

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Planning Commission | March 13, 2024

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1471136	Not very excited about any of them. What I really want to see is City of Bellevue helping hold PSE accountable for ACTUALLY reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions.	What I really want to see is City of Bellevue helping hold PSE accountable for ACTUALLY reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions.	What I really want to see is City of Bellevue helping hold PSE accountable for ACTUALLY reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions.
1471801	Updates to existing policies that provide more specific direction regarding enhancing and protecting biodiversity, watersheds, habitats, and other natural resources. New policy to accelerate the transition to all-electric buildings to improve public health, safety, and climate resilience.	how to tackle the urban heat island effect of cities to make warming temperatures more bearable in cities. Trees can help here!	#N/A
1472135	40% coverage of trees and transition to all-electric buildings. Trees are an important part of maintaining stable temperatures in our area and reducing greenhouse gases. Going all electric is a step in the right direction to reducing gas and oil usage. Planning must revolve around diminishing outages to close to zero, as we rely on electric over gas and oil heating, otherwise, it endangers residents and/or causing residents to seek alternative heating through wood burning or generators, both of which will cause greenhouse gas emissions to rise.	Education of public on using bio-friendly de-icers, pesticides and herbicides to reduce run-off of harmful chemicals found in products like "Round-Up" This will improve our waterways and soil health.	South of I-90 along the Eastgate/Cougar Mountain section is in great need of an overpass for wildlife and noise abatement from the new wall constructed on the north side. The neighborhood has increased by more than 15db in noise, making it difficult in some areas to carry on a conversation without speaking loudly. Some areas experience as much as 73db during peak traffic.
1472516	Protecting trees and minimalizing the loss of trees due to development, plus increasing the tree canopy in Bellevue will do a lot to support an environment that will help impact climate change.	when developers remove a tree, ask to mitigate that impact by planting four new trees nearby	#N/A

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1473380	These policies make sense.	Boy are there! You are planning for density near transit. That means those neighborhoods will lose more trees, have more greenhouse gas emissions, higher heat indexes, more traffic. I don't see any policy that indicates that neighborhoods impacted by density are entitled to more parks, more forested land, more shade, more handicapped mobility services, on a per capita basis.	Be fair! All of us want to live in Bridle Trails with the shady streets, parks and tree canopy. When you plan for density, remember that those of us in the dense areas deserve to have fewer trees cut down in our neighborhoods than others. You have overlooked the need for dense areas to have more green space, more trees, more forests, more parks to make up for the density. Driving down Coal Creek Parkway in fall is lovely. Walking around Crossroads and Bel-Red once it is on its planned "diet" to have bike lanes will be hot, with sun glaring off 6 story buildings too close to the sidewalk to have decent TALL trees and provide shade. On a per capita basis, unless you insist on density in ALL neighborhoods, we will suffer from over "loved" parks with too many people.
1474429	Making sure that the infrastructure for transmitting electricity is available to meet growing needs is paramount. Balancing protection of tree canopy with preserving views and facilitating development is also important.	Recognize that there different levels of benefit for environmental restrictions. For example, clean-burning natural gas is likely less harmful than burning coal to generate electricity. Regulations should be flexible and reasonable.	Need to know that changes that affect the quality of life and economics of citizens need to be thoughtfully imposed and cautiously implemented. Draconian changes in Bellevue will not have meaningful environmental impact, but may have significant negative impacts on citizens.
1475704	I don't see any policies on protecting wildlife and fish. I also can't find out which alternative is better for wildlife and fish. Why was that left out. What restoration is planned to increase wildlife and fish in Bellevue?	See above. There is nothing about protecting wildlife and fish.	We are protecting trees to help protect fish, but there are more than just one habitat we want to protect. We need to protect critical areas for wildlife and fish and wetlands, streams, etc.
1475724	#N/A	stop trying to eliminate natural gas from our world, it will not end well with the pathetic grid can't handle more electric use!	#N/A

