

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

A.1 THEMES

This section provides comprehensive discussions of the themes most frequently raised in public comments.

A.1.1 Theme 1: Concerns Regarding CEQA Approach

Several comment letters raise issues and comments of a similar nature and intent related to the environmental review conducted for the Climate Action Plan (CAP). The following provides a comprehensive response to those issues. Where appropriate, topics are identified to help the reader navigate to the topic that is of concern to them. The entirety of this section provides the County's response to issues related to the adequacy of the environmental review and adequacy of the environmental document presented.

THE CAP'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN AND EIR

The *Sacramento County General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report* (GP EIR) is a program EIR that considered the environmental effects of implementing the Sacramento County General Plan (General Plan) through the 2030 planning horizon. The GP EIR was certified by the County Board of Supervisors in May of 2010. The GP EIR includes two mitigation measures that require the County to develop a CAP.

Mitigation Measure CC-1 (page 12-39 of the GP EIR) states: "The following policy shall be added to the General Plan: It is the goal of the County to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. This shall be achieved through a mix of State and local action."

Mitigation Measure CC-2 (page 12-39 of the GP EIR) further specifies implementation measures including when the County must adopt a CAP, what elements the CAP must contain, and how often the County shall complete an inventory of GHG emissions.

Consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the GP EIR includes a programmatic analysis of the potential environmental effects of implementing Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 in Chapter 12, "Climate Change." As described therein, in concert with State and Federal activities, this mitigation is intended to offset the cumulatively significant climate change impacts associated with implementation of growth and development approved under the General Plan. The evaluation of Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 notes that although "the Climate Action Plan is intended to benefit the County in a variety of ways, there are potential negative physical consequences associated with implementation" (p. 12-33) and provides several specific examples. The analysis thereby provided decisionmakers the opportunity to review the potential environmental consequences of implementing CAP and the performance standards by which the mitigation must be implemented. Subsequent to the approval of the General Plan and certification of the GP EIR, no challenges to the analysis of the impacts of the CAP in the GP EIR were brought forward. Therefore, consistent with the requirements of CEQA, the analysis stands and remains valid and adequate. This analysis now becomes the benchmark from which future actions related to the CAP are evaluated (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 to 15164).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR THE FINAL CAP

The General Plan is the governing land use plan and policy document and is valid until such time as a new plan or elements are adopted. No new GHG or climate change policies have been adopted since approval of the General Plan except for the County's Climate Emergency Resolution, which is addressed in Theme 3, below. Therefore, the County is required as a matter of law to implement policies of its current General Plan.

The County has a long history of taking actions to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2. On November 9, 2011 and concurrently with the adoption of the 2030 General Plan and certification of the General Plan Update Final EIR, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the *Climate Action Plan – Strategy and Framework Document*, which presented a framework for reducing GHG emissions and an overall strategy to address climate change. On September 11, 2012, the Board of Supervisors adopted the *Climate Action Plan – Government Operations*, which quantified GHG emissions from the County's operations (e.g., County-owned facilities, vehicles, and equipment) and identified measures to reduce these emissions. The Final CAP currently under evaluation is the next phase of implementation. The Final CAP updates and supersedes the existing, preliminary CAP documents (i.e., CAP-Strategy and Framework Document and CAP- Government Operations). The Final CAP is wholly related to GP EIR Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 and is the continuation of a clear and transparent process to demonstrate compliance with the General Plan and updated State and Federal laws pertaining to climate change.

Consistent with the County's environmental review requirements and the requirements of CEQA, the County determined that preparation of the Final CAP was a project under CEQA. The Final CAP would require discretionary approval by decisionmakers and could result in physical environmental effects. Once it was determined the Final CAP was a "project," the County began a process to determine what level of environmental review under CEQA would be appropriate. That process involved preparation of a project description that included a description of all the physical activities and actions that would be implemented under the Final CAP (see Addendum Project Description). The County then directed the preparation of environmental checklist to guide the determination of the appropriate level of environmental review (see Addendum Environmental Checklist).

The GP EIR is a program EIR prepared consistent with the requirements of CEQA and remains valid to date. As discussed above, the Final CAP is a project that is the continuation of implementation of GP EIR Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 dictates that, in circumstances such as these, a lead agency "shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site." Section 15183 further indicates that an initial study or other analyses should be prepared by a lead agency to determine the scope of environmental review in light of this prohibition. The purpose of this process is to streamline the review of covered projects and reduce the need for the preparation of repetitive environmental studies.

Under Section 15183 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a checklist can be used to determine whether the following types of impacts may merit additional environmental analysis:

- Significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or area in which the project would be located;
- Significant impacts that were not analyzed in a prior EIR on the zoning action, General Plan or community plan with which the project is consistent;

- Potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the General Plan, community plan or zoning action; or
- Previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information, were not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

Unless an environmental effect satisfies one of these criteria, the lead agency can rely upon its previously certified EIR (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183[c]).

The Final CAP was prepared to address GHG reductions for approved General Plan land uses. The General Plan remains valid. No changes to land uses, densities, or zoning are proposed by the Final CAP, and no General Plan amendments are proposed by the Final CAP. Therefore, consistent with the guidance provided above, the County is not required to prepare a new, stand-alone environmental analysis unless peculiar project-specific environmental effects exist. The environmental checklist prepared for the Final CAP was structured with questions to determine whether any of the direct and indirect impacts of the CAP would trigger any of the impacts identified in the above questions. The environmental checklist prepared for the Final CAP evaluated all environmental resource topics covered in the GP EIR in addition to environmental topics that were known at the time of GP EIR preparation and that are now regularly included in CEQA analyses (e.g., forestry resources, energy, tribal cultural resources).

The environmental checklist, which is attached to the Addendum document, serves as the body of substantial evidence documenting the information relied upon in the County's decision-making process. For all environmental topics, the County proceeded in a stepwise manner to identify the environmental impacts of the Final CAP that were previously disclosed and certified in the EIR, identify whether the setting in which the CAP was evaluated has substantially changed since its preparation such that those changes could result in new or substantially more severe environmental effects, and provided a comparison of whether the Final CAP, as currently proposed and drafted, would result in new or substantially more severe environmental effects compared to the environmental effects that were previously disclosed and certified in the GP EIR. Specifically, the County assessed whether the details of the Final CAP substantially differ from what was previously evaluated and whether those changes resulted in any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts. This stepwise analysis and substantiation follows the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 for supplemental analyses. The results of this stepwise analysis concluded that the Final CAP would not result in any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts from those evaluated and certified in the GP EIR.

