



ATTACHMENT 2: SUMMARY OF MARCH 2021 PUBLIC OUTREACH

Since the release of the Climate Action Plan update (CAP 2.0) draft strategies and actions were released in early March, staff has been conducting outreach to solicit feedback on the draft strategies and actions from key stakeholder groups, including the following:

- Parks and Recreation Commission (March 11, 2021)
- Economic Vitality Committee (March 18, 2021)
- Chamber of Commerce (March 10 and 19, 2021)
- Bicycle Pedestrian Trails Committee (March 22, 2021)
- Planning Commission (March 24, 2021)
- Community Workshop (March 25, 2021)
- Youth Commission (March 31, 2021)
- Community Survey (launched in March and ongoing)

A summary of comments received during the outreach is provided below.

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

The following summarizes the feedback from the outreach conducted by staff, these are not verbatim minutes. Please note that the summaries below reflect comments of individual board or commission members, and do not reflect a formal action or consensus recommendation from the body. Therefore, in some instances there may be competing opinions stated or comments made.

Parks and Recreation Commission

The Parks and Recreation Commission met on March 11 to discuss the CAP 2.0 draft strategies and actions. There was significant interest regarding “low priority action **1143** Community Gardens”. Many Commission members stressed the importance of expanding community gardens in the community and wanted to see this action elevated to high priority. Additionally, Commission members would like to see “low priority action **1204**, Community conservation programs” elevated as well. It was noted that **1204** would cost very little and is easily achievable through Recreation programs at the Alviso Adobe (e.g., Ridge Runners). Both **1143** and **1204** had strong support for being elevated.

Also, “low priority action **1148**, Ecosystem health on City property” had some support for elevating to high priority.

Economic Vitality Committee

The Economic Vitality Committee met on March 18 to discuss the CAP 2.0 draft strategies and actions. There was interest to elevate “low priority action **1180**, Increase transit ridership” to high priority, due to it supporting other high priority actions, and it would cut down on traffic and need for parking spaces.

There was some concern about “high priority action **1001**, All-electric reach code”. Comments included potential over-reach, limitations on choice, and indication that the details and nuance of the Code will be critical. The sentiment was that this may affect certain industries (e.g., restaurants and biotechnology) in particular.

A comment was made that BE **1001** and “high priority action **1164**, existing building electrification plan” may be expensive. Some highlighted the importance of a cost-benefit analysis for these actions. There were concerns voiced about mandates/regulations (versus incentives and encouragement). There was also concern about a push towards electrification given the power outages and PSPS events. It was noted that battery storage will be an important piece of resilience. It was suggested that “low priority action 1166, regional electricity grid improvements” be considered so that we can make electricity more reliable as we electrify. There was also the suggestion to add renewable natural gas to the conversation instead of strictly relying on electrification.

There was encouragement to work with the school districts about messaging of electric vehicles, walk/biking to school, and promotion of waste reduction. A Committee member noted that hopefully, we will begin to see some of the trends outlined in the actions (e.g., electrification, renewable energy, etc.) in municipal buildings.

There was discussion relating to the balance of responsibility implementing the actions in the Plan (i.e., residents, businesses, and City). It was noted that costs relative to impact and potential benefits will be a crucial piece of the plan.

Chamber of Commerce

The Chamber of Commerce met on March 10 and 19 to discuss the CAP 2.0 draft strategies and actions. Chamber members emphasized the need for a cost-benefit analysis, which will be conducted as the next step for the draft high priority list, once this round of outreach is complete. The Chamber discussed that improving the climate is in everybody’s interest, however, the overall cost impact will be crucial.

There was discussion relating to the emissions inventory methodology and confirmation that pass-through traffic was not included in our emissions report. One Chamber member indicated the weighting given to “Support” in the Multi-Criteria Analysis was too low and should be increased.

One Chamber member noted that any mandatory point of sale language should be removed from the list of actions, which is in reference to “high priority action **1164**, Existing building electrification plan”, which states, “Use a phased approach that focuses first on municipal buildings, community education, and voluntary communication action, then becomes mandatory over time”. Chamber members noted their preference toward “carrots” (e.g., incentives, outreach, etc.) vs “sticks” (e.g., mandates/regulations). The Chamber discussed looking for change agents and social media influence to encourage adoption of some of the actions. A suggestion was made to work with local shops to influence change in ideology and behavior.

