

MEMORANDUM

DATE May 6, 2022
TO Will Nelson, Principal Planner
Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development
FROM Joanna Jansen, Tanya Sundberg, and Lindsey Klein
SUBJECT 4/25/22 Sustainability Commission Meeting Summary

During its meeting on Monday, April 25, 2022, the Sustainability Commission discussed and provided feedback on the draft sustainability goals, policies, and actions for the General Plan. There were approximately 12 participants in the meeting during this discussion item.

This memorandum lists the questions and comments from the Sustainability Commission, as well as the comments made by members of the public, by element. Additional written comments and the Jamboard results are attached to this memorandum.

Stronger Communities Element

» Sustainability Commission Comments

- SC-P1.3 - Construction of housing should also be supported near transportation.
- I like the transition from petroleum refining and other polluting industries to renewable and sustainable industries. I also like the support for job transitions.
- SC-A1.2 – I would like more specific language regarding the County’s intent to "support community resilience to climate change." What might support look like?
- I like SC-A1.2 - "With input from residents of Impacted Communities". I want more clarity on how the public engagement can be meaningful and not tokenism.
- Encourage creekside and shoreline businesses to create opportunities for community access to waterfronts.
- SC-P4.6 - Ensure availability of more recycled water for farm irrigation.
- SC-P5.2 - Maximize multimodal access to fresh food. Hurray!
- SC-A6.2 - Add to this action to include that the County’s Requests For Proposals or purchasing programs must require use of construction materials identified by the Buy Clean California website, whenever possible.
- We should directly support electrification of homes, especially indoor appliances, hot water heating, A/C and heating. We should specify low GWP refrigerants when electrifying.
- SC-A7.2 – We should include specifics about who is going to establish these programs and what they are specifically going to do.

- Please add this: Access to and expansion of job training, job opportunities, and economic stability in impacted communities so that residents can access safe jobs, earn a living wage to support their families, and build shared prosperity.
- SC-P8.3 – I would like to see this applied to all unincorporated areas.
- Establish a First Source Hiring Program requiring developers, contractors and employers to utilize good faith efforts toward employing residents of Impacted Communities, with emphasis on residents who are economically disadvantaged.
- SC-A8.2 - Appreciate the range of organizations and institutions that entail training, especially inclusion of childcare as requirement for training.
- Appreciate the inclusion of childcare as a requirement for training.
- SC-A8.2 is great.
- SC-A8.2 - Good emphasis on job skills training, but the action item should state how the services are to be "supported" and "work with"?
- I really like SC-P9.6 - Strengthen the viability of the Northern Waterfront as a dynamic economic asset and destination recreational area.
- General support for all elements, perhaps consider adding the PLA [project labor agreement] language suggested by comments from labor organizations.
- Need more support for energy reliability as it relates economic development and progress.

Land Use Element

» Sustainability Commission Comments

- Why no action items under the Land use policies?
- In relation to LU-P2.2, how does limiting development outside the ULL to non-urban uses, including mineral extraction, mesh with our recommendation to the BOS to not grant new drilling/extraction permits?
- LU-P2.2 - Delete mineral extraction - not allowable.
- LU-P2.5 - What does "clustering of allowable densities through use of Planned Unit District zoning" mean? I am very supportive of increased densities to preserve & protect natural features, flood plains.
- LU-P3.1 - Add something stating that the development of housing near employment centers should account for air quality. Be careful locating housing near polluting transit or distribution facilities/warehouses/dirty businesses.
- LU-P3.6 – I love this policy.
- LU-P3.8 Like inclusion of principle of circular economy & sustainable practices BUT should this not include life cycle analysis for new development?
- LU-A3.3 - I like having standards for new buildings like LEED.
- In LU-A3.3, focus on embodied carbon of materials - concrete, steel, etc. Prioritize local and natural materials in building.
- We need to prioritize low carbon construction materials and the industries that support them. Refer to the Buy Clean California Act and Marin County Low Carbon Concrete Code for background information and examples.
- LU-P5.1. - Agree that we should coordinate with Delta Stewardship Council.

- LU-P7.7- add expansion of green jobs.
- Facilitating remote work is a great idea, but there should be actions to support LU-P7.9.
- LU-A7.1 - Conversion of obsolete spaces to new uses is very good principle.
- I support LU-P8.1
- Add local green business like refurbishment, remanufacturing, other circular economy strategies to LU-P8.2.
- In LU-A8.2, include tech, to bring in tech jobs for the tech workers who already live here.

Transportation Element

» Sustainability Commission Comments

- We need emphasis on new multi-modal transit opportunities in the unincorporated area (to support sustainable land use), as they are currently limited.
- If new highways outside the Urban Limit Line (ULL) are restricted in scope, will that increase congestion and greenhouse gas emissions?
- I like the focus on micro mobility. I want to ensure we keep pace with electric micromobility trends by encouraging more pathways, storage, and charging infrastructure.
- Is “micromobility” defined?
- TR-P1.10 - This policy could be improved by prioritizing clean public transit investments in urban corridors and disadvantaged communities with high emissions impact. Look to AC Transit's Clean Corridors plan where zero emission buses are operating.
- TR-P1.10 - I like the encouragement of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, but I think it's divisive to prioritize them before new transportation technology. We need to focus on first/last mile connections to the existing transit network first.
- There is good emphasis on requiring new EV chargers in TR-P1.11. Shouldn't this involve amending the building code to require this?
- TR-P1.12 - Should "near zero" be quantified? How near is good enough? This may be a slippery slope to minimal compliance.
- TR-P1.11, TR-P1.12, and TR-P1.13 – I support robust infrastructure for electric vehicles, including charging stations.
- I would like to see an overarching focus on electrification of all transportation modes, setting goals to zero carbon by 2045 with interim goals along the way.
- Promoting electrification of the transportation sector is good, but we need a grid that could actually power a mass transition to all-electric transportation. Electricity grid realities and aspirations must align.
- We should transition the BART extension off diesel and not allow diesel-based rail in any future unincorporated extensions of BART. (This comment was endorsed by another commissioner).
- By 2040, all public transit agencies must transition to 100% percent zero-emission bus fleets. Zero-emission bus technologies include battery-electric or fuel cell electric. Transit agencies must purchase or operate a minimum number of zero-emission buses according to the following schedules: <https://afdc.energy.gov/laws/12257> SBF.
- TR-A1.8 and TR-A1.9 are great. We should expand them to include equitable funding structures for subsidizing e-bikes and other transportation programs and innovations.

- I appreciate the Safe Streets section. We need to identify hotspots for speeding (e.g., San Pablo Dam Road in El Sobrante) and implement enforcement and design solutions to slow traffic.
- We need more multi-modal opportunities in the unincorporated area. There is a lot of overlap with incorporated areas with regard to transportation, housing and jobs, so it is difficult to address in isolation and it must be coordinated, but unincorporated needs to take a role in all elements and not overly rely on resources in other areas.
- It is good to emphasize public transportation, walking, and biking but we must keep in mind people unable to do so and people whose preferences/lifestyles may not correlate well to riding the bus, walking, and biking.
- The emphasis on public transit, walking, and biking is good, but I am concerned it may overlook those who are unable to live such active lifestyles, or whose preferences/circumstances.
- TR-P6.4 – I support use of zero emissions locomotives.
- Please include the maritime sector as part of reducing emissions, see "CARB passes amendments to commercial harbor craft regulation":
<https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/CARB/bulletins/3105016>.

Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element

» Sustainability Commission Comments

- COS-P1.1 - I support efforts by public agencies and non-profit organizations to acquire and permanently protect open space areas.
- COS-P1.3 - I agree that we should discourage conversion of land designated Resource Conservation or Parks and Recreation to urban uses. In addition, can we actively plan for more parks and open space?
- COS-A1.1 - The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy has jurisdiction to require native tree planting even within municipalities to support wildlife habitat restoration.
- COS-P2.3 - I support Right to Farm buffers.
- COS-P2.5 - Deed disclosures for new residential development near farms protects both agriculture and residential developers. This is good.
- COS-P2.5 - This policy requiring deed disclosures for new residential developments adjacent to agricultural uses is a good idea. However, it should be an action item, as it would require passage of an ordinance.
- COS-P2.9 - We need programs for high-quality carbon sequestration methods implemented on local farmland. Programs could potentially provide financial benefits and support multiple uses on farmland, such as a small footprint of dense housing, eco-tourism, renewable power uses, and more.
- COS-P2.11 - Integrated Pest Management is important!
- The County should address pesticide and herbicide drift between housing and industry adjacent to agricultural land. Add some supporting policies or actions for Integrated Pest Management and organic farming.
- Add more stringent policies about which chemicals can be used within the county for agriculture uses and County-maintained grounds.

- I would like to see the County focus on integrated pest management and describe those related policies in the General Plan.
- Encourage additional agriculture projects in County public spaces.
- Encourage local farms to sell their products at regular evening farmers markets near transit stops such as BART stations and major bus hubs.
- COS-P3.5 and COS-P3.10 - I love the incentives, showcasing priorities, and local farmer support. Foodies will love it too.
- COS-A3.1 - I like the idea of supporting land banks and permanent set-asides for agriculture and open space, especially where mitigation of development occurs elsewhere.
- Consider a program that could create local agriculture awareness and linkage through "sister city" type relationships between population centers and local farmlands in the county.
- COS-A3.4 - Work with the UC Cooperative Extension for training. This type of information-sharing can grow into synergistic relationships.
- The County's Department of Conservation and Development should work with local agricultural workers, Chambers of Commerce, wineries, and others to increase public support and revenue for farms and wineries from agricultural tourism.
- COS-A3.5 - Look at Sonoma County's work to provide signage and wayfinding to promote agriculture in the county, as their efforts may be a model for this action.
- COS-P4.5 - Requiring a majority use of natives in new development landscaping is a great idea; they should also be non-flammable.
- COS-P4.5 - The practices in this policy also offer great educational opportunities. As aesthetic choices are gradually shifted, "nature" will return to have a majority of native plants, and that will be considered normal.
- Provide more natural open spaces for Impacted Communities.
- I fully support COS-P5.2. I hope we can emphasize restoration more in the General Plan.
- COS-P5.2 - In addition to wetland restoration, creek restoration and daylighting should be emphasized to restore habitat connectivity and function watersheds.
- COS-A6.1 - Any references to tree preservation need an implementation measure to track tree growth, health, age, lifespan, decline, and rate of replacement. This is necessary to sustain, expand, and protect the tree population since there have been die-offs in the public and private spaces. We should also emphasize their carbon capture capacity. We need to prioritize types of trees that are effective with carbon capture. Can we also make it clear if replacement would be provided at a 1:1 ratio or a 1:2 ratio?
- COS-A6.2 - This action is confusing. Are we trying to expand oak tree plantings or mitigating oak tree plantings? Please clarify.
- COS-A6.1 and COS-A6.2 - These actions should be coordinated with the fire districts in order to balance tree preservation with fire safety planning.
- I recommend encouraging use of livestock for landscape management instead of herbicides or fossil fuel powered landscaping equipment.
- We need more transparency on water use and data visualization.
- COS-P8.1 - The County should focus on leveraging our coastal zone, including access and riparian ecosystems. It is one of our great underutilized resources.
- I agree with the inclusion of repatriation and management of land by indigenous people.

- Consult with Native American tribes of the area on conservation efforts. Consider returning land to indigenous peoples.
- COS-P13.1 - Is this policy limited to Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element topics? As stated, it could apply to many other topics.
- I like COS-P13.3 and COS-A13.1.
- COS-P13.3 - I support subsidized joint community solar (and battery storage) projects which target lower income customers who have inadequate resources to accomplish the goal of renewable electricity capitalization.
- Promote innovation for battery storage paired with solar/wind energy.
- COS-P13.4 - I like the policy of developing more energy recovery projects. EBMUD is doing that quite successfully.
- I support COS-P13.4 in the development of energy recovery from landfills, treatment plants, or other areas because it lessens impact to adjacent nearby residential communities like Keller Canyon.
- COS-P13.6 - I agree with this policy. We should emphasize use of distributed resources in the existing built environment rather than encouraging new development in greenfields.
- COS-P13.6 - We need to pair electrification of homes and equipment with strong job training and transition industries for affected workers, to build capacity.
- COS-P13.6 - Contemplate strategies to work toward local grid management and decision-making with local distributed resources, rather than the status quo that favors distant, fragile resources that are less optimal and resilient for the local community.
- COS-P13.6 - Let's focus on renewable microgrids with battery back-ups. This will address both wildfire hazards and the desired shift to renewable energy.
- Is the COS Element the right element to house COS-P13.8?
- COS-A13.3 - Great to see green bank financing, but why is this tool limited to COS, could also apply to other sustainable projects?
- The lower the energy density of an energy source, the higher the resource intensity of that source. Efficiency will be key with lower energy dense sources such as solar and wind energy.
- Quickly phase out any rebate programs that provide incentives for efficient gas appliances, in favor of electrification-only incentives.
- COS-P14.1 - Requiring a true cost payment of greenhouse gas mitigation would make oil and gas well operations unprofitable. Is that what the General Plan is aiming for? If so, why not ban these operations outright? Is the County attempting to avoid the cost of litigation? We want no new extraction or drilling and no expansion of gas wells.
- Reconsider the need for COS-P14.1. I do not support new or expanded oil and gas wells.
- COS-P14.2 - There should be ban on new oil and gas wells.
- COS-P14.2 - There should be ban on new oil and gas wells.
- COS-P14.2 - The Sustainability Commission sent a letter on July 22, 2020 which called for a ban on oil and gas drilling throughout the county, such as has now been done by both Los Angeles County and effectively by Alameda County. The former General Plan had outdated pro-drilling language, as stated in our letter. The current General Plan, adopted in 1991, expressly stipulates (per Policy 8-71 of the Conservation Element) that "production of gas and oil resources shall be encouraged as a way to support the agricultural viability of rural areas"

(emphasis added). As it stands, this policy critically undermines the health of county residents, as well as our ability to achieve essential greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. Our Climate Action Plan documents the County's responsibility to meet the serious challenges of climate change "by reducing local GHG emissions while improving community health."

- COS-P14.2 should be strengthened because oil and gas drilling in Contra Costa County will be either near where people will want to live and need to live in the near future or are in the Delta and already below sea level and HS and LUC.
 - COS-P14.2 - Ban oil and gas drilling in Contra Costa County because all areas are likely to be 3,200 feet from potential sensitive receptors in the future. The O and G wells are always likely to be dirty. This affects public health more broadly and visually, causes a huge loss of housing values, negatively affects future community growth, and impacts property taxes. New wells are being planned in the Delta, which is below sea level and behind levies (regardless of sea level rise).
 - COS-P14.2 - Prohibit new and expanded oil and gas wells near schools, child care facilities, and homes.
 - COS-P14.2 - Prevent oil and gas operations beyond County properties, not only beyond 3,200 feet where people reside. Also prevent oil and gas operations where people are likely to reside in the reasonable future, on all Delta land which are below sea level now and in the reasonable future (e.g., behind levies).
 - Would like to see considerations of: 1) Realistic demand forecast for fossil fuels when discussing phasing them out 2) Alignment with AB 32 to minimize emissions leakage.
 - Want to see more teeth here with goal of no new refineries and no new drilling. We should be phasing-down now; any fossil-fuel supporting permits today will require transition in the future.
 - I want to see ban on new refineries and drilling. We should be phasing-down from today onward; any fossil-fuel supporting permits today will require transition in the future.
 - The restrictions on new or expanded oil and gas wells should dovetail with the actions already considered by the Sustainability Commission.
 - COS-A14.1 - I particularly support the bonding requirement in this action.
 - COS-A14.1 - There should be more rigorous interagency coordination for oil and gas operations, such as between planning departments, the County's Hazardous Materials division of Contra Costa Health Services, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM).
- » Public Comments
- Sustainable open space is critical for community mental health. Consider available acreage for open space versus development.
 - Give land back to first stewards of the land, the Native Peoples Lisjan (Ohlone) Sogorea Te' Land Trust.
 - Please include electrification of all buildings in the county.
 - Contra Costa County's energy transition policies must recognize the need to work with local business community/contractors to build up local capacity for electrification.