AGE OF GENERAL PLAN EIR ANALYSIS

Comments suggest that because time has passed since the GP EIR analysis was originally prepared, that passage of time and any potential changes or new information surrounding the topic of GHG evaluation make the analysis stale. This is an incorrect application of CEQA and its tiering provisions. The CEQA Guidelines do not provide a prescriptive manner or timeline in which analysis becomes dated or unusable. Rather, as described above, a lead agency must consider the current facts pertaining to the project at hand including: if a prior EIR was prepared and certified, whether the prior EIR evaluated the project in any capacity, whether the setting (regulatory or environmental) has changed and would result in new or more severe impacts, and whether the project as currently proposed is changed in a way that would result in any new or substantially more severe impacts.

While laws and regulations surrounding GHGs have evolved, the Addendum described those changes and evaluated whether the Final CAP would result in any new or substantially more severe environmental effects under the new laws and regulations. The analysis determined that the Final CAP would not create new, or increase the severity of any, environmental effects because of the changed regulatory environment. While time has progressed and the regulatory environment has advanced, those changes do not have a material effect on the conclusions previously disclosed in the GP EIR. In fact, in the case of GHG emissions with implementation of the Final CAP, current regulatory standards result in less environmental effects because reduction targets that must be met to achieve a less-than-significant determination are more stringent. The California legislature's passage of Senate Bill (SB) 32 in 2016 after the adoption of the County's General Plan established a more stringent and longer-term GHG reduction target than the one set by Assembly Bill (AB) 32 in 2006. With AB 32 setting the basis for the GP EIR's GHG impact analysis and Mitigation Measure CC-1, the Final CAP's alignment with SB 32 sets a more aggressive target than the AB 32 standards and it is supported by a concurrent plan from other agencies with overlapping jurisdictions that are also seeking to meet the more aggressive SB 32 target. This decreases potential environmental effects.

In the case of the Final CAP, the County has determined through evaluation and substantiation that none of the conditions requiring a higher level of environmental review are triggered by implementation of the Final CAP. As such, it prepared an Addendum supporting its reasoning and complying with the procedural requirements of CEQA.

SATISFACTION OF PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

To clarify CEQA's procedural requirements, when determining whether an additional document must be prepared for a later activity evaluated in a program EIR, CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(2) states that "this is a factual question that the lead agency determines based on substantial evidence in the record." CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15163 identify the conditions under which a subsequent and supplemental EIR analysis must be prepared, respectively. If a project would invoke any of those triggers, then a subsequent analysis is required.

Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines describes the conditions under which a supplemental EIR analysis would be prepared. In summary, when an EIR has been certified for a project, no supplemental EIR analysis is required unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects.
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15163 provides that a supplement to an EIR may be prepared, rather than a subsequent EIR, if any of the conditions described in Section 15162 would be met but only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 identifies the conditions in which preparation of an addendum is appropriate. Specifically, Section 15164(a) allows for the preparation of an addendum when some changes or additions to the environmental analysis are necessary but none of the conditions in Section 15162 and 15163 are triggered. Section 15164(b) further indicates that minor technical changes or additions can occur as long as the conditions in Section 15162 and 15163 are not triggered. Finally, Sections 15164(d-e) require that lead agencies must consider the addendum, its supporting documentation, and the certified final EIR and provide a brief explanation of why a subsequent EIR was not prepared.

The Final CAP as currently proposed contains additional details and specificity pertaining to GHG reduction and resiliency measures. While this specificity was not known at the time the GP EIR was prepared, the framework of potential actions and their resulting environmental effects was considered at a programmatic level in the GP EIR (see discussion above). Once additional details become known about a project or action evaluated at a programmatic level, CEQA requires lead agencies to determine whether those details would materially change the analysis previously certified and, if no new or substantially more severe environmental effects would occur, agencies must document their decisions with supporting substantial evidence and prepare an addendum. This is the process the County followed. The County's environmental checklist provides substantial evidence that none of the conditions outlined in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have been met and demonstrates that no new or substantially more severe impacts would result from implementation of the Final CAP.

APPROPRIATENESS OF PREPARING A CEQA ADDENDUM

Some comments questioned whether an addendum was appropriate for the Final CAP. Additionally, some comments suggest that no environmental analysis is required for an addendum. These comments appear to misinterpret the different types of EIRs outlined in CEQA Guidelines 15162-15164.

As described above, the County followed the procedural requirements of CEQA. An environmental checklist was prepared that documented that none of the conditions present in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163 would be triggered. The environmental checklist, Addendum document, and the GP EIR are considered together in making the determination whether supplemental review would be required. All of those documents make up the body of substantial evidence the County based its decision on, and the Addendum offers an explanation of how the lead agency came to its conclusion that additional supplemental review would not be required. None of the comments disagree with the analysis offered.

Rather, comments appear to center on arguments related to what is meant by “minor” or a “brief explanation.” In the context of the GP EIR, which is made up of thousands of pages, the Final CAP Addendum and environmental checklist at 160 pages, provides a representative, but complete, summary of the issues under consideration in a way that can meaningfully inform decisionmakers of the real and potential environmental changes associated with the project. The checklist was used to demonstrate that the full scope of the Final CAP and its compliance responses would be encompassed within the evaluation in the certified GP EIR.

Some comments also suggest that by preparing an addendum, a lead agency can avoid accountability and legal challenge under CEQA. This is factually false. An addendum is an appropriate and legal CEQA mechanism for considering changes to a project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15614). Like any CEQA document, the opportunity for challenging an addendum is available through the procedural requirements of CEQA.

The environmental checklist attached to the Addendum documents in detail what was described in the GP EIR, its conclusions, and whether the Final CAP as proposed would result in changes to those conclusions. As an example, see Section 3.1, “Aesthetics.” In the evaluation of the potential for the Final CAP to substantially affect the conclusions in the GP EIR related to adverse effect on a scenic vista, a cross reference to the impact evaluation in the GP EIR is provided (including page numbers) and the impact evaluation is summarized, elements of the Final CAP that could result in effects are described, and a consistency determination with the types and severity of impacts disclosed in the GP EIR is provided. This same methodology was followed in each technical resource section.