“High priority action **1001**, All-electric reach code” was discussed, with particular emphasis on concern for restaurants being required to use electric stoves. Induction stoves came up as an alternative, but the community and chefs need more access to them.

One Chamber member discussed the potential impacts on COVID in terms of trends that may emerge including decreased VMT and increased air quality improvement. Creating a tool, or working with other organization to create a tool, to track and identify changes in air quality may be a beneficial action to add.

The Chamber also emphasized how vital it is that this CAP 2.0 is qualified and can be used for CEQA streamlining for development projects.

Bicycle Pedestrian Trails Committee

The Bicycle Pedestrian Trails Committee met on March 22 to discuss the CAP 2.0 draft strategies and actions.

One Committee member noted that rental bicycle and scooter share programs is not appropriate for Pleasanton so recommended removing that element from “high priority action **1065**, Curb management program”, or moving the action to low priority. Ride share programs and rental scooters are typical in San Francisco, but are not as prevalent to the Pleasanton community. Another Committee member pointed out that this plan will be a long-term policy document so scooter/bike share may not be relevant today but could be in the future.

The Committee was generally enthusiastic about “high priority action **1064**, complete streets expansion”. One Committee member recommended instead of having a focus on parks and schools, it should be large business centers and schools. This is a bigger priority, and of higher need to Pleasanton particularly during peak trip times.

There was also high support from the Committee members regarding “high priority action **1082**, trails network expansion”. The Pleasanton community feels safer on trails than in bike lanes, and this needs to be highly prioritized. Creating a citywide trail network so people can bike to school or go shopping, or out to a restaurant, this is important and can help reduce cars on the road. This comment was highly agreed upon. It was also noted that many trail network gaps are in areas that the City may need to

take on, and are not in places where businesses can fill these gaps. The Committee would like this to be bolstered to include some onus on the City to fill in trail network gaps.

A Committee member spoke about microplastics in the water streams, and the need to have an action that focuses on filtration of microplastics in municipal water and in storm drains for public health reasons.

The Committee had differing opinions around “high priority action **1078**, workplace bike amenities”. Some said that this is already happening, but others noted that although this may be happening at some businesses, this action can help encourage other businesses to participate who have not in the past. Overall, there was the sentiment that there is a need in the community to have improved bicycle parking at businesses.

The Committee was also very interested in revamping “low priority action **1184**, VMT reduction study for K-12 activities” and increasing to a high priority action if possible. This would include partnering with schools so that physical education classes teach students the rules of the road, so they can cycle to school, and be educated about bicycle safety. An education campaign that teaches Pleasanton youth about cycling, rules to the road, and safety/awareness is a big first step. There are ample opportunities in Pleasanton to cycle around town, so education and additional safety measures can help encourage more students to bike to school rather than drive or get dropped off by family members. Parents are also uncomfortable with students riding in the street, so this goes along with action **1082**, and expanding trails to get around town. Further, this can be expanded to sports practice and games as well. Encourage carpooling when going to sports. Partner with sports clubs and the schools to promote and encourage this. Anti-idling was also brought up through the discussion and there may be an opportunity to combine “low priority action **1178**, anti-idling campaign for schools”, with this action.

Many Committee members also noted the importance of encouraging multimodal transportation to events at the fairground and downtown. The discussion aligned with “low priority action **1070**, City Information resources” and this may be a relevant action to elevate to high priority given the discussion.

There was also interest to elevate “low priority action **1180**, increase transit ridership”, and ideas to refine the action including looking into pedestrianizing Main Street and encouraging multimodal transportation throughout the City.

Planning Commission

The Planning Commission met on March 24 to discuss the CAP 2.0 draft strategies and actions.

The Commission discussed “high priority action **1167**, LEED certification for new construction”. The discussion pertained to the pros and cons of requiring LEED certified vs silver (or higher). Commission members commented that requiring LEED silver is

more appropriate than LEED gold or higher. Commission members were generally supportive of the action.

