small businesses based in Sacramento, like Burger Patch and The Better Meat Co., that are helping people enjoy more plants and less meat. The city can help support such startups and reduce its own purchases of meat. Thank you!
- The Behavior Energy & Climate Change conference is coming up. Nov. 17 - 20. <https://becconference.org/> Themes this year include Youth Engagement, Transport & Mobility, Social Equity. This year SMUD is the senior sponsor. This info would be useful to all Commission members and members of the TAC's. I talked with Kate Meis, Kathleen Ave & Robert Nelsen. The information at the conference will likely speak directly to the comments that were raised at the Oct. 23 Commission meeting by Commissioners as well as members of the public.
- No real discussion on climate can take place without acknowledging the value of TREES. Studies have proven that urban areas with canopy fair better in many areas
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256048802_Sustainable_Investment_Means_Energy_Independence_From_Fossil_Fuels and https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333581837_Is_it_true_that_'Small_Is_Beautiful'
- Cities do an injustice when they adopt lofty goals and programs without the transparency and accountability of regular public reporting and disclosure of how public funds are expended for these programs each year. Set annual goals for greater tree canopy, disclose the funding and personnel to achieve those goals, and report on performance every year.
- Shade from trees reduces evaporative loss for parks, gardens and yards. In furtherance of environmental justice, community health and resiliency depend upon expanding neighborhood tree canopy in all neighborhoods.
- Thank you for all your hard work
- Improve packaging waste, recycling, and hazardous waste recycling services

- We suggest the commission creates a youth council or recruit advisory members to engage and young people. They are at the affect of climate change more than many other groups. They will be bearing the burden of our decisions in the future. They must have a say. We (CA Center for Civic Participation) are interested in being partners for a project like this since we work to engage youth in policy and community based solutions. We provide youth civic education programs and we'd be interested in partnering.
- Climate optimism the January 5 issue of the economist included several letters to the editor rebutting the climate skepticism in their article in the December 5 issue. In his letter, amory lovins wrote in part "profitable carbon removal through natural-systems farming, grazing and forest and marine management is already proven, scalable and rich in side benefits. It can robustly achieve a 1.5oC climate trajectory with no overshoot, strongly support the UN's Sustainable Development Goals and avoid between \$1trn and \$3trn of supply-side investments a year by 2050, if coupled with lucrative and conservatively assessed energy efficiency and modern renewables. However, inertia and policy perversity block this in both energy and carbon removal, the former making the latter problematic. Systems that grow and sustain themselves will outperform machinery that must be built, maintained, protected and powered. This incurs opportunity cost: needlessly costly methods worsen climate change by saving less carbon per dollar. Emphasizing carbon removal through unnatural systems can incur moral hazard, waste money and time, and distract from the profitable solutions that are available." here is the link to the letters: <https://www.economist.com/letters/2020/01/02/letters-to-the-editor> to the original article: <https://www.economist.com/briefing/2019/12/05/climate-policy-needs-negative-carbon-dioxide-emissions> and to a summary of the paper lovins refers to in his complete letter: <https://rmi.org/insight/recalibrating-climate-prospects/>
- Expedite all of for a goal that is necessary since release of the IIPP (?) stating we have 10yrs.
- I'm really glad people care about this enough to solicit answers.
- I am so disappointed in the way this city is going into the next decade. More development, less attendance to the environment, more and more acquiescence to business to increase tax revenue so you can what – turn around and give developers a break and let them take over? The money doesn't seem to be going back into our city. Instead of using Arco arena for homeless accommodation, and the Arco pond for nature development and accommodation of the nesting egrets and herons, the plan is to rip it all up. The Kings own it, but instead of using city money to buy some of this back from the Kings, you so you can't afford it. The perception out here is that you're in the pocket of the developers.
- Cities must be transparent and accountable in their urban forest practices -- keep the trees; spend the mitigation funds; and report to the public.
- Dear Board members, Thank you for your service to our community. I am extremely concerned about the looming issues we are facing due to global warming. I have been involved in energy related solutions for over 20 years including solar electricity, solar thermal, wind power, renewable solid fuels and energy efficient gas. My concern is that a ban on natural gas from new construction, while sounding like it may reduce our carbon emissions, is premature and needs more study. Emerging technologies and high efficiency appliance and lighting systems are very encouraging, and we should continue to incentivize these, but I believe that more study is needed before we eliminate natural gas as an option. Electricity is not a carbon free option. According to SMUD's web site approximately 46% of our energy comes from renewable sources. The remaining electric energy is generated by gas at a much lower delivered net efficiency than an efficient gas appliance in the home. Without new sources of renewable energy, it is possible we could end up increasing carbon emissions and increasing energy costs. There is also the issue of homeowner choice to consider. There are appliances such as gas kitchen ranges & energy efficient gas fireplaces, both loved by home owners, that cannot be replaced with electric appliances. Productions builders will move more and more to all electric homes without a ban because it lowers their cost of production. Others will adopt high efficiency electric appliances because they have lower operating costs and government incentives that lower their cost. Eliminating the public's option to responsibly use gas or renewable solid fuel heating is unnecessary. The California Energy Commission and CARB is tasked with our

energy codes and very actively pursuing carbon reduction goals. They have a 3-year science-based study process to determine the cost benefit consequences of any new rule. I believe we should let them steer this issue. At the very least we should be very cautious making rules based on our intuition instead of relying on hard data.