In addition, as explained on page 1-2 of the Addendum, the GP EIR includes a separate, preliminary analysis of the potential effects of implementing Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 in Chapter 12, “Climate Change.” The analysis of the proposed mitigation notes, for example, that the construction of infrastructure necessary to generate renewable energy could “affect aesthetics and may affect open space areas (and any resources within them)” (p. 12-34). In addition, potential effects disclosed in the GP EIR include those associated with constructing new waste and water facilities (such as the regional composting facility, pipelines, and other infrastructure) that could result in impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, hazardous materials, and water quality. As a programmatic analysis, the GP EIR appropriately notes that the precise, project-level effects of such infrastructure projects would be evaluated at the time of implementation. This same standard is applied to the Final CAP, which itself is a program-level document. However, the Final CAP now includes additional specificity and measures that were not available at the time the General Plan was adopted. These measures are evaluated in the Final CAP Environmental Checklist to the degree their specificity can be determined. This process fulfills the requirements of CEQA.

ADEQUACY OF THE GP EIR’S EVALUATION OF GHG IMPACTS

Some comments assert that the adopted GP EIR’s analysis of GHG impacts is inadequate and improperly deferred mitigation for GHG impacts. No evidence to suggest that either of these documents and their analysis are inadequate has been provided. Rather, commenters express dissatisfaction with the age of the documents. Please refer to the discussion above, “Age of General Plan EIR Analysis.” However, the GP EIR was certified as adequate and the General Plan was adopted without legal challenge. As such, the adequacy of these documents has been established and cannot now be challenged. Further, given their certification and adequacy, they can now serve as the foundation for growth and development within the County.

Regarding the conclusions surrounding the General Plan's GHG impacts, the GP EIR determined that significant GHG impacts would occur and recommended, and the County ultimately adopted, Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 to reduce GHG impacts of the General Plan. These mitigation measures required the County to adopt the AB 32 goal as a General Plan policy and prepare a CAP and GHG development thresholds. In concert with State and Federal activities, this mitigation was intended to offset the effects of implementing the General Plan. However, based on the uncertain nature of the impact, the GP EIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable contribution to climate change.

The County adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations and Findings acknowledging that despite implementation of all feasible mitigation, a significant and unavoidable GHG impact would remain with implementation of the General Plan. Again, no challenges to this analysis were raised, including challenges alleging improper deferral of mitigation. Accordingly, the GP EIR and mitigation requiring implementation of a CAP are valid. The opportunity for challenging deferred mitigation has passed. The purpose of the Addendum analysis is to determine whether adoption of the Final CAP would make these impacts substantially worse than previously disclosed, which it would not.

CEQA MITIGATION MEASURES VS. FINAL CAP POLICY MEASURES

Several comments appear to conflate the requirements in the CEQA Guidelines for mitigation measures with the GHG reduction measures outlined in the Final CAP. As described above, the Final CAP document is the fulfillment of the mitigation measures identified in the GP EIR (see Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 in Chapter 12, "Climate Change"). The mitigation measure requiring preparation and implementation of the Final CAP meets the requirements outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15097. CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(b) states that where the project at issue is the adoption of a general plan, a monitoring plan shall apply to the policies or other portion of the plan that is a mitigation measure. The monitoring plan may consist of policies included in plan-level documents. As stated in the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (p. 26) previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2 were incorporated into the General Plan Land Use Element as Policy LU-115 (p. 127) as were associated Implementation Measures F, G, H, and I (p. 128).

Further, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 requires an EIR to identify feasible measures which could minimize significant impacts (Section 15126.4 (1)), and to provide that mitigation measures are fully enforceable through permit requirements, agreements, or legally binding instruments (Section 15126.4 (2)). Preparation of the CAP, its contents, its performance standards, and its timing was identified in Mitigation Measure CC-1 of the GP EIR and incorporated into the GP Land Use Element, which was adopted by the County. The Final CAP is a product of implementation of Mitigation Measure CC-1 and, therefore, demonstrates the County's compliance with and implementation of the GP EIR mitigation measures.

Preparation and adoption of a CAP policy document is the mitigation action prescribed by GP EIR Mitigation Measure CC-1. The GHG reduction and resiliency measures contained within the body of the Final CAP document are not mitigation measures subject to the enforceability standards outlined in the CEQA Guidelines for mitigation measures. Rather, the Final CAP identifies a menu of policy measures/actions the County can implement to achieve GHG reduction targets identified in Mitigation Measure CC-1. These measures each have timing and feasibility assumptions and will be collectively and routinely monitored by the County to ensure that the County is achieving stated performance standards and reduction targets. Where adjustment is required, the County will adaptively manage the timing and

scope of implementation of the measures to meet the goals and objectives of the Final CAP, and ultimately satisfy Mitigation Measure CC-1.

The Final CAP was prepared to fulfill a mitigation requirement of the GP EIR and is fully enforceable as a policy document incorporated into the General Plan. Planning law and CEQA require that lead agencies must evaluate the potential direct and indirect effects of the menu of actions that could be implemented under the policy document. The analysis must provide decisionmakers with a good-faith evaluation of the potential scope and magnitude of impacts that would occur with adoption of new policy documents. The Addendum together with the GP EIR comprehensively identifies the scope and magnitude of environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Final CAP. The Final CAP includes an implementation framework that identifies regular updates and evaluation of the effectiveness of implementing actions and strategies identified in the Final CAP and allows the County to adaptively manage its implementation over time to ensure it meets identified performance standards. As such, the Final CAP fulfills the mitigation commitment identified in the GP EIR. The Addendum comprehensively identifies direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with Final CAP implementation and demonstrates that no new significant or substantially more severe environmental effects would occur.

STREAMLINING PROVISIONS FOR GHG ANALYSIS

The Final CAP has been prepared to meet the requirements of a qualified plan for the reduction of GHG emissions as identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. If adopted, the Final CAP and its consistency checklist would provide a mechanism by which future development projects within the Urban Policy Area (UPA) and/or Urban Services Boundary (USB) can demonstrate their consistency with the Final CAP rather than complete a project-specific GHG analysis. All other environmental analysis would continue to be required consistent with CEQA and County policy. In other words, the streamlining provisions of the Final CAP would not remove the obligation of new development projects to evaluate all other environmental resource categories required by CEQA. An environmental document of some type (i.e., exemption, Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration [IS/MND], or EIR) would still be required. Further, the streamlining provisions of the Final CAP would not remove the obligation of new projects to consider GHG impacts. Projects would still need to identify their associated emissions and would need to propose measures to reduce GHG emissions that are consistent with the Final CAP. If the project can demonstrate that it would meet the reduction targets of the Final CAP, then at that stage additional project-level review could cease and the project would fall under the streamlining provisions of the Final CAP. The project's environmental document would be required to document through substantial evidence how the project demonstrates consistency with the Final CAP. That information together with the entirety of other environmental analysis would be brought forward to decisionmakers for consideration.