A member of the Commission noted that there are emissions associated with idling at stoplights and asked if it the correlation between stopping at stoplights, and emissions from idling is quantifiable. It was questioned if there is a way to prevent as much idling, particularly on two lane boulevards that make frequent stops.

The importance of cross-collaboration between stakeholders and commissions/committees was noted. There are competing priorities, and it was highlighted that is important to align with one another on the most impactful actions for the community and the next generation of Pleasanton residents.

There was support noted from one commissioner regarding “high priority action **1159**, shared parking”, and “high priority action **1145**, native plantings”.

It was also noted by multiple commissioners that low priority action **1105**, adopt water-efficient landscaping ordinances” should be elevated to high priority, because it is not too costly and will be impactful long-term. Many comments were made about water conservation and its importance. Important for new construction but also very important to encourage water conservation for existing Pleasanton residents and businesses.

A comment was made regarding overregulation. The Commissioner urged that the regulatory actions not go beyond the State; rather, align with the State and meet or exceed expectations.

Regarding “high priority action **1164**, existing building electrification plan”, it was noted it may be better to make these types of actions incentive-based rather than regulatory. It was also recommended to ensure that new construction has the necessary electrical outputs necessary to charge electric vehicles, but requiring it for existing customers may be difficult, because it may be costly to retrofit homes to be able to charge EVs (e.g., upgrading panels).

“High priority action **1001**, all-electric reach code” was discussed by the Commission members. Some members noted the difficulty of restaurants cooking without natural gas, and residents’ dependency on electricity in an all-electric home when the power goes out. The need for reliable backup power when considering electrification is an important element.

Other commissioners were concerned with the amount of electricity available on the grid. Some expressed the desire for “low-priority action **1163**, require solar on new construction” to be elevated and implemented alongside action **1001**. Another comment was that **1001** needs to be a phased approach, but is a priority, but **1164**’s mandatory piece may be too costly for current residents.

Youth Commission (March 31, 2021)

The Youth Commission met on March 31 to discuss the CAP 2.0 draft strategies and actions.

It was noted that educational actions in the plan should look for opportunities to collaborate with PUSD.

A Commissioner commented in support of “high priority action **1173**, municipal solar panels”, and “high priority action **1150**, develop urban forest master plan”.

The Commission members all agreed upon elevating “low priority action **1143**, community gardens” with interest in the Youth Commission partnering in implementation of the action. It was noted that the youth community in Pleasanton can get involved with this action and can help underrepresented community members get involved. Partnering with the schools is also of interest and focusing first on elementary students because there is less competition for staff and student time (less clubs and extracurriculars), and then can build traction with older students. Also, as schools are being renovated, work on including community gardens in their development plans.

There was also interest from Commission members to elevate low priority action **1184**, VMT reduction study for K-12 activities” to high priority. There was also interest in making the language more specific.

Commission members also expressed interest in elevating “low priority action **1204**, community conservation programs” to high priority.

Workshop Results

The City held a public workshop on March 25. The results are attached here as Attachment 2a.

Survey Results to Date

The City has had a public survey open for community input on the actions. The survey will be open until April 20, 2021 and staff will report the complete results to the Committee. The results through April 10, 2021 are attached here as Attachment 2b.

Other Public Comments

Throughout March, staff received written public comments, attached to this document. Staff also had conversations with Hacienda Business Park, StopWaste, Go Green Initiative, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Tri-Valley Air Quality Community Alliance (TVAQCA), and additional community members. The comments are wide ranging and cover a variety of topics and public viewpoints. Generally, the comments relate to, but are not limited to, the themes listed below:

- Exploring a jobs/housing balance, particularly near transit.
- Creating new actions (e.g., textile recovery, exploration of tertiary water filtration, etc.).
- Staying apprised of BAAQMD thresholds for CEQA streamlining.
- Avoiding a focus on exclusively solar energy.

- Elevating several of the low priority actions.
- Grouping and consolidating similar actions.
- Removing actions that are existing or required per state law.
- Increasing our partnership with the TVAQCA.
- Benchmarking City facilities to review energy usage and efficiency.