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1477045	<p>New policy to advocate for and support state and utility regulations that increase electrical grid reliability.</p> <p>This policy address a fundament need.</p>	<p>Please consider a policy that limits the number of policies. There is layer upon layer of well meaning policies in this proposal. There is no real focus. Having so many policies means that none will be effective.</p>	<p>Don't get split into too many layers of efforts. Bellevue is already an expensive place to live. More efforts and more expensive efforts will make the city less inclusive.</p> <p>Please get back to the basics of good environmental stewardship. That is; be more efficient. More efficient with power use. More efficient in construction. Encourage efficiency.</p>
1478573	<p>I support all of these policies, which seem to be established wisdom.</p>	<p>The consumer economy and all the stuff we buy has a lot of climate impacts that don't seem to be accounted for here. How do we make a greener economy?</p>	<p>We have waited too long on many of our environmental solutions: stopping pollution, recovering species and ecosystems, and stopping climate change. We need strong policies to stop and slow bad behavior and create investments in the right answers.</p>
1478575	<p>Updates to existing policies that provide more specific direction regarding enhancing and protecting biodiversity, watersheds, habitats, and other natural resources.</p>	<p>nothing new added spend my money wisely</p>	<p>money</p>
1485198	<p>They all sound good - in theory.</p>	<p>There needs to be more responsibility on the public use spaces for maintaining adequate tree canopy. Our parks need more shaded areas. Our parking lots could use more shaded areas. But homeowners should not be held to ridiculous policies for maintaining trees that are hazardous to their homes or expensive, time consuming runarounds for removing fire hazard, roof hazard, foundation hazard trees on their properties. Bridle Trails especially. We have living but very large trees that overhang our home, that are literally up against our home within a few feet, or with rootballs that will destroy our foundation if the trees fell over or caught fire or carry too much snowpack, but we are not allowed to</p>	<p>Please consider that people who buy homes here are not necessary flowing with money and may have stretched to be able to purchase a home here. Many of the marginally affordable homes may have deferred maintainance, to put it nicely, from the previous owners that the new, housepoor owners have to deal with. Making it exorbitantly expensive or not even permitted to deal with some of the canopy on their properties only risks more expensive damage and personal injury.</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
		<p>remove them?? My neighbor was denied removal of a dying tree that later in the season fell over and took out their fence and chicken coop.</p> <p>The "equity lens when making decisions about where to prioritize efforts to increase the tree canopy" needs to be refocused and not make Bellevue such a difficult place to live comfortably when home ownership - including maintainance and repairs - in this area is already too expensive.</p>	
1485394	All these “new” plans sound good because all are necessary to improve the climate.	Clean energy job creation and low cost housing need to be provided for, as well as public Libraries and other free public spaces, such as parks, recreation, beach access. Addressing Climate change is the most important issue. Policies need to support what’s best for the climate.	Addressing Climate change is the most important issue. Policies need to support what’s best for the climate.
1487927	More mixed use development because it will increase housing supply and improve walkability	Zoning reform. Too much of Bellevue is single family detached homes. Legalize the building of “missing middle” housing near commercial areas and schools	The future of Bellevue needs to be one where it’s walkable. Freeway expansions, destruction of retail space for car dealerships, and lack of funding for bike lanes and pedestrian infrastructure is a backwards way to go about planning
1488146	#N/A	Improve traffic flow using better ways to control traffic lights.	#N/A
1488317	Trees We need to stop cutting down trees for 4,000 sq ft homes !	Residential outside light restrictions.	Think of our present and future environment first not just money Something you can’t replace or buy

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1489685	<p>Many of these policies sound valuable. The most important overriding policies are those that zero in on achieving our greenhouse gas emissions targets of 50% by 2030 and hopefully 95% by 2050. Top priority must be given to electrifying everything but most importantly all existing and all new buildings and all transportation. Building electrification can be achieved by implementing building performance standards for all buildings including residential.</p> <p>-- New policy to accelerate the transition to all-electric buildings to improve public health, safety, and climate resilience.</p> <p>-- New policy to achieve a target of reducing citywide greenhouse gas emissions 95% by 2050 compared to emissions in 2011.</p> <p>-- Updates to existing policies around storm water management to minimize pollution and promote onsite filtration (in yard not into storm drain)</p> <p>-- Updates to tree canopy policies that commit the city to achieving its goal of at least 40% coverage, that specify increasing tree canopy in a variety of settings and stress the importance of trees to biodiversity.</p> <p>-- New policies to protect trees and minimize loss of trees due to development.</p>	<p>New policy to achieve 50% to achieve a target of reducing citywide greenhouse gas emissions 50% by 2050 compared to emissions in 2011.</p> <p>Policies to electrify transit.</p> <p>Protections for landmark trees to make it very hard to remove them.</p> <p>Policies to increase water conservation and recycling.</p>	<p>Well over 80% of our greenhouse gas emissions come from existing buildings and transportation. We must electrify existing buildings as well as new development. We need to have a MASSIVE push starting in 2024 to electrify existing buildings.</p> <p>They should not destroy Bellevue's neighborhoods with high rises.</p> <p>The residents are watching them. They should do their jobs to represent residents not developers.</p>
1490122	<p>Sustainable development, just because that is clearly the path to the future; most of the bullet points in that section seem like just-do-it actions to me.</p> <p>Re, trees: I think Bellevue is very good in this area, very tree-y. To me, it's important to have policies that discourage developers from clear cutting lots, and to protect the green spaces, BUT I feel like the city can butt out of sticking its nose into what an individual</p>	#N/A	#N/A