Some commenters expressed concern that projects outside the UPA or USB would result in environmental impacts potentially not contemplated within the Addendum. In consideration of comments received, the County is no longer recommending Revised Final Draft CAP Measure GHG-30, which would allow projects outside the UPA or USB to demonstrate consistency with the Final CAP. This measure has been removed from the Final CAP. Please refer to the response provided in Theme 4, below, for a full discussion of this issue.

The Final CAP, as a qualified GHG reduction plan, would provide an opportunity to streamline project-level GHG analyses for proposed projects within the UPA and USB and ensure that all projects demonstrate consistency with the applicable policies outlined in the Final CAP. This streamlining provision would not eliminate the County's decision-making authority on whether to approve a project or not. Nor would it

allow the approval of General Plan amendments without separate, stand-alone environmental review. Further, allowing proposed projects within the UPA and USB to streamline their GHG analysis from an approved, legally valid EIR (i.e., General Plan EIR) and associated Addendum, does not open the door to a new slate of environmental impacts that have not been considered in some capacity previously. The program-level direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of new growth and development have been adequately evaluated in the GP EIR and were not challenged. As demonstrated in the Addendum, the Final CAP would not result in any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts from those disclosed in the GP EIR and, therefore, would not change any of the conclusions of the GP EIR. Further, development projects would continue to require project-specific environmental analysis for all other topic areas. All potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of implementation of the Final CAP and its GHG analysis streamlining provisions have been evaluated. The County has complied with CEQA's requirements and comments offer no evidence to the contrary.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF THE FINAL CAP AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT PROJECTS

Some comments suggest that there are undisclosed significant cumulative impacts related to the Final CAP and potential approval of separate proposed projects requesting General Plan Amendments (GPA projects). The General Plan includes policies LU-119 and LU-120 that allow development projects to seek expansion of the County's UPA when certain criteria are demonstrably met. The General Plan identifies that regional growth and development could occur and the GP EIR evaluates the cumulative environmental effects, including GHG impacts, of that growth. The adopted UPA and USB serve as the development boundary of the General Plan and are the areas for which the environmental analysis in the GP EIR was prepared. Development projects that propose to build beyond the UPA would be required to evaluate not only the physical environmental effects of that development, but whether the proposed development would change or alter the conclusions of the General Plan EIR by significantly changing the scope of overall cumulative development in the County (also addressed in the above section).

Regarding the Final CAP, the analysis of GHG impacts is inherently cumulative. The modeling of GHG emissions and creation of targets in the Final CAP is based on anticipated development within the UPA over the time horizon of the General Plan (i.e., 2030) and is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG's) projections of reasonable growth throughout the region. GPA projects are not expressly included within the environmental analysis. Rather, the growth projections provided by SACOG consider the overall growth that is anticipated in the region. This is assumed valid irrespective of potential GPAs. Further, given the regional nature of GHG emissions, the precise location of new growth within the region is immaterial to the Final CAP analysis. From a cumulative standpoint, the cumulative impact analysis in the GP EIR addresses the impacts of the approved General Plan land uses in combination with other regional growth and development projects and other known projects at that time. While GPA projects have been proposed since the approval of the General Plan, some if not all of these projects are accounted for in regional growth projections and the programmatic direct and indirect impacts of that growth have been included in the GP EIR. Regardless, the County has prepared or is in the process of preparing project-specific stand-alone EIRs for these GPA projects, including project-specific GHG emissions analysis. Therefore, the impacts of those GPA projects will be evaluated, and mitigation proposed to bring them consistent with the General Plan, the adopted Final CAP, and local, State, and Federal regulations. All environmental impacts of GPA projects would be disclosed through their individual environmental documents, because GPA projects are not within the scope of the Final CAP. Rather, the

scope of the Final CAP only covers new development projects within the UPA and USB and that are consistent with the General Plan.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS PROVIDED IN THE FINAL CAP

Some comments appear to take issue with the “additional” analysis and information provided in the environmental checklist. Specifically, the comments assert that the strategy options identified in the Revised Final Draft CAP are beyond the scope of an EIR addendum. In response to comments received from stakeholders through the County’s public outreach process on the Revised Final Draft CAP, the County offered stakeholders and decisionmakers an analysis of potential strategy options that could be implemented by the County and were suggested by commenters for evaluation. That analysis provided a summary of the potential environmental conditions that would occur with implementation of those options. It was intended to be responsive to comments received, comparative to the analysis offered for the Revised Final Draft CAP, and informative to decisionmakers in weighing the environmental tradeoffs between strategies. While the provision of strategy options is not required in a CAP or Addendum, they are not precluded. The County is merely fulfilling its obligation to disclose information that is meaningful to the decision-making process and that is responsive to the comments received from stakeholders.

ADEQUACY OF THE ADDENDUM

Some comments assert that erroneous information is presented in the Addendum, the analysis of Final CAP mitigation measures and strategy options is inadequate, and an Addendum is a “faux” CEQA process that is free of all regulatory requirements. These statements are factually false and unsubstantiated.

The assertion that an Addendum is a “faux” CEQA process without regulatory requirements is false and misleading. As described above, an addendum is an appropriate and legally enforceable document outlined in CEQA Guidelines 15164. Further, while CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (c) states that an addendum need not be circulated for public review, the County has engaged in an open and lengthy public review process that has allowed for multiple opportunities for review and comment on its analysis. The County has gone above and beyond the requirements of CEQA to ensure transparency in the process and community engagement.

COURT DECISIONS REGARDING IMPROPER USE OF AN ADDENDUM

Some commenters assert that the County’s proposed Addendum and Revised CAP are inadequate as they contain some of the same flaws that were deemed problematic in a previous CEQA court case. However, the County’s Addendum and Final CAP as well as the facts associated with them are distinguishable from the cases cited. Specifically, commenters reference the *Sierra Club v. County of San Diego (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1172* case which centered on the improper use of an addendum for the adoption of County of San Diego’s CAP. Other than the fact that the case addressed a CAP adopted with an addendum, the facts of that case compared to this project are materially different.

