

EMAILS RECEIVED REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS

CITY OF ALBANY, CALIFORNIA



ALBANY CITY HALL
1000 SAN PABLO AVENUE
ALBANY, CALIFORNIA 94706

***Item 11-1:
Final Climate Action
& Adaptation Plan***

(note: received after 12 Noon cutoff
day of council meeting)

CITY COUNCIL MEETING
December 2, 2019

From: [buddycalifornia](#)
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Albany City Council - increase intermediate CAAP target
Date: Monday, December 2, 2019 12:58:04 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL.]

Dear City Council Members,

To keep Albany as the progressive city that it publicly portrays, please increase the intermediate pollution reduction target from 60% relative to 2004 by 2035 to 70% by 2030.

Otherwise, our CAAP will follow the current political vogue of declaring ourselves to be something in fantasy (climate protection leaders) while actually committing us to be something different in fact (climate protection laggards).

The last consideration by the Council just matched the most recent State Executive Order. Do not leave the highest reduction rate to the end of the time scale - this is dangerous in regards to economics and our climate.

Thank you,

Brian Williams

(Albany homeowner with 2 children in Albany schools)

From: [Ian MacLeod](#)
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Climate Action and Adaptation Plan
Date: Monday, December 2, 2019 4:43:35 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL.]

Dear Council Members,

While I am 100% in support of the overall intent and goals of the CAAP 2.0, I am writing to urge you to take the following actions to improve the draft Climate Action and Adaptation Plan:

1. Adopt a more stringent target goal of a 70% reduction in green house gas production by 2030, instead of 60% by 2035, as recommended by the Climate Action Committee. A more stringent goal is needed because of the urgency of the climate crisis. Front loading our efforts will have a greater payback and will reduce the likelihood of catastrophic and enormously expensive outcomes facing us if we fail to act decisively. The scientific consensus is that we must take drastic action in the next ten years to have any chance at stabilizing the climate at around a 1.5 deg. C global temperature increase. Please see the latest United Nations Environment Program 'Emissions Gap Report 2019' <https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2019> The City of Albany should take a strong leadership role on this. The time for delay in action or saying 'let's wait and see' is long over.
2. Regarding Active Transportation items 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. These items are actually weaker and more ambiguous than the same items in the CAP 1.0. The CAP 1.0 called for:
 - A) 30% bicycle network coverage by 2015 and 90% bicycle network coverage by 2020
 - B) Walking and bicycling mode share of commute trips. 15% combined by 2020

We have fallen way short of these goals. The CAP 1.0 also called for: Proposed bicycle infrastructure improvements will be based on street types and existing characteristics. Bicycle infrastructure improvements will include development of bike paths, cycletracks, class II bike lanes, bicycle-friendly intersections, etc. This makes a lot more sense than just prioritizing 'low stress' facilities in the CAP 2.0. Low stress facilities do not necessarily apply to all streets and in particular to high volume streets. As seen in cities all around the world, putting motorist separated/protected bike lanes on major streets is the most effective way to increase ridership and the modal share of cycling and other types of wheeled active transportation, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and reduce our green house gas production to meet our stated targets. The references to "low stress" should be deleted and the language should be changed to a statement such as "[create a continuous and connected bike infrastructure network throughout the City of Albany, appropriate to the type and characteristics of each street, that will increase the modal share of cycling and other types of active transportation and will increase access and safety for riders of all ages and abilities.](#)"

3. Multi-family housing, Transit Oriented Development, and increased density. The CAP 1.0 had an extensive section on increasing housing and density. The CAP 2.0 makes no mention of this whatsoever. There should be a section in the CAP 2.0 that addresses this, at least in principle. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/25/opinion/california-home-prices-climate.html> More local Transit Oriented multi-family housing development will reduce commute miles, and create a more robust, resilient, and equitable local economy.
4. Green Building Standards - Albany currently does not have any green building standards beyond basic CalGreen requirements and this is woefully inadequate given the current climate crisis. The CAP 1.0 called for adoption of CalGreen Tier 2 Standards, and this has not even been done yet, almost 10 years later. There should be more about adopting new green building standards in the CAP 2.0, such as LEED Gold for commercial buildings, Passive House certification for multi-family projects, among many options. More emphasis should be put on improving building energy efficiency through better insulation, air-sealing, and high performance windows. This is the low-hanging fruit that reduces the need for energy use in buildings in the first place, reduces heating equipment costs, and makes our buildings more resilient.

Sincerely,

Ian MacLeod

Albany P&Z Commissioner, writing on my own behalf