From:	Robin Briggs
To:	PCD_OneSeattleCompPlan
Subject:	Fwd: comments on One Seattle Comprehensive Plan & Climate Element
Date:	Sunday, May 5, 2024 9:17:35 PM

CAUTION: External Email

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Robin Briggs** <rbriggs1201@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, May 5, 2024 at 5:53 PM
Subject: comments on One Seattle Comprehensive Plan & Climate Element
To: <OPCD@seattle.gov>, <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>, <OSE@seattle.gov>
Cc: Tim Gould <timg.sierraclub@gmail.com>

I am writing to you on behalf of the 43rd Legislative District Environmental Caucus.

The new draft One Seattle Comprehensive Plan is going to be a critical part of Seattle's response to climate change. As such, it has excellent goals; we were very happy to see a Climate Element for the first time, and to see goals such as 9 trips out 10 zero carbon by 2030. However, we have serious concerns over the growth targets and feel that many of the goals could be made more robust.

The single biggest impact thing Seattle can do to reduce its emissions is to allow more infill development. People living in the city have shorter distances to travel, greater opportunities to do those trips in a zero carbon way, and even use less energy to heat their homes because of shared walls and smaller spaces. A study from the City of Shoreline found that a family in a new apartment by light rail would have less than one tenth the carbon footprint of the same family if they had to live in east King County. This is one change that costs the City nothing, and that engagement from OPCD and polls from the Chamber have shown is overwhelmingly popular. Obviously there are many co-benefits: it would also reduce the cost of housing, improve equity, help our local economy as workers have an easier time getting to work, and improve City finances by expanding our tax base. **The current plan picks the minimum possible legally allowable amount of growth, and we should be allowing double that**.

The Climate Element is the closest thing we have to a climate plan. Goal CE G1 states: "Seattle's core greenhouse gas emissions are reduced by 58 percent from 2008 levels by 2030 and attain carbon neutrality by 2050." This is inline with current goals, and excellent to restate here. I believe it is also critical to **add more intermediate goals between 2030 and 2050, so that we have specific reduction goals for 2035, 2040, and 2045**, just as we do now for 2030. This is frankly the only way we will have a hope of meeting the 2050 goal.

Goal CE G2 states: "Greenhouse gas emissions are reduced by reducing vehicle trips and

transitioning to zero-emissions trips." This should be changed to **include the goal from the 2013 Climate Plan to reduce transportation emissions 82% by 2030**, and zero-emission by 2050. It should also include intermediate goals for transportation emissions for 2035, 2040, and 2045.

The plan should emphasize mode shift over vehicle electrification for decarbonizing our transportation system. We should be primarily using mode shift, and electrifying the remaining trips, as recommended by the Climate Change Response Framework.

A policy that is missing from CE G2 is to promote more work from home. Work from home has been credited with the reduction of emissions on the eastside, and has been identified by PSRC transportation modelers as a prerequisite for meeting transportation reduction targets (see here, starting on p. 24). Please add in this policy.

Goal CE G5 should reference the goal from the 2013 Climate Plan to reduce building energy emissions 38% from 2008 levels by 2030, and the goal of zero carbon should be explicitly tied to 2050. Intermediate goals for the building sector for 2035, 2040, and 2045 should also be added so that we can assess progress as we go along to the overall goal of zero emissions by 2050.

The language used for many of the goals is vague enough that it will be difficult or impossible to tell if the goals have been met. In particular, a goal with the aim of "reducing greenhouse gases" can be trivially met with a 1% reduction, or seriously reduced by 50%, or eliminated entirely. The goals need to be much more specific so we can judge our progress.

Lastly, the City should provide a timetable for when the public will be hearing more specific proposals for the policies from the Climate Element.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Robin Briggs, for the 43rd LD Environmental Caucus