

Planning Commission Comments							Cascadia Interpretation of Next Steps	
#	Date	Form	Name	Title	Action # or Topic	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation	
1	5/6/2022	Written	Michael Truog	Community Member	Water Supply, Wildfires, Air Quality, Power Supply, Solar Flares, Viruses	Concern about the general access to food, water, breathable air, and power.	Comment Acknowledged	Acknowledged
2	5/9/2022	Written and Verbal	Brian Mattuch	Community Member	46	Believes the actions should be removed due to language to 'add filing to property record'. The commenter references the North Olympic Peninsula Resource Conservation & Development Council (NODC) "Climate Change Preparedness Plan for the North Olympic Peninsula". Specifically, "E-8: Update financing policies for development in high risk areas" and the proposal to remove mortgage subsidies for areas with high climate change impact risks.	A property recording documents potential threats to the developed structures on a site. The action states "discourage", not "prohibit". A recorded document would be required in lieu of prohibition. As critical areas in the City are threatened by extreme weather events and potential sea level rise, it is important to document that current and future property owners demonstrate their understanding of potential threats to their property and onsite development due to climate change. This includes heavy rain or melting snow that can create mass wasting events at the top of slopes. The 2015 Report by the NODC is referenced as a foundational document that led the way for Port Angeles' planning efforts, but in no way are its listed actions directly transferable to the City's own plan. They are mutually exclusive documents. There is no action provided related to the NODC's E-8 key action provided by the commenter.	Revised action description to reflect response / recommendation
3	5/9/2022	Written and Verbal	Brian Mattuch	Community Member	47	Believes the actions should be removed due to the inclusion of language 'managed retreat'	The term "managed retreat" is used as "id est" or "for example".	Interpreting as no action needed based on this comment. But edits will come from other feedback.
4	5/11/2022	Verbal	Bob Vreeland	Community Member	Wildfire Protection	Plan includes adaption and mitigation for sea level rise but not forest fire vulnerability. Asked for an appendix of actions that were considered but not included.	An appendix of actions not included in the plan is being proposed.	See Appendix G of Planning Commission materials.
5	5/11/2022	Verbal	Brian Grad	Community Member	Urgency	The urgency of the need for change puts our community and the world at "5 minutes past midnight". There is a need to address how we will adapt as a community to this rapid change.	Comment Acknowledged	Acknowledged
6	5/11/2022	Verbal	Ed Chadd	Community Member	Urgency	Every tenth of a degree of increased average temperature has a great deal of impact on the severity of storms, wildfires, drought, ocean acidification, and the death of our salmon population. We have to do our part, no matter how small, to decrease suffering.	Comment Acknowledged	Acknowledged
7	5/11/2022	Verbal	Ian Miller	Community Member	Comprehensive Plan Inclusion	Why are some actions listed for inclusion into the Comprehensive Plan but not others.	Actions that are earmarked for inclusion into the Comprehensive Plan are more broadly policy oriented. The Comprehensive Plan does include an implementation plan that is more directive. The Climate Resiliency Plan will include its own implementation plan specific to climate resiliency related actions. This implementation planning is scheduled to kick off July 2022 and will result in actionable items that will be included in the Comprehensive Plan's Implementation Plan.	Acknowledged
8	5/11/2022	Verbal	Ian Miller	Community Member	47	Why is the description of the action so much more broad than the title.	Staff is changing the title to better reflect the description	Will update action short name
9	5/11/2022	Verbal	Ian Miller	Community Member	47	Confused about the policy's description which includes hard shoreline protection in certain areas, including "bluff crests".	Specifically, both development at the top of bluff and marine bluff toe are affected by erosive activities of undercutting from sea level rise and wave action and extreme weather events.	Will update action description
10	5/11/2022	Verbal	Tony Billera	Community Member	Projected increase in average global temperatures	Even with the pledges we see today there is still a projected 4.3 degrees of increased temperatures in this century. The current policies get us to 3.1 degrees if the policies are effective. Another four to five degrees in 70 years leaves us with an unsustainable planet.	Comment Acknowledged	Acknowledged
11	5/11/2022	Verbal	Marilee Smith	Planning Commissioner	Staff Implementation	The Plan will not be successful without interdepartmental coordination and cooperation.	Comment Acknowledged	Acknowledged