The following summarizes the facts of the *Sierra Club* case and how they compare to the County’s CAP:

San Diego County’s General Plan included a series of mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures CC-1.1 through CC-1.19) to address the GHG impacts of the County’s General Plan. Those mitigation measures included requirements to update, review, and implement County programs; implement a strategic energy plan; revise the zoning ordinance; coordinate with other entities; educate the

public; reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and encourage alternative modes of transportation; and, based thereon, to revise the County guidelines for determining significance.

Specifically,

"[Mitigation Measure] CC-1.2 requires the preparation of a County Climate Change Action Plan within six months from the adoption date of the General Plan Update. The Climate Change Action Plan will include a baseline inventory of greenhouse gas emissions from all sources and more detailed greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and deadlines. The County Climate Change Action Plan will achieve comprehensive and enforceable GHG emissions reduction of 17% (totaling 23,572 MTC02E) from County operations from 2006 by 2020 and 9% reduction (totaling 479,717 MTC02E) in community emissions from 2006 by 2020. Implementation of this Climate Change Action Plan will contribute to meeting the [Assembly Bill No.] 32 goals, in addition to the State regulatory requirements noted above."

All mitigation measures were included in the County of San Diego's adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and committed the County to achieving specified reductions by 2020. However, when the County of San Diego adopted the CAP, it stated that the CAP did not ensure the required GHG reductions would be met. Rather, the strategies in the San Diego CAP were identified as recommendations and did not commit the County to their implementation.

Additionally, the GHG reduction measures proposed in the San Diego CAP were loosely defined and did not include specific timelines for when reductions would be achieved. Many of the measures were also unfunded, with no plans for funding. Finally, many of the measures required San Diego to coordinate with outside agencies and San Diego committed itself to implementing measures that were not within its control.

The court found that San Diego County had erroneously assumed the CAP that was prepared was exactly the same as the mitigation requirements outlined in Mitigation Measure CC-1.2. The County of San Diego offered conclusory statements that that the CAP proposed was the same as adopted mitigation without providing substantial evidence to support these statements. As such, the County of San Diego did not provide any evaluation of potential environmental impacts associated with the CAP or make findings regarding those environmental effects, which is required by CEQA. Rather, the County of San Diego made "implied findings" that its CAP was substantially similar to adopted mitigation.

In contrast, in Sacramento County's Final CAP, specific GHG reduction targets and timelines for achievement are proposed and identified, evidence is presented that demonstrates the proposed reductions and participation rates relied upon are feasible and are within the County's control, the County has committed through the General Plan to implement the Final CAP, the County has a long history of taking actions to fund and implement programs that support GHG reduction measures, and the Final CAP includes an adaptive monitoring program to ensure reduction targets will be achieved based on the reduction target timelines identified.

Further, the Sacramento County Final CAP provides defined GHG reduction measures. Where quantified reductions are relied upon, these reductions are achieved through measures that are within the County's control and are based upon publicly available feasibility data or proven participation rates. Refer to Theme 13 for additional explanation of this issue. All data is presented for review in the appendices of the Final CAP.

Additionally, as is described in detail above, Sacramento County made no assumptions about the similarity of the Final CAP to the Mitigation Measure CC-1 in the GP EIR. Rather, the County proceeded in a factual

and stepwise manner to determine what if any environmental impacts would occur with implementation of the Final CAP and whether the Final CAP would or would not result in new or potentially more severe environmental effects from those disclosed and certified in the GP EIR. The result of that process produced a body of substantial evidence that supported the conclusion that no new significant or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Further, no additional mitigation would be required to implement the Final CAP. The direct and indirect effects of implementing the Final CAP, a plan level document, were addressed in the GP EIR and were reconsidered through the Addendum and Environmental Checklist. In addition, as discussed above, the impacts of the plan including the GHG streamlining impacts were disclosed and documented through the entirety of the record which included the General Plan, GP EIR, Final CAP, Addendum, and Environmental Checklist. This analysis and evidence were lacking in *Sierra Club v. County of San Diego (2014)*.

The commenters also suggested that because an Addendum was prepared and a EIR was not, the County avoided the consideration of mandatory alternatives to the project, in particular a Smart Growth Alternative. Commenters suggest this as evidence that the County's use of an Addendum was inappropriate based on reference to *Golden Door Properties, LLC v. County of San Diego (2020) 50 Cal.App.5th 467,546*. Reference to the Golden Door cases' lack of a Smart Growth Alternative is immaterial to whether an Addendum is appropriate. In the Golden Door case, a supplemental EIR was prepared, which requires consideration of alternatives consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6. There is no requirement in the CEQA Guidelines that an Addendum must include the evaluation of alternatives to a project. The underlying premise of an Addendum is that environmental impact conclusions of a certified EIR, which included a full alternatives analysis (as in this case the General Plan EIR) would not change and, therefore, a supplemental or new stand-alone EIR would not be required. To opine that the Golden Door case forces the County into preparation of an EIR is misleading and inaccurate.

A.1.2 Theme 2: Land Use Planning and Climate Change

Many comments reference the County's authority over land use decisions in the unincorporated area, and assert that this authority should be used within the Final CAP to bring about changes to the type and location of future development in the County. By doing so, this would address GHG emissions in the transportation sector by reducing the amount of driving or VMT. Specifically, the comments state that new growth areas approved and under evaluation in the unincorporated County would generate unnecessary GHG emissions. Comments refer to these anticipated projects as development of "greenfield" areas, or simply "sprawl," and suggest that the CAP should prohibit all development outside of the UPA and USB.

The County agrees that its land use authority is an important tool for addressing climate change, and further agrees that using this authority to encourage infill development is necessary to achieve reductions in VMT and resulting GHG emissions. This authority is also essential to achieve other important County objectives; those related to affordable housing and protection of habitat and open space, for example. Both the Final CAP and the General Plan have roles to play in encouraging infill development, as described below.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The County's General Plan, adopted in November of 2011, includes a policy framework for acceptance and approval of private applications to expand the UPA and create a master plan. The intent of the policy framework is to provide for smart growth, including a mix of residential densities and complementary land

uses that support transit as well as larger lots for executive housing. The policy framework also balances development with the need for habitat preservation that supports the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan. This approach is fundamentally different from the 1993 General Plan, which focused on supply and demand growth management. The 2030 General Plan discussions on growth management resulted in a focus on design, quality, and performance.