- I really like that the draft policies and actions call for the County to use REACH codes to further energy efficiency. There is nothing in this section that recognizes that the State is moving to all electric existing buildings and one driver for this is healthy homes and communities (as well as supporting the transition to a clean energy economy).
- I agree with Commissioner Moore's comment to ban oil and gas drilling.
- I also agree with the comments to ban oil and gas drilling.
- Transition off of fossil fuels. Net zero goals need to be replaced with real zero goals.

Public Facilities and Services Element

» Sustainability Commission Comments

- Labor and environmental advocates should work together to capture infrastructure funding.
- Please find ways to build in development of walking/biking trails wherever possible. For instance, add development of new multi-use trails to align with PFS-P1.4.
- High speed broadband expansion to attract businesses and also to lift up disadvantaged communities.
- Wood cut by Public Works and for public projects should be reused as wooden objects (i.e., street furniture) rather than chipped and returned as carbon to the atmosphere. In addition, these removed trees should be mitigated by replanting in appropriate areas.
- PFS-P4.2 - Create criteria for integrating landscaping into new development that will promote water retention. Landscaping that could help meet the criteria might include new rain gardens and green roofs or adding greenspaces to existing infrastructure to offset impacts from new development.
- PFS-P4.2 - Improve this policy by ensuring existing and future landscaping are compatible with recycled water that has salinity. Some trees cannot tolerate alkaline soils and salinity.
- PFS-P4.2 - Landscaping for new developments should also include natives and non-flammable vegetation.
- Create incentives for residents and businesses to convert lawns to drought-tolerant landscaping.
- PFS-P4.3 - Add to this policy to state that the County will promote improvements to infiltration near street trees surrounded by large areas of hardscape to provide better access to water.
- PFS-P4.4 - Our Building Code should require dual piping for drains to provide greywater separation as well as for water supplies (such as non-potable uses). It is much more expensive to retrofit plumbing in the future. New construction, which will last for decades, needs to be ready for major changes to water use rates.
- PFS-P4.5 - Explore building codes that promote rainwater harvesting, dual plumbing, and allowing common-sense water reuse.
- Encourage alternate greywater ready plumbing in new builds
<https://homeguides.sfgate.com/grey-water-new-home-construction-79645.html>
- The policies and action items that support use of greywater are excellent.
- Create tax credits for residential rainwater harvesting.

- We should focus on advanced water conservation and re-use measures, such as permitting for greywater landscaping, rather than promoting desalination plants. Desalination plants are very energy intensive which then leads to more water use.
- We could use more desalination plants.
- Is there a way to have more teeth with water agencies to promote water efficiency and conservation? PFS-P4.6 seems vague.
- PFS-P4.7 - Coordinate with GAS on Land Use Decisions.
- PFS-P4.8 - The approval Groundwater Sustainability Plan should be the East Contra Costa Subbasin. The East Contra Costa Subbasin is no longer part of the Tracy Subbasin. This policy is not clear as written.
- PFS-P4.9 - With the current drought, how do we determine if new development would significantly aggravate groundwater overdraft conditions?
- Overall, water conservation should be targeted toward exorbitant and non-productive water users, such as golf courses. Consider prohibiting the uses that enable that type of water use.
- Explore public-private solutions to maximize stormwater capture and use. We may need to look creatively at stormwater property rights.
- Ban wastewater disposal in wells from passing through to aquifers. For example, there is a wastewater well proposal currently before the County Planning Commission, which does pass through an aquifer mostly regulated by the East Contra Costa County Subbasin but is accessible by virtue of being proposed in adjacent unincorporated County property.
- PFS-P4.15 - I support wastewater reclamation and reuse programs. However, can larger residential developments be encouraged to incorporate built-in systems for diverting graywater for irrigation purposes?
- PFS-A4.2 - Can we clarify the definition of "foundation drainage"? Does this mean diverting rainwater from foundation? Our current standard requires drainage to the street into stormwater capture. We could add gutter to landscape drainage which is the new emerging standard. Gutter to landscape information:
https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/guidelines_for_gutter_rebate_fy19.pdf
- PFS-P5.8 - Compatible tree planting should be a huge part of stormwater management and flood control.
- PFS-A5.2 - I agree that we need a levee flood risk management plan.
- I'm not sure what is in the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, but I would like to see options for localized processing of organics and recycling without worsening the air quality in Impacted Communities.
- Are there GOPAs that focus on reduction of food waste, both from institutional and private sources? Given the huge contribution that food waste makes to methane emissions, this should be a big priority.
- Curbside residential food waste pick-up service is provided in some parts of the County and should be expanded throughout all County franchises.
- PFS-P7.4 - Provide options to recycle safe, low-temperature plastic (for certain plastics) for use as a cement hardening agent. Simultaneously, rigorously discourage plastic usage.
- Consider ways to get more accurate reporting of waste recycling, especially for commingled waste. The recycling rates are often not regulated and artificially high.

- Encourage monofilament fishing line recycling to reduce pollution of the Delta: https://dbw.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=29426
- We need programs to support repair through education, which can lead to job creation and manufacturer and consumer changes of mindset.
- Consider opportunities to hire a small business composting service, which could facilitate local job creation, rather than executing single vendor contracts to big, centralized facilities.
- Emphasize reuse, as opposed to disposal, within County operations. For example, the County Jail could use of disposable food ware. Additionally, encourage reuse to the public.
- Regarding COS-P13.4 and PFS-P7.10, I question the ability to site new landfills in the county. However, if new landfills are created, they should be required to capture methane.
- Regarding PFS-P7.10, I question the ability to site new landfills in the county. However, if new landfills are created, they should be required to capture methane.
- Add new guidance about new bans on highly recyclable materials and bans on materials with high carbon footprint (i.e., food waste).
- PFS-P11.1 - I am concerned that this policy to locate libraries in areas with broadband internet access accessible to the greatest number of people, may disadvantage those in more rural areas without good broadband.

» Public Comments

- Facilitate installation of grey water systems.
- Require new buildings to have greywater systems.

Health and Safety Element

» Sustainability Commission Comments

- HS-P1.7 - I fully support using Zero-Emission Vehicle trucks by 2025.
- HS-P1.7 - What do "near zero-emissions operations" mean? We should just say "zero-emissions operations" and define it. Applicants can always file for a waiver if they have special conditions.
- HS-P1.7 calls for large buildings' industrial building to reach "near zero emissions". This could be better phrased because we need to move, sometime soon, to requiring net zero emissions or require fees for those that cannot meet net zero emissions. Fees could go to environmental justice needs in the county. By the way Central Contra Costa Sanitary District has voted to develop a net zero plan on scopes 1, 2, and 3.
- HS-A1.2 - All new County-funded community buildings should enable quick conversion into emergency evacuation centers/cooling centers.
- HS-P2.2 – This policy could be improved to set a goal for tree canopy, for example about 40 percent in impacted communities.
- In HS-P2.2, I like the focus of a tree canopy, but we should include language specifying that trees and vegetation should be non-flammable and native.
- HS-P3.1 is inconsistent with the Climate Action Plan proposal to use per-capita metrics, which wouldn't deliver absolute reductions. We need to stick to absolute reductions to be true to HS-P3.1. (This comment was endorsed by another commissioner).