12	5/11/2022	Verbal	Ben Stanley	Planning Commissioner	Public Process	Would have liked the public process to occur in person. The virtual process has not been as successful as an in person process could have been. Understands deadlines	Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic precluded staff's ability to hold community workshops in person. Outreach was performed by CAPG members attending the Farmers Market and Winter Ice Village.	Acknowledged
13	5/11/2022	Verbal	Tammy Dziadek	Planning Commissioner	Planning Process	Impressed with the Plan	Comment Acknowledged	Acknowledged
14	5/11/2022	Verbal	Ben Stanley	Planning Commissioner	47	Concern over language involving development within the shoreline.	It's important to acknowledge the threat that the shoreline may experience with sea level rise, even if the City's shoreline may not be as dramatic as other areas of the Puget Sound region, it's important to be prepared for the risk of a rise at the highest predicted range. This includes the development of utilities and transportation facilities in the shoreline, or the increased hard armoring protection or creation of alternatives for those facilities.	Acknowledged
15	5/11/2022	Verbal	Ben Stanley	Planning Commissioner	47	Concern over any language involving insurance	See response for Comment #4.	Acknowledged
16	5/11/2022	Verbal	Richie Ahuja	Planning Commissioner	Implementation	Believes the Planning Commission should pull out 5-10 actions for recommendation of immediate action based upon MCA and feasibility.	An implementation planning effort is currently being organized and will kick-off in July of 2022. The planning Commission Climate Action Subcommittee will be involved as stakeholders and the Planning Commission will lead the public process in that plan's development	In addition to implementation planning process, see Getting Started chapter of CRP for recommendation on actions to start with - these should not contradict implementation
17	5/12/2022	Written	Brian Mattuch	Community Member	Action Reduction	proposal to reduce the number of actions from 55 to 5		More context would be helpful to understand concern. Is it possible implementation planning would address this concern?
	6/7/2022	Written	David Freed	Community Member				
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Brian Mattuch	Community Member	General	Thank you to Planning Commission for addressing issues. Some language was eliminated from the plan and other language was changed. What you're seeing tonight is a much better product than the plan the existed before the		Acknowledged
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Bob Vreeland			Shout out to Emma for sheparding through the process. Hope to apass beofre leaving for Port Townsend and hope she will still be available to help implement the plan or give suggestions given that Port Townsend has a plan and		Acknowledged
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Ben Stanley	Community Member	General	My views are as a community member tonight. He's involved in the plan and very happy to see it to Council tonight. Very effective to help us get funding for projects. Planning Commission did vote in a non unanimous fashion to approve the plan. The people who voted against were concerned about the lack of focus. Many on the Commission would now love to narrow the focus. Right now, it's a wide menu of options to select from. Know it can't be all enacted with limited funding. Cost benefit analysis would allow us to figure out the ability. Planning Commission would love to work on the Implementation. This is not the end of the plan, but just the beginning. Re: the content our main focus is on transportation emissions because BPA mix of electricity is highly renewable. Focus on new housing satisfies that and is why our town is so focused on affordable housing. Encourage walkable lifestyles and encourage reduction in emissions which has a ton of economic benefits. See the housing efforts as the same as the climate efforts. Includes resiliency and adaptation measures.		Acknowledged
	6/7/2022	Verbal	David Freed	Community Member	General	Depend heavily on services and products secured in Port Angeles. Buy most of groceries and our medical care here. As the City fares, so do we. Thank you to City Council for considering this. These are my personal opinions. Climate change is not a political ideology. It's objectively measured. Sources say that the climate is getting warmer through human activity unless we can freeze our GHG emissions right now. As one of the citizens affected, our concerns for the next 50 years is that we're worried about increasing risk of wildfires in the urban/wild interface. Concerned about water scarcity and droughts and the increasing fragility of our food systems. Want to see more support for local food production whenever possible. Worry about increasing instability brought by political rancor.		Acknowledged