The Growth Management criteria (General Plan Policies LU-119 and LU-120) that were adopted by the Board of Supervisors address complex growth issues amidst extreme economic fluctuations and sweeping regulatory changes. These policies represent a performance-based approach emphasizing high quality, smart growth criteria rather than a business-as-usual approach that repeats historical land use patterns. Policies LU-119 and LU-120 were developed with the primary objective of reducing VMT and include requirements related to (1) sufficiently high densities to support transit; (2) infrastructure, including transit, that is put in place at the same time the project is developed; (3) a jobs-housing balance that reduces the need for long commutes and ensures lower VMT; (4) a project design that will enable residents to walk, ride bicycles, or take transit to their jobs and schools; and (5) a reasonable amount of mixed-use development. As stated in the March 7, 2011 letter (attached) from the California Attorney General's office, the growth management criteria "would substantially achieve the[se] objectives."

EXISTING PROGRAMS THAT ENCOURAGE INFILL DEVELOPMENT

The General Plan focuses on directing future development and investment toward previously urbanized communities. The General Plan provides three primary methods for urban growth: (1) buildout of infill sites (including targeted commercial corridors), (2) buildout of planned communities within the UPA, and (3) new growth areas (see the Land Use Element, pages 24-37). General Plan Policy LU-3 (below) summarizes this methodology. Policy LU-68 grants explicit public funding priority to projects that reduce VMT.

- General Plan Policy LU-3. It is the intent of the County to focus investment of public resources on revitalization efforts within existing communities, especially within commercial corridors, while also allowing planning and development to occur within strategic new growth areas.
- General Plan Policy LU-68. Give the highest priority for public funding to projects that facilitate and encourage infill, reuse, redevelopment and rehabilitation, mixed-use development, particularly in Environmental Justice communities, and that will result in per-person vehicle miles traveled lower than the County average, and the lowest priority for projects that do not comply with public facilities Master Plan phasing sequences.

Prioritization of high-quality infill development supports Sacramento County's GHG reduction goals and implementation of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). In addition, the County has worked on several other programs designed to encourage infill development. These programs have been completed or are in-progress, and include:

- Re-Envision West Arden Arcade Plan
- Fair Oaks Boulevard Corridor Plan
- North Watt Avenue Corridor Plan
- Fulton Avenue Special Planning Area
- Folsom Boulevard Complete Street Master Plan
- Watt Avenue Complete Streets Project

- Fair Oaks Boulevard Complete Street Master Plan
- Arden Way Corridor
- Commercial Center Re-Use Brochure
- Kosmont Report
- Stockton Boulevard Special Planning Area (SPA) Ordinance Update (ongoing)
- SB-2 Permanent Local Housing Assistance (ongoing)
- SB-2 Amendments
- Rezone Program

In 2021, California HCD awarded the County a Local Action Planning (LEAP) Grant for the preparation and adoption of planning documents and process improvements that accelerate housing production. One component of the LEAP Grant was to restart the County's Infill Program. Work includes developing priority infill areas and an inventory of sites, auditing regulations, identifying potential amendments to the Zoning Code or Design Guidelines and identifying incentives and strategies to encourage infill. Outreach will begin with County departments and outside agencies and will expand to stakeholders and the public. Priority infill areas will include the Green Zones identified as part of SACOG's Green Means Go program.

LAND USE AUTHORITY OF THE FINAL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

As described further in Theme 1, development of the Final CAP is required through adoption of Mitigation Measure CC-1 in the General Plan EIR. The purpose of the Final CAP is to identify ways to avoid or substantially lessen the generation of GHG emissions from implementation of the growth and development pattern anticipated to occur under the adopted General Plan through the planning horizon (i.e., 2030). The General Plan document and the policies contained therein, not the Final CAP, are the County's tools that guide application of its land use authority over the type and location of land use development that is allowed to occur in the unincorporated areas of the County.

In support of the idea that the Final CAP should regulate development, some comments quote the *Climate Action Plan: Strategy and Framework Document* (Sacramento County 2011), which acknowledges that land use planning "plays a role in adapting to climate change" (Sacramento County 2011: 14). The strategy document does not, however, indicate that the Final CAP is the appropriate mechanism for changing land use patterns. In fact, the proposed actions to address climate change from the transportation and land use sector included in the strategy document are (1) increase average fuel efficiency, (2) increase use of alternative and lower carbon fuels, and (3) reduce per capita VMT. The document explains that, "[v]ehicle miles traveled are largely a function of land use patterns" which are established by the General Plan. Methods to reduce VMT that are identified in the framework document include channeling new development to urban areas, as well as increasing overall land use mix and connectivity. The Final CAP includes measures that address each of the actions identified to reduce GHG emissions from the land use and transportation sectors and is consistent with the commitments and message in the strategy document.

In addition, while future land use patterns in the unincorporated area, including policies to encourage infill development, are primarily established through the General Plan, the Final CAP includes measures (listed below) to further encourage development within infill locations and reduce VMT from all new residential and office/business professional development in the County.

Some comments address the Final CAP measures and assert that they are inadequate to reduce VMT and discourage development in greenfield areas. The intent and efficacy of these measures at reducing GHG emissions, as well as modifications that have been made to the measures in response to feedback from the community and Board, are described below. The previously proposed carbon neutrality requirement for new growth (Measure GHG-30 in the Revised Final Draft) is discussed separately in Theme 4. As described there, this measure has been removed from the Final CAP.

- **Measure GHG-11: Reduce Emissions from New Residential and Office/Business Professional Development Vehicle Miles Traveled**

Under implementation of this measure, the rate of VMT generated by new residential and office/business professional development in the County must achieve a standard of 15 percent below the regional average rate of VMT. If a project as designed does not meet the standard, then the County would ensure that all feasible on-site measures to reduce VMT are incorporated into the project. If implementation of all feasible on-site measures does not achieve the standard, then a project would be required to participate in a VMT mitigation program. This program would be developed and implemented by the County. A project applicant would be required to counterbalance all remaining project-level and cumulative VMT impacts with funding allocated toward VMT improvement projects or equivalent GHG emission reduction projects in the County.

This measure encourages infill development in multiple ways. As explained in the discussion of Screening Criteria in the County's *Transportation Analysis Guidelines*, residential and non-residential projects located in "VMT-Efficient Areas" such as infill development locations are not required to demonstrate compliance with this VMT reduction standard and, therefore, are not subject to the potential on-site and off-site mitigation requirements and their associated costs. On the other hand, projects located outside of VMT Efficient Areas would be subject to the potential mitigation requirements and associated costs, and these requirements and costs would increase in proportion to a project's rate of VMT.