- HS-P3.3 - What is Circular Economy?
- Regarding the circular economy referenced in HS-P3.3, ensure green chemistry is included in definition (i.e., making sure materials being reused are free from things like per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances [PFAS])
- HS-P3.3 - Transitional projects like use of bio diesel and renewable fuels, green hydrogen production, carbon capture sequestration, and tank storage will help us get to a net zero-emission goal.
- Identify the nexus and trade-offs in achieving both zero waste and carbon neutrality. Please address this critical nuance in related policies and actions.
- HS-P3.4 - On-site energy generation for medium-sized businesses may be a good fit with community microgrids to achieve greater economies of scale.
- HS-P3.5 - Revise this policy to note that soil health could be improved by preserving green open spaces.
- Sequestration in deep limestone layers to form new rock has not yet been proven to be efficient. Storage in gas layers is also unproven as effective on a large scale. Carbon dioxide leakage can be dangerous to communities near high-pressure carbon dioxide pipelines. It requires more fossil fuel use to perform and is enormously expensive and needs subsidies which could go elsewhere.
- HS-A3.1 - Greenhouse gas emissions forecasts for Contra Costa County include a huge element over which the County has little control: fossil fuel plants.
- HS-A3.1 - We need to commit to updating greenhouse gas inventory annually at least, but I prefer quarterly or even monthly. This should include a dashboard that allows for transparency and tracking of progress.
- The focus on climate resiliency and adaptation is good.
- Leverage what may come out of CARB Scoping Plan related to Natural and Working Lands (NWL). Try to ensure that the County's NWLs capture greenhouse gas emissions.
- HS-A4.1 - We need to optimize management and preservation of natural areas to maximize natural land based (soil and biomass) carbon sequestration potential.
- I really like HS-P6.1 through HS-P6.3.
- Ensure sea-level rise includes groundwater in projections and solutions.
- HS-P6.4 - Agree that industry should have robust remediation plans.
- HS-P6.4 - I recommend including plans to mitigate against sea level rise in the development of new industrial projects in areas subject to sea level rise, not just remediation.
- HS-A6.2 - Implement Goldman School Working Group to assist in coordinating activities with groups (BOS Res 3/29/22).
- A countywide sea level plan is key, but the action item should state who is going to run that coordination process.
- HS-P7.1 - Regarding wildfires, and in view of our immense need for new housing, I'm concerned about a ban of new housing, and would include in the policy that the County should consult with structural fire experts regarding hardening new residences.
- HS-P7.2 - Regarding a site-specific fire protection plan for a single-family residence, I'd like to know the cost of that before including it.

- HS-P7.3 - What is the effect of requiring all new development to be served by adequate firefighting services? Funding needs to allocated to this address requirement, as a large portion of East County already does not receive adequate firefighting services.
 - HS-P7.5 - I wonder where defensible landscaping against fire hazards can be placed. Contra Costa Fire District already releases reminders to encourage defensible landscaping.
 - HS-P8.2 - This policy asks people to use less energy at times when they need it most, which doesn't seem right. We need more focus on energy reliability as environmentally prudently as possible.
 - Add a new policy to partner with state and federal efforts to shift the hazardous waste disposal burden to producers rather than jurisdictions.
 - HS-P9.4 - If new hazardous waste facilities are not allowed, what is the on-going plan for disposing of hazardous waste?
 - HS-P9.6 - I am supportive of having risk analysis conducted on stationary tanks in flood areas.
 - HS-P9.15 - Yes! Household hazardous waste can be inaccessible and inconvenient.
 - I have big support for HS-P9.15.
 - HS-P9.15 - I like the emphasis on ensuring adequate sites and process of collecting household hazardous waste. This should also include batteries, lightbulbs and over-the-counter medication and prescription drugs.
 - HS-P9.15 - This policy should include an option to collect prohibitive products, such as batteries.
 - We need to make basic lithium battery recycling convenient for people to prevent them from throwing these batteries away in curbside trash bins.
 - Emphasize lithium-ion battery reuse programs in the county, rather than just lithium-ion battery recycling options. See <https://global.nissanstories.com/en/releases/4r>
 - HS-A9.1 and HS-P9.15 - I suggest improving communications and provide an educational program to teach end-users how they help with the collection of household hazardous waste, unused pharmaceuticals, and universal wastes.
 - HS-A9.2- I agree that the Oil Spill Contingency Plan should be improved by adding waterways and rail transport where oil spills can happen.
 - HS-A10.2 - The County's Brownfields and Contaminated Sites Cleanup Policy and has not been updated since 2011 when the Board of Supervisors accepted the Brownfield Report, dated September 17, 2010 at their January 25th, 2011 meeting. The 2011 Brownfield Report needs to be updated to current standards.
 - HS-A13.3 - I believe that the minimum ingress and egress standards for roadways are already in place in each fire district and this should be coordinated with the fire districts.
 - Strengthen particulate matter emissions control and prevent nuisances, such as pollution noise from industrial sources. Add multi-agency oversight rigor before the projects and on an ongoing basis, before problems arise.
- » Public Comments
- There are a lot of really great policies in this document and the information is provided in a very clear way. Beyond sustainable transportation, I think the interjurisdictional coordination is

very important for sea level rise, housing and more. It would be great to have an emphasis on cross jurisdictional coordinating (to the extent that its possible) for other climate risks as well.

Global Comments

- » This probably applies to other sections, too, but it is worth considering how unincorporated policies interact with incorporated areas.
- » Generally I would like to see a mechanism to provide the community more transparency in both the goals but also in CCC's progress in meeting those goals.
- » What/where are the community profiles?
- » This may just be the way that different GOPA were pulled out, I don't always see action items to accompany the policies. It appears that there are more policies and goals than actions. It seems we need more accountability, which comes from the actions. Is that the case? What is the relationship between the policies and actions and goals?
- » The State requires that certain topics be addressed in eight elements. In the background section, can you include an explanation of how State requirements are satisfied and which element each topic is addressed?
- » Please define Impacted Communities.
- » Please include timelines for General Plan implementation.
- » Please consider visual readability of the chosen text and background in the Draft General Plan. Generally, there should be a high color contrast (80 percent) between the text and the background in order to make text more readable.
- » Does the schedule for the General Plan differ from the schedule for the Housing Element?

Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council

2727 Alhambra Ave. Suite 5
Martinez, CA 94553
FAX (925) 372-7414



Bill Whitney
C.E.O.
Phone (925) 228-0900

October 27, 2021

Contra Costa County
Board of Supervisors
651 Pine Street
Martinez, CA 94553

Re: The Promise of Contra Costa's General Plan Revisions

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

As the representative of over 35,000 working men and women who live in Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council shares the excitement many feel towards the new General Plan that is being proposed.

As an example, the requirements under SB 1000 to address environmental justice in Impacted Communities in the unincorporated area of the County have the County setting the following goal in the Plan's Stronger Communities Element:

Goal SC-5

Access to and expansion of job training, job opportunities, and economic stability in Impacted Communities so that residents can access safe jobs, earn a living wage to support their families, and build shared prosperity.

We support the new General Plan, and Goal SC-5, but are concerned that the General Plan may fail to offer the full benefits that could derive from the new investment capital it will attract. The new General Plan should encourage career pathways into construction jobs which are one of the few opportunities residents in an Impacted Community might have to join Contra Costa's middle class. It would be irresponsible for us not to consider what additional community benefits could result from the approval of the Plan as it relates to that construction workforce.

A few thousand residents in the Impacted Communities support their families through their work in the construction trades. Will they help build the new Contra Costa? Will hundreds of millions in construction wages be reinvested in the local businesses where these families shop? Will the County lose millions in sales tax revenue if these wages are spent elsewhere?

Will these construction wages be sufficient to support working families who live in our community? Conversely, will a "low road" development business plans result in wages that only those living elsewhere can afford to accept?

Will the potential promise of hundreds of apprentice opportunities be realized so that our region's training programs can accept more at-risk workers? In lieu of public policy intervention, it is likely few apprentices enrolled in the State of California approved programs will be employed in the build-out of the residential and light commercial developments encouraged by the General Plan.