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	homeowner can do with a tree in their yard. Apply your nanny state tendencies elsewhere.		
1490739	Filtration through the yard, not the storm drains. And we should enforce that yards aren't polluting. People all over the city have installed astroturf instead of grass when really we should all have varied plantings. The city does nothing about all that impervious surface.	Require daylighting of streams and restoration of wetlands. Sturdevant and Goff Creeks are a mess, from the Spring District to the nasty business park that sits in the north end of the Mercer Slough. Let's protect these wetlands better.	#N/A
1491003	None. Drop the whole thing.	Yeah. Put a moratorium on multi family housing	Start respecting private property
1491584	These policy moves address important issues around sustainability, including climate change, reduction in GHG emissions, energy efficiency and net zero development, and habitat and tree canopy protection. Once major area that seems to be missing is around transportation, which contributes heavily to GHG emissions as well as other harms through polluted runoff water with toxins leached from brake pads and tires.	<p>The policies say they will "consider the impacts" of climate change on various processes and planning strategies - but do not commit the city to actually adopt processes and strategies to mitigate the harms of climate change. The city could "consider the impacts" and simply ignore them. The policy language needs to be stronger and make commitments to not only consider the impacts, but make decisions that materially reduce the amount and impact of climate change.</p> <p>The same criticism applies to the equity policy move; while it will consider the impacts on historically marginalized groups it does not commit the city to actually involving them in planning and decision making processes, or making decisions that specifically mitigate past and future harms to these</p>	<p>There are a lot of resources available to shape stronger and more actionable policies by looking at peers around the world. For example another major contributor to GHG is organic decomposition in landfills, and Bellevue lacks curbside composting.</p> <p>Australia has banned natural gas in new homes this year: https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/climate-energy/australian-state-bans-gas-new-homes-2024-push-cut-emissions-2023-07-28/</p> <p>Many states are banning the sale of gasoline cars and Bellevue could get in front through equitable deployment of EV charging infrastructure and banning any new gasoline pumps: https://www.cnet.com/roadshow/news/states-</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
		<p>communities. The city should look at the state-level HEAL Act and the associated Environmental Justice Council and Environmental Disparities Map as a guideline for how to measure and assess impacts to overburdened groups, as well as involve them in budgeting and planning processes.</p> <p>https://waportal.org/partners/environmental-justice-council</p> <p>https://doh.wa.gov/data-and-statistical-reports/washington-tracking-network-wtn/washington-environmental-health-disparities-map</p> <p>The policies "support" the phasing out of fossil fuels and "accelerate" the transition to all-electric buildings, but do not commit the city to eliminating fossil fuel hookups in new construction, or provide specific programs to retrofit existing buildings to eliminate fossil fuels. These policies need to be written with stronger language with specific policies and programs that will actually achieve sustainability goals. The current language runs the risk of generating reports that will sit on shelves.</p>	<p>banning-new-gas-powered-cars/</p> <p>27 of the C40 cities have already passed peak GHG emissions and are now on the downslope: https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/27-C40-Cities-have-peaked-their-greenhouse-gas-emissions?language=en_US</p> <p>There are lots of tools available, Bellevue could adopt any number of policies and programs that would make a real difference in fighting against climate change.</p>
1491650	<p>[The existence of climate change, the need to prevent it's predicted negative impacts and therefore the need to eliminate carbon emissions makes me say the policy moves listed below sound good to me.]</p> <p>1. New policy to accelerate the transition to all-electric buildings to improve public health, safety, and climate resilience.</p>	<p>Missing is a policy about whether to rely on distributed energy resources (DER) or utility energy resources.</p>	<p>That business as usual is not going to cut it.</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>2. New policy to advocate for and support state and utility regulations that increase electrical grid reliability.</p> <p>3. New policy to support development that phases out use of fossil fuels and promotes renewable energy and building electrification.</p> <p>4. Updates to existing policy to factor in the cost of climate change to capital projects and budgeting processes.</p>		
1491697	#N/A	#N/A	<p>1. Housing affordability</p> <p>2. Rising waters due climate change</p> <p>3. Aging population and accessibility into public places</p>
1492159	<p>Sustainable Development and Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions - it is imperative that the City focuses on reducing GHG emissions 50% by 2030. If we don't reach this goal, then it will be incredibly difficult catch up and an 80% reduction by 2050 won't be achievable.</p>	<p>It is imperative that the City focuses on reducing GHG emissions 50% by 2030. If we don't reach this goal, then it will be incredibly difficult catch up and an 80% reduction by 2050 won't be achievable.</p>	<p>It is imperative that the City focuses on reducing GHG emissions 50% by 2030. If we don't reach this goal, then it will be incredibly difficult catch up and an 80% reduction by 2050 won't be achievable.</p>
1493150	<p>The policies that matter most to me are the ones that will help us reach our 2030 goals of reducing GHG emissions by 50%.</p>	<p>This effort needs to have support from transportation, which I know you are considering in another section.</p>	<p>Your leadership on these policies will help our citizenry recognize that climate change is real with real consequences and the longer we wait, the more work we have to do and the harder it will be to protect the world we want for ourselves and future generations.</p>
1497013	<p>These are all shifts in the right direction. I especially like:</p> <p>Ensuring facilities for composting and recycling at Multifamily and Commercial Buildings.</p> <p>Various improvements in the Tree Code.</p> <p>Creating noise level standards to limit harm to living</p>	<p>Policy requiring addition of some # of charging facilities to new Multifamily Buildings.</p> <p>Policy requiring (not just encouraging) onsite filtration of Stormwater.</p> <p>Stronger mandates for energy efficiency in new development.</p>	<p>As our city transforms over the next decade or two, it will be worth the investment to do it right:</p> <p>Make sure Multifamily buildings are efficient AND highly livable.</p> <p>Ensure new construction & redevelopment both create neighborhoods that are human-centered</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	beings. Assigning dollar value to ecosystems. Considering impacts of climate change on planning , development, and other projects, & Factoring cost of climate change....		(scale, air, light, trees) walkable, and have desirable neighborhood center services and green spaces that are easily accessible (walk, roll, bike, & car). We can make it a place people want to live. If we don't, they will choose another, more livable place.
1497689	All. I feel climate change represents an existential threat to humans. Many of today's other very serious problems won't matter if the effects of climate change, e.g. food supply disruptions, lead to mass loss of lives. Even we survive as a species, the social toll will likely be huge as people displaced by uninhabitable areas seek refuge in most hospital areas, perhaps the northwest. While this is a much larger issue than Bellevue, it can only be addressed by changes everywhere. Further, I believe Bellevue has the opportunity (and responsibility) to demonstrate to the rest of the world, that effective improvements are possible, often without breaking the bank.	Emphasis on electrification of motorized transportation. improvements to encourage non motor vehicle transport (e.g. bike lanes, improved walking routes/paths). Greater emphasis on supporting folks with lower income and/or in existing higher density residences to move to lower carbon worlds (e.g. subsidies for natural gas to heat pump conversions EV charging stations for folks with garages).	That I thank them for their public service. And that I hope, in these contentious times and somewhat post-truth era, that they approach decisions based on facts and logic, and not in response to the politics and emotions of traditional and social media echo chambers.
1498272	I am in agreement with all of the new and updated policies and would support achieving them both through financial/fiscal decisions and actions (e.g. volunteers, etc.)	#N/A	Bellevue is a leader in this area and I wish to keep it that way.
1498286	The new policy to advocate for and support state and utility regulations that increase electrical grid reliability. This is tantamount to our future.	There is a glaringly obvious missing piece about climate change, and that includes reduced snowpack and it's downstream effects, including drinking water and wildfires. We need to prepare for less water and an increase in wildfires.	#N/A