- **Measure GHG-23: Incentivize Infill Development**

Under this measure the County would procure a nexus study to determine the feasibility for imposing an "Infill Fee" on master plan developments that are located in areas that contribute to increased VMT and associated GHG emissions, and use the funds collected only for the purposes of facilitating infill development or redevelopment in the urban, unincorporated areas that are targeted for infill or redevelopment. The proposed Infill Fee amount was \$1,000 for each Dwelling Unit Equivalent, as specified in the Revised Final Draft CAP, but may change depending on the analysis in the nexus study. This measure would result in the County exploring funding options to incentivize infill development, including the potential for imposing a fee on development projects in non-infill locations that increase VMT and GHG emissions for the sole purpose of stimulating development activity within infill locations of the unincorporated areas.

The Final CAP does not provide any land use entitlements; it provides CEQA streamlining of GHG analyses for those projects that demonstrate consistency with the Final CAP. CAP Appendix I would be used show compliance with the Final CAP to achieve CEQA streamlining. This checklist is primarily an effort to streamline the permitting process for infill development and encourage development in areas already identified for growth in the General Plan. The Final CAP will not provide CEQA streamlining to projects outside the UPA or USB. Please refer to Theme 4 below for a detailed response regarding this issue.

GROWTH ASSUMPTIONS AND HOUSING ANTICIPATED IN THE GENERAL PLAN

The General Plan identifies a total residential unit holding capacity (i.e., the amount of new growth that could be accommodated) of 103,500 to 150,000 units (General Plan EIR, Table PD-1). Residential units in the New Growth Areas (West of Watt, Easton, Jackson Highway Corridor, and Grant Line East) were assumed to result in between 51,500 and 76,000 new units. Development of the Planned Communities and New Growth Areas is assumed throughout the General Plan EIR (e.g., Chapter 3, "Land Use," and Chapter 9, "Traffic and Circulation") and the impact evaluation considers the effects of this growth.

Modeling of GHG emissions in the General Plan EIR included buildout of Planned Communities within the UPA and New Growth Areas. Buildout of Planned Communities includes the following approved plan areas inside the UPA:

- Elverta Specific Plan
- East Antelope Specific Plan
- Mather Specific Plan
- Vineyard Springs Comprehensive Plan
- North Vineyard Station Specific Plan
- Florin Vineyard "Gap" Community Plan

Proposed New Growth Areas are shown geographically in General Plan Plate PD-4 (page 2-17). Their residential holding capacities are shown in Table PD-1 (page 2-13), and both housing units and employment assumptions are shown in Table TC-4 (page 9-22) of the Transportation and Circulation chapter. The GP EIR's Climate Change chapter includes a comprehensive analysis of the GHG emissions associated with the then-proposed General Plan. Table CC-4 (p. 12-29) contains a summary of estimated 2030 CO₂e emissions from the proposed General Plan as a total of 13,283,063 MT per year.

Grant Line East includes Cordova Hills, which was approved in 2013 and has a holding capacity of 8,000 residential units and 6,548 jobs. Easton was approved in 2008 and includes Glenborough (3,329 residential units) and Easton Place (1,644 residential units). The Jackson Highway Corridor New Growth Area (see General Plan EIR Plate PD-4, page 2-17) includes the following applications that were submitted after the approval of the General Plan Update in November 2011:

- West Jackson Highway Master Plan (16,484 housing units, 19,323 jobs)
- Jackson Township Specific Plan (5,690 housing units, 5,248 jobs)
- NewBridge Specific Plan (3,075 housing units, 1,350 jobs)

Totals: 25,171 residential units, 25,921 jobs

In addition to the Jackson Highway Corridor, the Grandpark Specific Plan and Upper Westside Specific Plan are two pending master plans in Natomas. These projects total 23,892 residential units and 9,356 residential units, respectively, with complementary acreage included for employment uses to balance jobs and housing in their respective areas.

In fact, the applications submitted for West Jackson, Jackson Township, NewBridge, Grandpark, Upper Westside, and Cordova Hills propose 66,419 new residential units. This is roughly 2/3 of the lower estimate used in the General Plan EIR analysis. Therefore, to the extent that future projects in these areas streamline GHG analyses under the Final CAP, this would not result in indirect inducement of growth beyond the

scope of the General Plan EIR. In addition, the Grandpark Specific Plan, Upper Westside Specific Plan, West Jackson Highway Master Plan and Jackson Township Specific Plan are currently under review and should not be considered “approved,” unbuilt units.

The assertions made in comments that the Final CAP would facilitate unplanned growth are not accurate. The anticipated growth, including pending master plans in greenfield areas, is within the scope of the development anticipated during preparation of the General Plan and reflected in the General Plan EIR analysis. As described above, the County has established growth management processes in the General Plan to encourage infill and institute requirements for greenfield developments that reduce VMT. These established policies would be supported by policies in the Final CAP. As explained above, the Land Use Element of the 2030 General Plan already emphasizes infill development in approximately 25 percent of its implementation measures.

The County cannot change past decisions that resulted in land use patterns and development that contribute to VMT and associated on-road emissions but is committed to reviewing future projects in the context of established climate change goals. As the County reviews project applications considering the latest GHG thresholds and regulations, changes in project features and designs that aid in the attainment of communitywide GHG reduction goals often result. In addition, the County has committed to updating the General Plan before 2030, to cohesively address these important topics in a manner consistent with the facilitation of the County’s climate-related goals.

A.1.3 Theme 3: Climate Emergency Resolution and Carbon Neutrality Goal

CLIMATE EMERGENCY RESOLUTION

On December 16, 2020, the Board of Supervisors passed Resolution No. 2020-0856 Declaring a Climate Emergency (Climate Emergency Resolution), which calls for County action to chart a path towards and to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. Comments were submitted expressing support for this action and suggested that the CAP should demonstrate that the County will achieve the carbon neutrality goal. As explained further in Theme 1, above, the Final CAP has been prepared to fulfill the County’s obligation to reduce the GHG emissions associated with buildout of the General Plan in accordance with targets established by the State. The State targets would not meet the Climate Emergency Resolution carbon neutrality goal by 2030.