Additionally, though the General Plan hopes to address the need for tens of thousands of new housing units, this goal can't be met unless there is a future construction workforce to build it. Only if we are intentional in efforts to promote the State of California approved apprenticeship programs can we hope to have a local workforce ready to build the needed housing the General Plan calls for.

To help ensure our community gains the benefits it needs with the passage of the Plan, we are proposing the following modifications to the Plan:

Goal SC-5

Policies

Add SC-P5.3 Encourage the use of the local construction workforce, the use of apprentices enrolled in State of California approved apprentice programs, the payment of area standard wages for the construction workforce, the provision of family health benefits and retirement benefits, and support for job access to residents of Impacted Communities through participation in a joint labor/management apprenticeship program, first source hiring program, or Helmets to Hardhats program.

Add SC-P5.4 Maintain and improve public and private education in the County and encourage post-secondary training, education facilities, and Joint Labor/Management Apprenticeship Programs in the County and region to support a highly-skilled workforce.

Actions

Modify- SC-A5.1 Establish a First Source Hiring Program requiring developers, contractors, and employers to utilize good faith efforts toward employing residents of Impacted Communities, with emphasis on residents who are economically disadvantaged. For any development project of more than 100 residential units, or 100,000 sq/ft of commercial or retail development, that receives any discretionary County subsidy, fee reduction or waiver, tax waiver, tax rebate, loan, or other financial support, or that, includes a development agreement, lease agreement or property sale agreement with the County, the developer shall require its construction contractors to employ workers for each trade on the Project who are enrolled in the State of California approved Joint Labor/Management Apprenticeship program in at least a 1:5 ratio of apprenticeship enrollees to non-apprenticeship enrollees.

If the relevant Joint Labor/Management Apprenticeship program does not provide timely dispatch of apprentices for the Project, the construction contractor may request dispatch from any other State of California approved Apprenticeship program. If no relevant apprentices are available for dispatch, the contractor shall be required to document that it employs local workers with less than three years of experience at a 1:5 ratio on the Project.

Add- SC-A5.4 For any development project of more than 100 residential units, or 100,000 sq/ft of commercial or retail development, encourage the use of the local construction workforce, the payment of area standard wages, and the employment of apprentices enrolled in the State of California approved Joint Labor/Management Apprenticeship Committees by (A) requiring all applications for discretionary approvals related to the Project to include a workforce development impact report that sets forth if and how the applicant will meet the goals outlined in SC-P5.3; and (B) requiring the developer of any project that was not constructed under a project labor agreement to submit a report to the County after completion of construction that sets forth the success or failure of the Project in meeting the workforce development goals outlined in SC-P5.3.

Add SC-A5.5 Any Requests for Proposals issued by the County for a project with more than 100 residential units, or 100,000 sq/ft of commercial, warehouse, or retail development shall encourage applicants to commit to the construction of the project through a project labor agreement, use of joint-labor management apprentices, and adoption of a 30% local hire goal.

Add SC-A5.6 Applicants seeking to enter into a Development Agreement with the County for a project with more than 100 residential units, or 100,000 sq/ft of commercial, warehouse or retail development shall be encouraged by the County to commit to the construction of the project through a project labor agreement, use of joint-labor management apprentices, and adoption of a 30% local hire goal.

I'm looking forward to the opportunity to speak with each member of the Board to discuss these proposals.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bill Whitney". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Bill Whitney, CEO

February 25, 2022

County Sustainability Commission
c/o Jody London

RE: Draft Sustainability Element / County General Plan Update

Dear Commission Members,

I have reviewed the draft Sustainability Element for the update to the county's general plan. Much of the policies contained in the draft element are in keeping with good sustainable land and resource planning. However, there are a few key areas where essential policies are either missing or warrant greater detail:

- ◆ **HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT:** The Sustainability Element ought to push for higher density residential development near commercial nodes and transit corridors, and outline the major benefits of denser urban style development:
 - Frees up open space for recreation, nature and critical habitat preservation, and agriculture.
 - Encourages more resident-serving commercial and cultural establishments, thus creating higher-density mixed-use neighborhoods that are more convenient and less reliant on personal powered transportation.
 - Makes public transit more efficient by providing a greater number of potential riders in a concentrated area.

- ◆ **FOSSIL FUELS IN BUILDINGS:** The Sustainability Element ought to call for no fossil fuel systems in all new buildings, no new fossil fuel systems to serve new building additions, and for phasing out fossil fuel systems in existing buildings.

- ◆ **SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION:**
 - New multi-family developments must accommodate the growing number of EVs that residents are expected to own.
 - Encourage EV infrastructure to be added to existing multi-family developments.
 - New EV charging stations ought to include solar electric (PV) generation and battery systems, to lessen grid loads and increase resilience.
 - Encourage solar electric generation and battery systems to be added at existing EV charging stations.

- ◆ **LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE:** This appears to be missing from the draft. Fossil fuel powered landscape maintenance equipment should be phased out throughout the county.

- ◆ OIL AND NATURAL GAS RESOURCES: The Sustainability Element should call for no new drilling, as well as phasing out existing drilling for, and processing of, fossil fuel products.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Free to contact me should you have any questions or comments regarding my suggestions.

Sincerely,

Gary Farber
Walnut Creek

Member: Policy Team of 350 Contra Costa (for information only; letter not endorsed by 350 CC)

April 25, 2022

County Sustainability Commission
c/o Jody London, jody.london@dcd.cccounty.us

RE: Draft Sustainability Element / Draft County General Plan

Dear Commission Members,

I have reviewed the draft Sustainability element for the update to the county's general plan. Thank you and all involved for the excellent work.

There are areas I would like to call particular attention to. Those which has long caused negative health impacts on communities in Contra Costa County.

- ◆ **Use of Fossil Fuels in Buildings:** The Sustainability Element ought to call for no fossil fuel systems in all new buildings, no new fossil fuel systems to serve new building additions, and for phasing out fossil fuel systems in existing buildings.

- ◆ **Oil and Natural Gas Resources:** The Sustainability Element should call for no new drilling, and for phasing out existing drilling for, and processing of, fossil fuel products and redirect those efforts and resources as quickly as possible to transition to clean energy sources such as wind and solar. Accompanying this energy transition, as mentioned in the Sustainable Economy section, is the transition of clean responsible living wage jobs and the training needed for this employment transition. Given the severity of the climate situation along with the community's health and wellbeing, the Plan should seek to "leapfrog" directly from oil and gas to the cleanest most economically viable energy sources available, directing innovative thinking to the end solutions.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or comments regarding my suggestions.

Sincerely,

Derene Hinchliff

Unincorporated Contra Costa County

Member: 350 Contra Costa (for information only; letter not endorsed by 350 CC)

Sustainable Economy

- Sustainable Industry and Economy
- Business and Innovation

This probably applies to other sections, too, but it is worth considering how unincorporated policies interact with incorporated areas. HC

I support LU-P8.1 SBF

SC P5.2 Maximize multimodal access to fresh food. Hurray! ND

SC A1.2 would like more specific language re "support community resilience to climate change." What might support look like? ND

Really like SC P9.6: Strengthen the viability of the Northern Waterfront as a dynamic economic asset and destination recreational area. ws

LU A7.1 Conversion of obsolete spaces to new uses is very good principle. ND

What do you support about these policies and actions?

I like the transition from petroleum refining and other polluting industries to renewable and sustainable industries. Like the support for job transitions. WS

Appreciate the inclusion of childcare as a reqmnt for training. ND

LU-P5.1. - Agree that we should coordinate with Delta Stewardship Council - MM

SC A8.2 Appreciate range of orgs and institutions that entail training, esp inclusion of childcare as requirement for training.