Planning Commission Comments							
#	Date	Form	Name	Title	Action # or Topic	Comment (may be paraphrased)	Response / Recommendation
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Ed Chadd	Community Member	General	End of a long road. Want to begin by saying the fact that this plan has managed to make Bob Vreeland happy is an immense accomplishment. Next logical step, long in the making, and fully agree with the very first statement in the plan about why we're taking action. Our resiliency plan considers the overall quality of life and health while providing tangible benefits for the community. Agree with all the prior speakers, particular David Freed's comment that climate change will be here for many decades no matter how quickly we can stop our emissions. With that change, Port Angeles will be presented with a set of challenges and opportunities. This plan confronts the challenges and recognizes what some of the opportunities might be. As climate change worsens around the world, Port Angeles will be seen as an increasingly desirable place to live and we can capitalize on this to make it a better place to live if we think ahead. If not, then it's a crushing burden on us. The social implications of all this—we need to set our course so that quality of life is assured and that people have trust in one another. The basics are very clear that we need to prevent what we can because every hundredth of a degree increase causes immense suffering. It could make the difference if a food crop makes it or not. Need to capitalize our strengths and cope with our weaknesses. I think the rest of it will take care of itself if we do that. Focus on putting the rubber on the road. The Plan is broad and visionary and needs to be implemented. Think seriously about what we need to do to implement. There are some comments near the end of the plan itself about initial implementation. First of all, formalize some kind of climate planning group, paid participation, budget request for a full time position. Lucky to have NODC grant project to get this underway. We will want to fold this into the Comprehensive Plan and the Hazard Mitigation Plan. We want to do a Wildland Urban Interface Plan. Climate resiliency and emergency planning is important and it won't work unless it's monitored, assessed and adapted. A clear and simple plan needs to be put in place. The City is to be commended for showing leadership in Clallam County. We are behind Jefferson County and Port Townsend, but we are out ahead what will certainly come down fairly soon from the state. We put ourselves in a very good position to attract grants and residents who will help make this a better place to live.	
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Sisi Bruch	Community Member	General	Implementation is key. This shouldn't be another plan to sit on the shelf. Comprehensive Plan will likely be required to be folded in by Commerce and there will be grants. You will have a plan that is ready to be incorporated. Density and housing is your best bet to have the funds to be able to implement the actions in the plan.	Acknowledged
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Navarra Carr	City Council	#21, 46, 47	Hoping to include net ecological gain into #21. Many people don't like the status quo of no net loss. Add sentence to prioritize net ecological gain when possible. Want to speak to items #46 and 47 and heard those comments and the importance of building sustainably in City limits. Concerning that Planning Commission heard those comments and wants to take the verbiage away from what the community wanted. It's also appropriate to disincentivize. If a home is falling off the bluff, the taxpayers should be concerned that they have to pay for this. Someone is going to be paying for someone's loss. Hopefully nobody dies from their house falling off the cliff and into Country Aire. We should be appropriate concerned about this. Our hospital is also on the same bluff and do we want to allow development in an area that might be tenuous due to ecological changes. Same with sea level rise. We should be thinking about the fact that our Coast Guard station is located in an untenable area. DON't want to see items #46 and 47 taken out. Appreciate staff's recommendation to use a definition from the outset of what "carbon neutrality" is. Here we are using in the community sense and not the political sense. Hey we're vulnerable and we need to do something about it. In terms of the City as an institution, we should be able to commit to that as we're own entity even if it's not the community goal that every city resident is carbon neutral. It's a mistake to take these words out altogether.	Acknowledged Per Emma direction, will revise 46 and 47 descriptions for clarity, and add net ecological gain for City projects (need to clarify if for 21 only or for entire CRP).