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1498407	#N/A	<p>policies that address water supply and electric power concerns</p> <p>https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/environment/wa-drinking-water-hydropower-at-risk-as-pnw-snowpack-shrinks/ https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/climate-lab/seattles-water-comes-from-two-river-systems-which-one-do-you-drink-from/</p>	<p>global warming is real as well as climate change and its impact on the environment. proactively addressing this in this area will become increasingly important. Addressing environmental impacts from an emergency management perspective also should be a priority to ensure public safety.</p>
1498590	<p>Electrification is great! But the grid has to be robust enough to handle all that extra juice and to coordinate the flow of power to make sure you can send power where it needs to go and away from areas that have too much. Switching to a distributed local grid that orchestrates power flows rather than having omit come top- down from power companies to passive consumers.</p>	<p>Climate goals also need to be accounted for when deciding on roads or expanded lanes for existing streets.</p>	<p>Density is our friend. Zoning that allows detached units on property, multi family housing and provides tax incentives to do so would be a tremendous benefit</p>
1498620	<p>around stormwater management to minimize pollution and promote onsite filtration (in yard not into storm drain)</p>	#N/A	#N/A
1498897	<p>Updates to existing policies that provide more specific direction regarding enhancing and protecting biodiversity, watersheds, habitats, and other natural resources. - Let's make Bellevue a vibrant city in a real park! We aren't there yet.</p> <p>Updates to tree canopy policies that commit the city to achieving its goal of at least 40% coverage, that specify increasing tree canopy in a variety of settings and stress the importance of trees to biodiversity - This goal is measurable and achievable!</p>	#N/A	<p>Use a climate change lense (enhancing adaption/resilience) for all decision making.</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	New policy to support development that phases out use of fossil fuels and promotes renewable energy and building electrification. - Let's address Climate change and be leaders, not follower like Bellevue is now.		
1499042	New policies to protect tree canopies, especially those surrounding the Watershed neighborhood subareas. They should also be preserved for the at the 40% subareas. Trees bring a sense of well-being that is priceless.	Public safety should be given priority. Also, resident who have invested in their homes and communities should be stakeholders and prioritized over left wing media who are urging housing growth at any cost over people's quality of living.	Grow the way people will desire to live or cities will be back to square one, inequitable neighborhoods in subareas less desirable to live in.
1499305	All the policy moves mentioned above are important but I believe reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions is most critical. We cannot stop the rise in global temperatures unless we stop emitting these emissions. If we can stop our planet from warming, it would reduce, perhaps eventually eliminate so many of the climate disasters we are experiencing today and which will increase in number and severity if we continue with our GHG emissions as they are today. This policy would include the phasing out of fossil fuel in our energy needs.	No	We must do all we can to sufficiently address climate change.
1499419	<p>I support Bellevue to take stronger action on preventing and reducing greenhouse gas pollution. I also support planning ahead for a changing climate. On most of these policies, I support them, and would encourage stronger action.</p> <p>However, some of these policies appear to be at odds with climate and sustainability goals.</p> <p>It is unclear what is mean by the "policy to advocate for ... electrical grid reliability". The city needs to be crystal clear in its advocacy that it supports the</p>	<p>The city should phase in procurement requirements for all of its larger suppliers to do greenhouse gas reporting, and scale down their greenhouse gas pollution towards climate targets. This can be modeled after the work of major businesses that operate in Bellevue.</p> <p>Energy efficiency should be encouraged in all new developments, not just affordable housing. Bellevue should adopt the latest building standards for new buildings to improve insulation and energy efficiency.</p>	Bellevue should be very wary or building new roads or widening roads. The existing road network should be evaluated to see how it can be repurposed to improve safety, greenery, and active and public transport. This has been very successful internationally, and also improves road safety because people don't speed as much on narrower roads.