- Even if I can do anything about making changes sooner for individual areas of the plan, this draft doesn't inspire confidence in the city's understanding of the very serious state we are in the midst of, dealing with the first of many pandemics to come. This is only the appetizer for what is coming.
- Greetings, I am one of your neighbors from just over the causeway in Davis. I am a student of climate science (among other things), and the writing is on the wall that once we put out this fire from the current COVID-situation that we must prevent the next societal breakdown that will make COVID look like a tiny little episode. The ecological crisis must be addressed in a complete way, ramping up immediately and seeking to make the majority of the transition towards clean infrastructure and economies within the next 10 years, and make sure our food and water systems are healthy and resilient to meet the changes in our climate that are already underway. We must think about protecting intact ecosystems and making city life not only less damaging, but regenerative. I know that we can do this...it will just take a collective will and collaboration on a scale never seen before. Count us in here in Yolo County to partner to create a bioregion that supports life and well-being of all its inhabitants. All the best, David Abramson
- I am making a clarification of a longer comment I sent yesterday, as I didn't notice that there was a place to suggest items specifically for year one.
- I'm glad that this commission was formed. I'm hoping that these suggestions are actually implemented!
- Key Findings from Business Roundtables: Reliance on one form of energy. It may be helpful to think of this item as not only about "one form of energy", but also variety of delivery mechanisms of energy. That is, moving away from thinking only about "forms of energy", but including thinking about delivery mechanisms. There is much variety, quite a bit more than currently in place in the region, for how energy can be generated and delivered. And many of the mechanisms can address community and economic development concerns. As well as providing resiliency during acute circumstances. I think diving deeper into this might open opportunities in unexpected ways. Appreciate Mr. Corliss' response to Ms. Bjork's presentation.
- Listen to the scientists!!!!!!
- Maintaining and preserving community historical transportation infrastructure that both critically serves and retains the vital community identities of past and recent values will ensure that community Identity is preserved for future generations.
- Please tie your report to the most recent and best available science and update appropriately.
- Preserving and utilizing existing transportation corridors with scientific advancement in green technologies to equitably raise and improve the quality of life in the many disadvantaged areas of Sacramento right now, addresses a critical moment of opportunity to close the gap between the haves and the have nots.
- Scientist shown that a mainly plant-based diet is healthier for individuals, and society. It also eliminates the torture of animals. We also now know that what we eat affects our behavior and our mental awareness. I have spent 18 years as a Buddhist chaplain in California prisons. The inmates continually request a healthy diet and a more plant-based diet. Has anything been done to encourage a plant-based diet in Sacramento County Jail, both the main jail and the Elk Grove annex? Thank you. Rev. Diane Wilde, Founder, Buddhist Pathways Prison Project, www.buddhistpathways.org
- Staff support, TAC and public participation have played a major role in the critical work the commission has accomplished to get to this point. Similar continued support and participation will be necessary to move into implementation of these recommendations.
- Thank you for your hard work and commitment. Sooner! Stronger! Thank you!

- Thank you!
- The coronavirus crisis is deeply affecting the budget and attention focus. This will continue for some time. NEVERTHELESS, what all must keep in mind at all times is that THE existential crisis for generations to come is climate change. This topic cannot be put on the back burner "for now". So the most important single step to be taken at this time is to establish and fill in each city a senior level position for a person who oversees all aspects of climate-change planning and implementation, and who reports directly to the mayor and city council.
- The MCCC report is well done, contains aggressive yet achievable goals and I have only two comments. First, Year One Overarching priority #4 must be modified to include advocating for State and Federal legislative changes that fully preserve and protect existing Transportation Corridors for the reasons stated in my Agenda Item #5 recommendation stated above. Second, I'll just repeat the report's summation on page 28 which says it best: "Turning this plan into action rests on more than just ideas and good intentions. It requires residents, businesses, City government, and other institutions to urgently rise to the challenge of making big changes – changes in our infrastructure, technological advances, ramped up green workforce development, and change in the decisions we make every day as members of the community. Everyone must play a role to ensure a more equitable, prosperous and resilient future for all residents." I look forward to this future as without it we will probably leave our grandchildren with a situation that has them dealing with ocean front property in Sacramento. Travel by foot, bikes, rolling devices, modern battery driven mass transit is the future I want my future family members to enjoy and experience.
- The Sacramento Southern Railroad/Walnut Branch Line corridor represents a rare opportunity for the City to utilize an existing asset to support growing transportation needs of citizens well into the future. But to take advantage of this the City must take prompt and aggressive action to make it happen.
- We need to continue to change our ideas about how we do public transportation. Utilizing this west-side corridor would be consistent with the goals of the MCCC report. But legislative action is necessary and advocating for it needs to be included in Year One Overarching Priority #4 to protect this already existing transportation corridor.