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Lindsey Shromen-Wawrin	City Council	General	Appreciate the comments and work. Remember staying up late reading through all the recommended actions. We wanted to do this planning for several years and at that time we were dealing with staff shortages. Nathan recommended waiting until we had the staff so we weren't just checking a box. I wish we did cost benefit analysis of everything, but it's hard how to evaluate the benefit of a playground versus a chip seal. Very careful about reductionism to everything greenhouse gas emissions, but it's a useful metric. We will have a big challenge in 2025 with the Comp Plan revision because we have the current Comp Plan, SDAT, 2019 Housing Action Plan, and now this resiliency plan, which we will shortly I presume incorporate. So we are hanging a lot of documents together and like our Municipal Code they may not work together. We need to align these documents together. Carbon neutral is the goal we set in 2019 and I know it may remain on offsets instead of actual reductions, but feel that a 2030 goal as a City as an entire community that we should continue to keep and move forward on. We can set a more ambitious goal in the future like zero carbon. I want to keep this in, but want to hear other critiques and concerns others have on this goal.	Will add definition of carbon neutrality in CRP - call-out box
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Brendan	City Council	#2, #33	When we talk about local food security, I not only want to make sure that we talk about here on the peninsula, but also consider local and international trade as well. That's #2 increasing community capacity. In the transportation section, gives the clean hydrogen example. There is big environmental hazards when it comes to fracking. Take out "hydrogen" in #33	Revised to specify H2 would not come from fossil fuels
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Lindsey Shromen-Wawrin	City Council	#33, #46, #47	Regarding comment about hydrogen. Right now it is not sustainable sourcing from gas, but a lot of the plans producing it from electrolysis are from non fossil fuels. I don't know if we can use this in applications or not. It is a good alternative to batteries for energy storage. I don't agree with phrasing of #33 that talks about clean hydrogen. Defaults to battery sources, vehicle can run on batteries or run on hydrogen. Should not assume that electrification = batteries even though that's the direction things are going in. We will probably end up wanting to have energy stored in batteries and compressed hydrogen generated from electrolysis and not from fracking. I voice my support to in how retention of #46 and 47 are phrased in the staff report and not remove them completely from the Plan.	Revised #33 to distinguish between BEV and FCEV, and to specify H2 would not come from fossil fuels. Will revise 46-47 per staff suggestion.
	6/7/2022	Verbal	Bob Vreeland	Community Member	#46 and 47	Not sure what the right words are to satisfy builders and Chamber of Commerce for #46, 47. Advise, warn, educate? If people that own homes in areas that are potentially vulnerable to climate change, storm tides, and bluff erosion, wildfire, flooding from increased rain, if they're not educated about these things, the City knows is going to happen in certain areas, that leaves the City vulnerable. I believe to successful litigation for loss of life and property damage. I don't want to pay for increased cost of liability insurance that the City has for these occasions. There needs to be some language changes (I agree). In #47, consider hard shoreline protection in certain areas such as bluff areas. I have no clue what that could be. Maybe it's the great wall of PA that I unaffectionately refer to as the wall to keep the transfer center from falling into the strait. But nobody could afford that except Elon Musk and if they could afford it, it would make their neighbors more susceptible to sea level rise. The issue of adding filing to property of record and that will drive realtors and builders nuts, but I don't know what you can do there.	Will change 46-47 descriptions.

Cascadia Interpretation of Next Steps

Acknowledged

Acknowledged

Per Emma direction, will revise 46 and 47 descriptions for clarity, and add net ecological gain for City projects (need to clarify if for 21 only or for entire CRP).

Will add definition of carbon neutrality in CRP - call-out box

Revised to specify H2 would not come from fossil fuels

Revised #33 to distinguish between BEV and FCEV, and to specify H2 would not come from fossil fuels. Will revise 46-47 per staff suggestion.

Will change 46-47 descriptions.