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>development of a carbon-free electricity system. Reliability is one component of that, but if only reliability is mentioned, the city could inadvertently end up supporting fossil fuels. Please ensure the city's position on this is updated.</p> <p>Policies to protect trees in the city are not aligned with climate or sustainability goals, and can become a tool for NIMBYs. While I support tree canopy and native plants, the city policy needs to be clear on why trees are being protected, and not be over-protective. Higher urban density, and improvements in active and public transit, are both more important for climate and sustainability than any specific tree in this city.</p>	<p>Bellevue should speed up and streamline solarization and electrification permitting for homes.</p> <p>Methane gas (marketed as "natural gas") connections to new buildings should be discouraged and phased out.</p> <p>Active and public transit investments, as well as increasing density and mixed use, are critical to improve the energy efficiency of transit across the city. This also leads to reduced pollution from greenhouse gases.</p>	
1499731	<p>None really, the sustain able stuff and going electric has to be market driven over a reasonable period of time like 100 years, The advertised schedule for removing fossil fuels and going all electric is not practical or desirable. Need and energy mix for reliability, diversification and security. NEED COMMON SENSE!!</p>	<p>COMMON SENSE and Market Driven Changes.</p>	<p>Not in favor of further limiting development in Bellevue. Tree policies are over the top now with absolutely no benefit to the Citizens of Bellevue. There is PLENTY of foliage and plants to enhance the carbon footprint and filter water. Don't over regulate Upland areas especially. Don't burden new development with the damage already caused by the old unless you are ready to start going backward and remove all structures to meet existing codes. Use common sense and do not be swayed by activism and poor science,</p>
1500189	<p>All of these policies are important, including ensuring development and capital projects consider climate impacts and that the resources are available for city renovations or new buildings to models of clean energy and climate resilience. Centering equity, particularly the perspectives and knowledge of priority community is essential during the</p>	<p>Tree establishment periods need to be extended and more resources committed to tree care, including watering. Extreme heat events have been stressing trees, including street trees and mature trees. This stress will be evident with increasing tree loss over time. Tree care and preservation should be a policy and budget priority. If the city doesn't increase tree</p>	<p>#N/A</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	development of policies and implementation strategies.	watering, we will see significant losses. The stress is evident every summer and increasing.	
1501817	There is no policy that protects and restores existing streams to help fish restoration.	Yes, what is the protection of fish and wildlife when there are proposed developments? Are fish and wildlife not part of the environment?	That this EIS is lacking in wildlife and fish
1503872	I LOVE: New policy to establish noise standards that limit harmful impacts to human health and safety and wildlife. This is something we can do NOW and is a relatively easy first/small step forward. I also LOVE the idea that the city acts as a role model by leading the way with Greenhouse Gas emission targets and changes like electrification. Lastly, the TREES updates and new policies are much needed and appreciated. It takes decades for trees to ultimately grow and provide the shade and canopy that is desirable and it only takes minutes for developers to cut them down.	I believe that we not only have to build for a sustainable future but we likely will also have to ADAPT to the changes already happening as a result of climate change. It will be important to address (and implement) adaptive design that contemplates the increased heat, fires, extreme weather, flooding, etc. that will likely increase in frequency (with, of course, the end goal being to ultimately reverse those changes through carbon reduction).	I think we all recognize an understand that development and growth is a part of ensuring a vibrant and healthy city. That said, it feels like Bellevue has ‘oversteered’ toward allowing development and developers to do whatever they want... In many cases, these developers are flipping their projects as soon as they are complete and ultimately could care less if they degrade the livability and sustainability of the community as a result of their selfish (ie profit maximizing) choices. Don’t be scared of creating high standards (and requirements) for design and development! We want quality over quantity and quality will pay off in the long run. There’s a reason why the Bellevue Collection is fully occupied (versus other centers that are not)... it is because of Kemper Freeman’s attention to detail, high standards, and willingness to say no to tenants that do not meet their standards.
1503989	reducig citywide greenhouse gas emmissions 95% by 2050	Retaining the "City in a Park"	Protect historical existing neighborhoods