SC-A8.2 is great -KH

General support for all elements, perhaps consider adding the PLA language suggested by comments from labor organizations. HG

LU-P2.2 - Delete mineral extraction - not allowable. - MM

BRM: Need more support for energy reliability as it relates economic development and progress

RFL - Please find ways to build in development of walking/biking trails wherever possible. For instance, add development of new multi-use trails to align with PFL-P1.4

HS-P3.3 - What is Circular Economy? - MM

re: circular economy - ensure green chemistry is included in definition (for example, making sure materials being reused are free from things like PFAS)-kh

HS-P6.4 - Agree that industry should have robust remediation plans. - MM

Add local green business like refurbishment, remanufacturing, other circular economy strategies to LU P8.2. WS

Is there anything you would add or change?

COS-P14.2 Should be strengthened bc oil and gas drilling in CC County WILL be either near where people will want to live and need to live in the near future or are in the delta and already below sea level and HS and LUC CD

Facilitating remote work is a great idea, but there should be actions to support this; VRS

Generally I would like to see a mechanism to provide the community more transparency in both the goals but also in CCC's progress in meeting those goals ce

Strengthen particulate matter emissions control and prevent nuisances, such as pollution noise from industrial sources. Add multi-agency oversight rigor before the projects and on an ongoing basis, before problems arise. CD

LU-P7.7- add expansion of green jobs SBF

Good emphasis on job skills training, but the action item should state how the services are to be "supported" and "work with"? VRS

Great to see green bank financing, but why is this tool limited to COS, could also apply to other sustainable projects? HG

LU-P3.8 Like inclusion of principle of circular economy & sustainable practices BUT should this not include life cycle analysis for new development? ND

SC-P8.3 - would like to see applied to all unincorporated areas - kh

PFS-P4.7 - Coordinate with GAS on Land Use Decisions - MM

Why no action items under the Land use policies here? 'RS

Focus on embodied carbon of materials - concrete, steel, etc. Prioritize local and natural materials in building. WS

It to see more teeth here with goal of no new refineries and no new drilling. We should be phasing-down now; any fossil-fuel supporting permits today will require transition in the future. WS

Access to and expansion of job training, job opportunities, and economic stability in impacted Communities so that residents can access safe jobs, earn a living wage to support their families, and build shared prosperity.

In the action item for innovation districts, include tech, to bring in tech jobs for the tech workers who already live here; VRS



Sustainable Land Use

- Healthy Neighborhoods
- Community Character and Identity
- Sustainable Development
- Smart Growth and Conservation

What do you support about these polices and actions?

Is there anything you would add or change?

only beyond 3,200 feet where people reside, but also where people are likely to reside in the reasonable future. Prevent oil and gas operations on all delta land which are below sea level now eg behind levees of will

LU P2.5 What does "clustering of allowable densities through use of Planned Unit District zoning" mean? Very supportive of increased densities to preserve & protect natural features, flood plains. ND

How does limiting development outside the ULL to non-urban uses, including mineral extraction, mesh with our recommendation to the BOS to not grant new drilling/extraction permits? VRS

What/where are the community profiles? VRS

Like COS P13.3 and COS A13.1. WS

Support subsidized joint community solar (and battery storage) projects which target lower income customers who have inadequate resources to accomplish the goal of renewable electricity capitalization. CD

BRM: The emphasis on public transit, walking, and biking is good, but concerned may overlook those who are unable to live such active lifestyles, or whose preferences/circumstances

I like the focus of tree canopy, but include that it should be native, non-flammable, trees/vegetation; VRS

Construction of housing should also be supported near transportation; VRS

Like SC -A1.2 - "With input from residents of Impacted Communities". Want more clarity on how the public engagement can be meaningful and not tokenism. WS

BRM: Good to emphasize public transpo, walking, and biking but must keep in mind people unable to do so and people whose preferences/lifestyles may not correlate well to riding the bus, walking, and biking

Should directly support electrification of homes, especially indoor appliances, hot water heating, A/C and heating. Specify low GWP refrigerants when electrifying. WS

The action item regarding artists in residence should include specifics about who is going to establish these programs and what they are specifically going to do; VRS

LU P3.1: add something re: housing near employment centers to take into account air quality. I.e., be careful locating housing near polluting transit or distribution facilities/warehouses/dirty businesses. WS

LU-P3.6 - love -kh

Source Hiring Program requiring developers, contractors and employers to utilize good faith efforts toward employing residents of Impacted Communities, with emphasis on residents who are economically

Need emphasis on new multi-modal transit opportunities in the unincorporated area (to support sustainable land use), as they are currently limited. HG

Recommend including plans to mitigate against sea level rise in the development of new industrial projects in areas subject to sea level rise, not just remediation; VRS

I am concerned that a policy to locate libraries in areas with broadband internet access accessible to the greatest number of people, may disadvantage those in more rural areas without good broadband; VRS

Like having standards for new buildings like LEED, LU A3.3. WS

HS-P2.2 - could be improved to set a goal for tree canopy, for example about 40 percent in impacted communities SBF

If New hazardous waste facilities are not allowed, what is the on-going plan for disposing of hazardous waste? VRS



Sustainable Transportation

- Safe and Sustainable Transportation
- Connected Transit
- Equitable Transportation
- VMT Reduction
- Green Transportation Infrastructure
- Safe Streets
- Active Transportation
- Transit-Oriented Development
- Interjurisdictional Coordination

What do you support about these policies and actions?

Is there anything you would add or change?

TR-P1.11, TR-P1.12, and TR-P1.13 - Support robust infrastructure for electric vehicles including charging stations - MM

TR-P6.4 - Support use of zero emissions locomotives - MM

call 800-254-6755. By 2040, all public transit agencies must transition to 100% zero-emission bus fleets. Zero-emission bus technologies include battery-electric or fuel cell electric. Transit agencies must purchase or operate a

is 'micromobility' defined?

In new highways outside the ULL are restricted in scope, won't that increase congestion and CGH? VRS

Labor and environmental advocates should work together to capture infrastructure funding. CL

Good emphasis on requiring new EV chargers; shouldn't this involve amending the building code to require this? VRS

Like the focus on micro mobility. Want to ensure we keep pace with electric micro mobility trends - encourage more pathways and storage, charging infrastructure. WS

I like encouragement of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure but I think it's divisive to prioritize them before new transportation tech; we need to focus on the first/last mile: VRS

Should transition BART extension off diesel and not allow diesel based rail in any future unincorporated extensions. HG

+1. WS

BRM: Promoting electrification of the transpo sector is good, but need a grid that could actually power a mass transition to all-electric transpo - grid realities and aspirations must align

There is a lot of overlap with incorporated areas with regard to transportation, housing and jobs, so it is difficult to address in isolation and must be coordinated, but unincorporated needs to take a role in all

Appreciate Safe Streets section - we need to identify hotspots for speeding (eg. SPDR in El Sobrante) and implement enforcement/design solutions to slow traffic -kh

TR P1.12 Should "near zero" be quantified? How near is good enough? This may be a slippery slope to minimal compliance. ND

prioritizing clean public transit investments in urban corridors and disadvantaged communities with high emissions impact. Look to AC Transit's Clean Corridors plan where ZEB's - zero emission

Please include the maritime sector as part of reducing emissions, see "CARB passes amendments to commercial harbor craft regulation": <https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/CARB/bulletins/3105016>

TR-A1.8 & .9 are great - how about equitable \$ structures for subsidizing e-bikes, etc.? -KH

Would like to see an overarching focus on electrification of all transportation modes, setting goals to zero carbon by 2045 w/interim goals along the way..ce



Climate Change & Natural Hazards

- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Flooding and Stormwater
- Wildfires
- Resilient Homes
- Resilient Infrastructure and Development
- Preparedness, Response, and Recovery
- Interagency Coordination

HS A1.2 Can all new County-funded community buildings should enable quick conversion into emergency evacuation centers/cooling centers. ND

The restrictions on new or expanded oil and gas wells should dovetail with the actions already considered by the Sustainability Commission: VRS