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1504040	all are good	no	#N/A
1504365	What a poor question! There is not sufficient time or space to answer it.	(1) Many of the policy statements are so broadly worded that they could be broadly impactful if taken at full value. Details are needed. (2)What is seriously missing is attention to the needed transportation transformation which must stay ahead of growth. Growth and development should go hand in hand with improved alternatives to single occupancy vehicle usage, and especially the increased public transit access in all areas, but especially in areas experiencing increased housing density. Development must be tied to providing added public transit service. Also, minimum parking stall requirements should be dropped at the same time as development is linked to increasing public transit accessibility and convenience. (3) All new parking stall growth must include the requirement for EV charging stations. (4) There must be a policy to maintain the current square feet of city park land per capita ratio as population growth continues.	In addition to my comments in answer to question #5, I feel strongly that Climate Change Mitigation and Resilience should be a stand alone element in the new comprehensive plan, separate from other environmental policies.
1504800	All of them! More green Solar yes	Less walls along highways	The future - survival

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1505160	<p>This survey format is so frustrating to me. I cannot easily comment on specific policies. So they're all pasted here.</p> <p>GENERAL</p> <p>Updates to existing policies that provide more specific direction regarding enhancing and protecting biodiversity, watersheds, habitats, and other natural resources. YES. And I agree with PC Comm Chair's comment on 2/14 to flip the order, bringing forward the intent to save green spaces, etc., and thereby to focus development in brown and gray fields.</p> <p>Updates to existing policies that provide more specific direction to consider the impacts of climate change on planning, development, and other projects. YES because of course we should be doing this!</p> <p>Updates to existing policy to factor in the cost of climate change to capital projects and budgeting processes. YES because of course we should be doing this!</p> <p>New policy to consider environmental impacts to historically marginalized groups from city planning and projects. YES because of course we should be doing this! And to ensure all that air pollution policy language includes all areas and uses eg including housing, not just child care centers.</p> <p>New policy to advocate for and support state and utility regulations that increase electrical grid reliability. NOT NECESSARILY. I commented on this one in #6 below.</p> <p>New policy to use tools that assign a dollar value to ecosystems, to help evaluate the costs associated with protecting, repairing, or losing those ecosystems. YES. I commented on this policy move below in #6.</p>	<p>I have no idea. The 169 pages of the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update: Proposed Amendment, plus the FEIS and Appendices is way too much for even a civically engaged resident like me to have time to review, let alone be able to understand everything.</p>	<p>All of my comments to individual policies above, and these, which I'd written prior to diving in to comment on each policy individually.</p> <p>"New policy to advocate for and support state and utility regulations that increase electrical grid reliability." This policy immediately makes me think this is a boon to PSE who already is raping its customers and building unnecessary new infrastructure to make beaucoup bucks, but won't increase reliability. See: CENSE and their years of analysis and fighting these gratuitous projects and rate increases.</p> <p>"New policy to use tools that assign a dollar value to ecosystems, to help evaluate the costs associated with protecting, repairing, or losing those ecosystems." Can this policy please be applied to Airfield Park in Eastgate, so it's preserved as is, vs. greatly denigrating this open space and natural area for a ginormous aquatic center, etc.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>New policy to establish noise standards that limit harmful impacts to human health and safety and wildlife, YES. It's kind of amazing that we wouldn't already have a policy on this.</p> <p>Updates to existing policies around stormwater management to minimize pollution and promote onsite filtration (in yard not into storm drain). YES although I have no idea how you implement and monitor this. What about homeowners pouring toxic materials down the stormdrain, or down their house drain? Out of ignorance, presumably.</p> <p>TREES -- I support EVERYTHING the city can and should already have been doing to retain significant and landmark trees. I live in Eastgate. Developers like MN Construction have been raping (yes, that is how I denote their behavior) my neighborhood and denuding our once-lush conifer-filled lots.</p> <p>Updates to tree canopy policies that commit the city to achieving its goal of at least 40% coverage, that specify increasing tree canopy in a variety of settings and stress the importance of trees to biodiversity. ESPECIALLY IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS!!! The chart shared in the Jan. 11 presentation on tree code proposed changes, showing the tree loss in the past couple of years in residential areas is simply deplorable.</p> <p>New policies to protect trees and minimize loss of trees due to development. DOH, YES!</p> <p>New policies to support the health of city trees and urban forests by improving soil conditions and considering impacts of climate change. YES</p> <p>New policy to use an equity lens when making decisions about where to prioritize efforts to increase the tree canopy. YES. This is overdue.</p>		

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - my overall comment here is: it's about time!</p> <p>New policy to support net-zero development that eliminates greenhouse gas emissions and waste. YES</p> <p>New policy to support energy efficiency in affordable housing projects by providing incentives, financing to support retrofits, or other strategies. YES</p> <p>New policy to support development that phases out use of fossil fuels and promotes renewable energy and building electrification. YES. And what about the monster entity called PSE and where it is sourcing its energy to provide the increased electricity? Going electric isn't an improvement if the electricity is generated from fossil fuels.</p> <p>New policy to make sure new commercial and multi-family buildings provide space for composting and recycling in addition to garbage. HECK YES! Why hasn't this been done already?</p> <p>Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions - YES, we should be doing everything in the quiver or toolkit to address reducing GHG.</p> <p>New policy to accelerate the transition to all-electric buildings to improve public health, safety, and climate resilience. YES, but same comment here as above re PSE's electricity generation sources.</p> <p>New policy to achieve a target of reducing citywide greenhouse gas emissions 95% by 2050 compared to emissions in 2011. YES but I have yet to see concrete pathways for how the city plans to actually achieve it GHG reductions goals. Increasing</p>		

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	staff for the Environmental Stewardship team is a good start but not nearly sufficient. New policy to consider the impacts of climate change and emissions reductions goals when planning for new growth. DOH!		
1505460	#N/A	#N/A	The 40% tree canopy idea, if you think that private property should be part of the inventory, is wrong. Cost of climate change, not clearly defined at all. In general this all looks like a PC committee got together, and nobody had the guts to say that anything was a bad idea. There are many bad ideas here that will cost a lot of money.
1505773	Reducing greenhouse gas emissions because it is the most important thing to slow down climate catastrophe.	Stop building new roads and start incentivizing alternative modes of travel to meet the necessary emissions goals. Convert automobile-only transportation corridors to include completely accessible and safe (traffic stress level 1) bicycle and pedestrian routes to reach any part of the city.	You must act quickly and decisively to lower emissions. It will only be harder the longer you wait.
1506173	Noise standards that limit harmful impact on human health - living near a grocery store that doesn't take into consideration the noise they create affects the neighbors. It would be great if they were required to reduce the business noise (by sound barriers or buffers) so that neighbors can not hear them when they are IN their houses and are able to enjoy their backyards without excessive noise which is stressful to be around.	#N/A	#N/A
1507787	They all sound good, but be careful about over-protection of trees. Tree canopy is good, and trees are attractive, but it's also important that the city can develop climate-friendly infrastructure like denser housing, safe walk and bike lanes, and more. Trees should not get in the way of these priorities by causing delays or additional expense. Planting new	The city should require all of its landscaping contractors to make progress on piloting and switching to electric tools. A greater and steadily increasing use of electric tools could be incentivized. This will reduce the health impacts of noise, particulate pollution, and vibration on workers. It will	#N/A

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	native trees may often be just as good for city needs as preserving the ones that are in place.	<p>reduce the environmental impacts of noise and particulate pollution on residents. It will reduce greenhouse gas pollution, helping the city to meet climate goals. And, it will encourage and incentivize local landscaping companies to offer these services to Bellevue businesses and residents more broadly, so there will be a flow-on benefit to the whole community.</p> <p>While some landscaping companies will argue they can't do this, others that already do it. The equipment is available, and it works. For example, the Clean Air Lawn Care franchise which operates locally offers 100% electric tools already.</p> <p>For a summary of some of the impacts of Bellevue continuing to allow gas-powered tool use, please see: https://grist.org/technology/lawn-equipment-pollution-report/</p>	
1508450	Planning for stormwater management	<p>CL-12 is this target adjusted for population size?</p> <p>CL-26 Zero-waste community wide in accordance with the Environmental Stewardship Plan doesn't seem to match with CL-29 and CL-30</p> <p>CL-58 Should the impervious area calculation also include areas where drainage has been installed to divert rainfall off the property, rather than allowing it to permeate the ground on-site?</p>	#N/A
1508626	Quite frankly, many of these policies seem way too light-weight. Climate change requires rapid and bold actions. The city seems to be doing almost nothing towards reducing GHG emissions. Almost no budget is allocated to it, the city has policies that are so	The city is completely missing taking real action against climate change. So far, there is very little focus or funds by the city to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions. There are few policies in place. The building code is a joke. The city MUST mandate (not	The city should not be allowing so many affordable homes to be completely torn down and replaced with giant mansion that are not only completely against all the city's efforts to create affordable housing but are also absolutely terrible for the environment. Such