Really like HS-P6.1 thru 6.3. WS

HS-P1.7 - Fully support using ZEV trucks by 2025 - MM

PFS-A5.2 - Agree that we need levee flood risk management plan - MM

HS 3.4 On-site energy generation for med.-size businesses may be a good fit with with community microgrids, to achieve greater economies of scale. ND

BRM: Focus on climate resiliency and adaptation is good

COS-A14.1 - Support in particular the bonding requirement - MM

What do you support about these policies and actions?

and aesthetics.(b) Requirements for site reclamation, including bonding. The development of a more rigorous Interagency Coordination, ie for oil and gas operations, such as planning department with

If not here, recommend encouraging use of livestock for landscape management instead of herbicides or fossil fuel powered landscaping equipment SBF

Need to prioritize low carbon construction materials and the industries that support them. Follow the Buy Clean legislation and marin county low carbon concrete code. WS

BRM: HS-P8.2 - asking people to use less energy at times when they need it most seems off. Need more focus on energy reliability as environmentally prudent possible

HS A3.1 Forecasts of GHG emissions for county include a huge element over which the county has little control: fossil fuel plants in CC County. ND

SCDA6.2 Require county RFPs or purchasing programs for residents to use construction materials identified by the Buy Clean California website, whenever possible. ND

HS-P3.1 is inconsistent with the CAP proposal to use per-capita metrics which wouldn't deliver absolute reductions. Need to stick to absolute reductions to be true to HSP3.1 HG

+1. WS

Is there anything you would add or change?

Is COS the right category for COS-P13.8? HG

HS-P1.7: what does "near zero-emissions operations" mean? We should just say zero (and define it). Applicants can always file for a waiver if they have special conditions. WS

COS-P14.2 - There should be ban on new oil and gas wells - MM

HS-A6.2 - Implement Goldman School Working Group to assist in coordinating activities with groups (BOS Res 3/29/22) - MM

Ensure sea-level rise includes groundwater in projections & solutions - kh

A countywide sea level plan is key, but the action item should state who is going to run that coordination process? VRS

HS-A6.1 - Facilitate coordinating by implementing Goldman School Working Group to assist in coordinating activities with groups (BOS Res 3/29/22) - MM

what is the effect of requiring all new development to be served by adequate firefighting services? Funding needs to be allocated to this, as a large portion of East County already does not receive adequate firefighting services: VRS

Regarding wildfires, and in view of our immense need for new housing, I'm concerned about a ban of new housing, and would include in the policy that County should consult with structural fire experts regarding hardening new residents: VRS

We need to commit to updating GHG inventory annually at least, prefer quarterly or even monthly, a dashboard that allows for transparency and tracking of progress ce

Regarding a site-specific fire protection plan for a SFR, I'd like to know the cost of that before including it: VRS

Want to see ban on new refineries and drilling. We should be phasing-down from today onward; any fossil-fuel supporting permits today will require transition in the future. WS

HS-P3.5 could be improved by adding soil health could be improved by preserving green open spaces SBF

Compatible tree planting should be a huge part of stormwater management and flooding SBF

I wonder where defensible landscaping against fire hazards can be placed somewhere. ConFire had already put out their reminders to encourage defensible landscaping. SBF

I believe that the minimum roadway, ingress and egress standards are already in place in each fire district and this should be coordinated with the fire districts: VRS



Energy Resources

- Energy Use
- Oil and Natural Gas Resources

What do you support about these policies and action

Is there anything you would add or change?

I support COS-P13.4 development of energy recovery from landfills, treatment plants, etc. because it lessens impact to adjacent nearby residential communities, like Keller Canyon SBF

COS-P13.6 agreed. emphasize use of built environment for distributed resources rather than "green field" development. HG

COS-P14.2 – There should be ban on new oil and gas wells - MM

wells are always likely to be dirty, effect public health more broadly and visually, cause a huge loss of housing values, negatively affect future community growth and also the amounts in property taxes collected for

Let's focus on renewable microgrids with battery back-ups...solving both wildfire and the shift to renewable energy. ce

COS-P13.1 is this limited to COS topics. As stated it could apply to many other areas. HG

Need to pair electrification of homes and equipment with strong job training and transition industries for affected workers, to build capacity. WS

limestone layers to form new rock has not yet been proven to be efficient. Storage in gas layers is also unproven as effective on a large scale. CO2 leakage can be dangerous to communities near high pressure CO2

COS-P13.4 and PFS-P7.10. I question the ability to site new landfills in county, but if so they should be required to capture methane. WS

BRM: promote innovation for battery storage paired with solar/wind

Prohibit new and expanded oil and gas wells near schools, child care facilities, and homes -kh

Reconsider the need for "COS-P14.1 - Require new or expanded oil or gas wells to mitigate impacts..." I do not support new or expanded oil and gas wells. WS

contemplate ways to work toward local grid management and decision making with local distributed resources, rather than the status quo that favors distant (fragile) resources that are less optimal, and less resilient, for the local community. HG

I like the policy of developing more energy recovery projects; EBMUD is doing that quite successfully; VRS

quickly phase out any rebate programs that provide incentives for efficient gas appliances, in favor of electrification-only incentives HG

BRM: important principle: the lower the energy density of an energy source, the higher the resource intensity of that source - efficiency will be key with lower energy dense sources (solar/wind)

Transitional projects like bio diesel and renewable fuels, Green Hydrogen, Carbon Capture Sequestration, tank storage will help us get to the net zero goal. CL

payment or true cost of GHG mitigation would make these operations unprofitable. Is that what the GP is aiming for? If so, why not an outright ban? Is it avoidance of cost of litigation? We want NO new extraction or drilling, no expansion.

HS-A9.2- Oil Spill Contingency be improved by adding waterways and rail transport where oil spills can happen SBF



Management of Solid & Hazardous Waste

- Solid Waste Management
- Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Management

development projects) should be put to long term durable use as wooden objects (street furniture, etc) rather than chipped and caused to return the carbon to the atmosphere faster. Removed trees should be initiated by

Maybe I missed it. Are there GOPAs that focus on reduction of food waste, both from institutional and private sources? Given huge contribution to methane emissions from food waste, this should be a big priority. ND

What do you support about these policies and actions?

Is there anything you would add or change?

HS-P9.6 - Supportive of having risk analysis done on stationary tanks in flood area - MM

PFS-P7.3 Safe, low temperature plastic recycling (for certain plastics), to be used as a cement hardening agent. While at the same time rigorously discouraging plastic usage. CD

programs needed to support repair through education, leading to job creation, and manufacturer and consumer changes of mindset. HG

PFS-P7.10. I question the ability to site new landfills in county, but if so they should be required to capture methane as well. WS

Add something about new bans on highly recyclable materials, and bans on materials with high carbon footprint (i.e. food waste). WS

HS-P9.15 yes! HHW can be inaccessible / inconvenient -kh

Haz Waste: Partner with state and national efforts for extended producer responsibility that shifts the disposal burden to producers, not counties. WS

A key concept is in understanding the nexus and trade-offs in achieving both zero waste and carbon neutrality...please address this critical nuance and related policy ce

not sure what's in the IWM plan, but would like to see options for localized processing of organics and recycling (without worsening air quality in impacted communities) -kh

BRM: big support for HS-P9.15

Consider ways to get more accurate reporting of waste recycling, especially for commingled waste. The recycling rates are often not regulated and artificially high. WS

emphasize reuse, as opposed to disposables, both inside county operations and outside. County Jail use of disposable foodware comes to mind (show leadership for private businesses). HG

HS-P9.15 - The plan should include prohibitive products such as batteries - MM

HS-A9.1 and HS-P9.15: Suggest improving communications/education program to end-users - how can they help? SBF

Monofilament line recycling, to keep these fishing lines out of our Delta: https://dbw.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=29426 SBF

I like the emphasis on ensuring adequate sites and process of collecting Hazardous HHW, this should also include batteries, lightbulbs and over the counter and prescription drugs. VRS

BRM: Need to make basic lithium battery recycling convenient for ppl, to prevent ppl from throwing them away in curbside trash bins - important safety issue here

HS-A10.2 - The plan has not been updated since 2011 when BOS accepted the Brownfield report dated 9/17/10 at their 1/25/11 meeting. This report needs to be updated to current standards - MM

open possibilities for small business composting business/job creation rather than single vendor contracts to big centralized facilities, if they can meet needs/standards. HG

curbside residential food waste pick up is provided in some parts of the County and should be expanded throughout all the County franchises: VRS

Emphasize lithium ion battery reuse programs in county (not just recycling). See <https://global.nissanstories.com/en/releases/4r> WS



Water Resources

- Water Conservation
- Water Efficiency
- Water Quality
- Water Management
- Coordinated Facilities and Services

COS A3.5 These supports for local agriculture—signage, wayfinding etc. Sonoma County may be a model for these initiatives. ND

What do you support about these policies and actions?