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>weak, it's embarrassing. Obviously, the developers have city staff in the palms of their hands. The city allows all these teardown of good homes. Shame on Bellevue and proof that developers are controlling the city staff - either that or the city has absolutely no interest in mitigating climate change, just pretending like it matters while doing almost nothing.</p>	<p>"support") that ALL new construction - residential and commercial - cannot use fossil fuels for heating/cooling air or water. The city needs to phase out gas furnaces as soon as possible. Simple codes like requiring ALL new construction have wiring in place for charging electric vehicles (easy and cheap during the construction phase).</p>	<p>giant homes will exist for 50 to 100 years or more, are allowed to heat air and water with fossil fuels, throw away many resources into landfills, and use new resources in construction. It's appalling that the city allows this - totally and utterly hypocritical to say you support affordable housing and mitigating climate change while allowing so much tearing down of good, more affordable homes for McMansion. Shame on Bellevue!!!</p> <p>If you want to mitigate climate change at all, Bellevue MUST put in strict policies with clear timelines that are relatively soon in order to make real change. You are in a position to make a difference and are squandering it by talking about it and taking very little real action.</p> <p>Planning Commissioners are NOT making good decisions for the next generation. There is not enough bold action and strict policies to mitigate climate change. You are creating a city that will not be very livable for our future generations because you're too focused on short-term concerns like bending to whatever developers want you to do while selling our kids' future. You are in a position to make REAL change. Do it - MAKE REAL CHANGE.</p>
1508648	<p>The most important policies that need to be addressed are those associated with climate change and the reduction of greenhouse gasses. As a graduate student planning on living in the area for the foreseeable future, it is vital that make significant strides towards lower-emission transportation and housing initiatives. Bellevue needs to take a stronger stance and enforce stricter rules associated with climate change (like building permits and</p>	<p>The biggest policy that needs to be improved is that associated with climate change. Bellevue is not doing enough to mitigate our greenhouse gasses and move towards a net-zero city. It is vital to take steps in this direction to set up the next generation for success.</p>	<p>They need to know that the next generation of people planning on living and working in Bellevue are expecting the Planning Commissioners to look out for our futures and the needs of not only our city but also the people living here. Without taking massive steps towards lower greenhouse gasses as quickly as possible, we are being set up for failure. Steps need to be taken TODAY to ensure the success of future.</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	regulations). We can't wait 5 or 10 or 15 years to start making changes, these NEED to start NOW.		
1508649	<p>Every policy above needs to have mitigating climate change at the core. Without doing so, there will be no world for us humans to live in. I'm 18 and worry about the fact that the US and the world isn't doing enough. Here is Bellevue, sadly, we are not doing much either. I see my city allowing perfectly good houses to be completely torn down and replaced by gigantic McMansions for maybe 2-4 people to live in. This new house could be there for 100 years and you let it happen and you are doing it all the time, in fact, it seems to be happening more and more. This is unacceptable. Bellevue should be a leader as our city is full of well educated people with enough financial resources and yet we do so little. Please think of the next generation. Please take bold action. Force developers to make zero-emissions buildings. Please require existing buildings to become energy efficient. Phase out all fossil fuel use in all buildings and vehicles. Use taxes and incentives and cooperate with banks to find funding for individuals to make changes to their homes. Get businesses to change their cars and trucks to all-electric. You can do this because you have the power to do it. Please use your power to make my future one I can look forward to by address climate change NOW!!!</p>	<p>All new building (homes and businesses) need to be zero-emissions starting yesterday. Such a policy should have already been in place. Please do so NOW as climate change needs to be addressed seriously and urgently. All existing buildings need to be required to be energy efficient. What the state is requiring is pretty lame. Bellevue should be requiring more and sooner.</p>	<p>I was born and raised in Bellevue and now attending UW Seattle. I am worried about how the City of Bellevue is not doing enough to reduce our GHG emissions. This is URGENT, but is being treated like we have all the time in the world. We do not. We young people are depending on the Planning Commissioners to be well educated about climate change and how we must address it as urgently as possible. Please make aggressive policies even if they piss of developers. We are depending on you to make a future not just good, but you have to make a future possible. If we don't address climate change now, there will not be a world to live in at all. Please take bold action IMMEDIATELY.</p>

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1508675	Preservation and improvement of the ecosystem of critical areas and the tree canopies surrounding them.	<p>What is missing is a scale determining the maximum impervious surface area before it begins to affect temperatures directly surrounding it with the minimum 40% tree canopy.</p> <p>The effects of Impervious surfaces areas are not limited to only stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Keeping the city clean and maintained.</p>	Ecosystems need to be looked at as a whole, and not just parcel by parcel in areas with 200 foot trees and watersheds.
1509055	All except to completely rely on electricity. Electricity is vulnerable to weather conditions and people will need alternative sources.	Education on food consumption and carbon footprint. A good example is the beef industry.	Take into consideration energy alternatives outside of just electricity.

Which policy moves sound good and why?

- Good focus on electrical grid reliability. All great policy moves.
- Love: ALL of the new updates, highlights: trees, stormwater, sustainability, more composting and recycling in MF developments
- Tree canopy good --> make city beautiful & peaceful!
- Keep these preservation policies & move on the excellent new ones

Are there any policy ideas missing?

- Poster does not align with staffer's view on policy.
- Give incentive and gradual phase out gas-powered blowers for landscaping because they cause air and noise pollution.
- Give incentives for new and existing houses to install solar panels.
- Make saving land to support saving trees or planting trees a priority. Trees need land to sustain health and growth. Stop allowing trees to be cut down.
- Eliminate gas-powered lawn tools
- I would like the tree code to include provisions for removing trees for solar power on homes. I would also like to see incentives for training trees on single family lots - my neighbors who cut down every tree around their mega-mansion have a "save big trees" sign in their yard. Seems unfair they don't have trees but want me to provide the benefit of my trees for free.
- Be careful with noise standards in an urban environment.
- Concerns the dollar value calculations on ecosystems. Could add a lot of bureaucracy and cost with little/no value.
- Reduce greenhouse gas! The city has no incentive to do this, no solar promotion, no limits on new gas lines for residential! Prohibit new gas, incentivize solar storage.

What do you want Planning Commission to know?

- I'm concerned that over-development and/or not keeping it dense will worsen our climate change. We are at an emergency tipping point, and we should not be cutting down any trees. Keep them, keep ourselves.