Is there anything you would add or change?

Policies/Action items that support use of gray water are excellent: VRS

COS P3.5 and 3.10 Love the incentives, showcasing, and supports for local farmers. Foodies will love it too.

pipng for drains (greywater separation) as well as for water supplies (for non-potable uses like toilet flushing). It is much more expensive to retrofit plumbing in the future. New construction, which will last for decades, needs to be ready for

Create tax credits for residential rain water harvesting. CL

PFS-P4.2: Improve this policy by ensuring existing and future landscaping are compatible with recycled water that has salinity. Some trees cannot tolerate alkaline soils and salinity

PFS-P4.8 - The approval GSP should be the East Contra Costa Subbasin. The East Contra Costa Subbasin is no longer apart of the Tracy Subbasin. Policy not clear - MM

aquifers, for example, there is a wastewater well proposal currently before the County Planning Commission, which does pass through an aquifer mostly regulated by the East CC County Subbasin, but is accessible by virtue of being

Is there a way to have more teeth with water agencies on promoting efficiency and conservation? PFS-P4.6 seems vague. WS

PFS-P4.2 - Add criteria for adding water retention to buildings, such as rain gardens and green roofs and adding greenspaces to existing infrastructure. WS

Similar comment to Climate...more transparency on use and data visualization is needed. ce

With current drought, how do we determine if new development would significantly aggravate groundwater overdraft conditions? VRS

advanced water conservation and re-use measures (permitting for gray water landscaping for instance) over promoting desal plants as desal plants are very energy intensive (which then leads to more water

PFS P4.15 Water reclamation and reuse, yes. But can larger residential developments be encouraged to incorporate built-in systems for diverting graywater for irrigation purposes? ND

BRM: explore public-private solutions to maximize stormwater capture and use - may need to look creatively at property rights of stormwater

landscaping for new developments should also include natives and non-flammable vegetation: VRS

Gutter to landscape information: https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/guidelines_for_gutter_rebate_fy19.pdf SBF

RFL: continued from last post it - desal is very energy intensive, which then leads to even more water use.

Overall, water conservation should be targeted particularly towards exorbitant & non-productive water users (golf courses, etc.) - consider prohibiting such uses - kh

We could use more desalination plants. CL

PFS-P4.3 improve infiltration near street trees surrounded by large areas of hardscape to provide better access to water when they are otherwise outside a natural context. HG

explore building codes that promote rainwater harvesting, dual plumbing, and allowing common-sense water reuse. WS

Encourage alternate greywater ready plumbing in new builds <https://homeguides.sfgate.com/grey-water-new-home-constructi>

clarification on "foundation drainage" - is this diverting rainwater from foundation- current standard is draining to the street into stormwater capture. We could add gutter to landscape drainage which is the new emerald standard

Deep incentives for residents & businesses to convert lawns -kh



Agriculture

- Agricultural Economy
- Agricultural Land Preservation
- Interagency Coordination
- Right-to-farm
- Sustainable Agriculture
- Agricultural Housing

What do you support about these polices and actions?

Like the idea of supporting land banks and permanent set-asides for ag and open space, especially where mitigation of development occurs elsewhere. WS

COS A3.4 Working w UC Cooperative Extension for training, information-sharing can grow into synergistic relationships. Very good idea. ND

COS-P2.11 - IPM is important!

expressly stipulates (per Policy 8-71 of the Conservation Element) that "production of gas and oil resources shall be encouraged as a way to support the agricultural viability of rural areas" (emphasis added). As it stands,

COS P2.5 Deed disclosures for new residential development near farms protects both agriculture and residential developers. Good. ND

sequestration methods implemented on local farm land, with financial benefits as well as supporting multiple-uses on farmland which might include a small footprint of dense housing, eco-tourism,

Is there anything you would add or change?

Encourage additional Ag projects in County public spaces: VRS

Requiring majority use of natives in new development landscaping is a great idea, they should also be non-flammable. VRS

The policies to strengthen mitigation for tree removal should be coordinated with the fire districts, so that we balance tree preservation with fire safety planning: VRS

County Community Development should work with local AG workers, Chambers of Commerce, Wineries, etc., to create more public support and increased revenue for farms/winerles from AG tourists: VRS

COS-P2.3 - Support Right to Farm Buffers - MM

The policy requiring deed disclosures for new residential developments adjacent to ag use, is a good idea, but should be an action item, as it would require passage of an ordinance: VRS

Perhaps a program could create awareness and linkage through "sister city" type relationships between population centers and local farm lands. HG

RFL: Adding in more stringent policies on which chemicals can be used within the county not only for agriculture but for county maintained grounds.

would like to see CCC focus on integrated pest management and describing related policies herein ce

What about addressing pesticide and herbicide "drift" when housing and industry are located adjacent to ag land. Add some support for IPM and organic farming. WS

support local farm food distribution/sale through transit site (BART and major bus hub) regular evening farmers markets including food moved on transit. HC

Ensure availability of more recycled water for farm irrigation SBF



Sustainable Open Space & Natural Resources

- Interagency Coordination
- Recreational Amenities
- Preservation of Ecological Resources & Natural Systems
- Preservation of Creeks, Wetlands, and Riparian Areas
- Preservation of Upland Areas
- Preservation of Scenic Resources
- Sustainable Mineral Resources

What do you support about these polices and actions?

Is there anything you would add or change?

COS-P1.1 - Support Support efforts by public agencies and non-profit organizations to acquire and permanently protect open space areas - MM

Provide far more natural open spaces for disadvantaged communities = compared to historically. CD

COS-P5.2 In addition to wetland restoration, creek restoration and daylighting should be emphasized to restore habitat connectivity and function watersheds. HG

Need to optimize management and preservation of natural areas to maximize natural land based (soil and biomass) carbon sequestration potential. HG

CCC should focus on leveraging our coastal zone including access and riparian ecosystems. It is one of our great underutilized resources...ce

Fully support COS-P5.2. I hope we can emphasize restoration more in the General Plan. WS

age, lifespan, decline and rate of replacement if sustaining/expanding/protecting tree population since there have been die offs in the public and private spaces. Also to emphasize their carbon capture capacity- we need to

COS-P1.3 Not only discourage... but can we actively plan for more parks and open space? Overlaps with Sustainable Land Use section. WS

COS-A1.1- ECCCHC has jurisdiction to require native tree planting even within municipalities to support wildlife habitat restoration SBF

Agree with the inclusion of re-matriation and management of land by indigenous people. HG

of native plants in new development, avoiding invasive species: these practices also offer great educational opportunities, aesthetic choices are gradually shifted, and over time, "nature" based on natives

BRM: Leverage what may come out of CARB Scoping Plan related to Natural and Working Lands (NWL) - try to ensure county's NWLs are sinks not sources of GHGs

Encourage creekside / coastal businesses to create opportunities for community access to waterfronts - kh

Consult with Native American tribes of the area on conservation efforts. Consider returning land to indigenous peoples. -KH

COS-A6.2 is confusing. Are we trying to expand oak tree plantings or mitigating oak tree plantings? Please clarify. Thank you. SBF