The CAP was under development when the Climate Emergency Resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Significant progress on the CAP had been made at the time the Climate Emergency Resolution was adopted. The County’s carbon neutrality goal was adopted in advance of the publication of state guidance on how local planning can be implemented to achieve carbon neutrality. For example, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is currently preparing an update to the Scoping Plan to address carbon neutrality by 2045 but it will not be finalized until the end of 2022. To not lose momentum in the implementation of its own CAP, County staff revised the Final CAP to be responsive to the directive of charting a path towards carbon neutrality considering the best available, feasible, and implementable GHG reduction measures. The County committed to and is implementing a framework for achieving carbon neutrality by 2030. This framework includes using the Climate Emergency Mobilization Task Force to provide expert and community advice on the mobilization of public and private resources necessary to implement a climate and sustainability plan that identifies and integrates current and future actions

necessary to achieve an equitable, sustainable, and resilient economy and transition to Countywide carbon neutrality by 2030 and beyond. The Final CAP clearly articulates eight actions (beginning on the bottom of page 7 and continuing on page 8) that the County is committing to implement to meet the goals of the Climate Emergency Resolution, including the County's development of the Climate Emergency Response Plan (CERP) through the Climate Emergency Mobilization Task Force (Task Force).

CLIMATE EMERGENCY MOBILIZATION TASK FORCE

Comments were also directed at the specific make-up and priorities of the Task Force. In March of 2022, the Board adopted a resolution regarding the size and composition of the Task Force. At the Board's direction, the Task Force shall be 13 members composed of six environmental justice leaders, one youth, and six subject matter experts in the areas of air quality, agriculture, built environment, economics, energy, and transit/transportation. The Board further directed that the County Executive assure, to the maximum extent practical, that the environmental justice leadership members represent as many geographic areas of the unincorporated County as possible, particularly the County's four identified Environmental Justice Communities. The overall mission of the Task Force is to provide input, guidance, oversight, and assistance to the Sustainability Manager and to serve as an advisory body to the County. The scope of work shall be framed upon the principles of equity and be conducted with urgency. The Task Force can also play a role in implementation and refinement of the Final CAP and assist with the identification of funding resources. The Board of Supervisors approved the appointments of the 13 members of the Task Force on August 9, 2022, and monthly public meetings are expected to begin in September 2022.

A.1.4 Theme 4: Measure GHG-30 and the Carbon Neutrality Requirement for New Growth

To further the mission of carbon neutrality, and in response to community comments expressing concern about the GHG emissions associated with new development outside the UPA and USB, a new CAP GHG measure (GHG-30) was included in the Revised Final Draft CAP to require development projects needing an amendment to the UPA and/or USB to demonstrate carbon neutrality and, if approved, to achieve it during their implementation.

As a point of clarification, Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Projects that are outside the UPA and USB cannot streamline their GHG analysis from the Final CAP; they must prepare their own project-specific environmental analysis, and the CAP Consistency Checklist (Appendix I of the Final CAP) has been revised to remove the consideration of projects outside the UPA and USB. All measures, policies, and mechanisms that would facilitate streamlining of GHG analyses for new development projects outside the UPA and USB have been removed from the Final CAP.

To provide a good-faith response to the comments received regarding new development outside the UPA and USB, the following detailed response is offered.

Measure GHG-30 set a requirement for new development outside of an UPA and/or USB to demonstrate that it would achieve carbon neutrality through application of on- and off-site GHG and VMT reduction measures. Under implementation of this measure, any development project seeking an amendment to the UPA or USB would be required to achieve a standard of carbon neutral development, in which a project would be required to have a net total of 0 annual GHG emissions. This standard would be achieved through implementation of all feasible on-site GHG reduction measures, and could include off-site requirements to mitigate any residual GHG emissions that cannot be mitigated on-site, subject to review

and verification by the County or a qualified third party. Compliance with Measure GHG-30 would require quantification of GHG emissions, demonstration that the reductions occur during implementation, and County verification. This measure would reduce GHG emissions from VMT (and from other non-VMT sources) for projects located in non-infill locations (i.e., projects requiring UPA or USB amendments) by requiring such development to adhere to a carbon-neutral development standard. By contrast, infill development projects would not be subject to a carbon-neutral development standard.

The measure was initially identified as a Strategy Option for the Board's consideration and was evaluated in the Addendum prepared for the Revised Draft CAP released in the fall of 2021. However, in response to the public comments received at the Planning Commission workshop in the fall of 2021, the County proposed the measure in the body of the Revised Final CAP as an unquantified measure.

This change resulted in comments at the March 2022 Board workshop that expressed support for the measure, opinions that the measure was not strong enough or could facilitate sprawl, and concern about the cost burdens of new housing. Sacramento County Board of Supervisors members and residents expressed concerns that Measure GHG-30 would place additional financial burdens on new housing development that could render new housing unaffordable for Sacramento County residents and opined that this measure could contribute to the State's housing crisis. Supervisors also noted that the measure would create two sets of standards based on location, rather than the metrics of the specific development. In response, the Board directed County staff to place the measure in Appendix F, "Additional Options Considered for the CAP," and conduct further study of the measure's feasibility before including it in the Final CAP. As such, this measure has been removed from Final CAP and remains an option for future consideration. Future development projects outside the UPA and USB would be required to demonstrate consistency with Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's (SMAQMD's) thresholds of significance, which provide a uniform scale to measure the significance of GHG emissions from land use and stationary source projects in compliance with CEQA and SB 32. As described in SMAQMD's CEQA guide, projects that are consistent with SMAQMD's Tier 1 and Tier 2 GHG Reduction Measures would not conflict with the State's Scoping Plan.

With regard to the Final CAP and for clarity, because Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP, comments suggesting that the Final CAP and Addendum are inadequate because of Measure GHG-30 are now moot.

A.1.5 Theme 5: Electrification of Existing Residential and Commercial Development

Commenters have expressed concerns that Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06 do not include stringent enough requirements to decarbonize existing residential and commercial buildings. Measure GHG-04 directs the County to develop a program to facilitate the transition from natural gas appliances in existing commercial and nonresidential buildings using benchmark years for certain building types. Measure GHG-06 directs the County to place requirements on existing residential buildings to turnover natural gas appliances with electric appliances.

Comments question whether the County is taking sufficient action to reduce GHG emissions from existing and new residential and non-residential development. Similarly, commenters expressed concern that the County does not have a mechanism in place to enforce the targets established in Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06.

In developing the GHG reduction measures, the County must recognize the limitations of its legal authority to implement actions. In the case of decreasing on-site natural gas consumption at existing development, the County has limited authority to require County residents to replace natural gas-powered appliances with electric appliances as it generally has no decision-making authority absent an application for a permit. The Final CAP requires the County Building Permits and Inspection Division to receive documentation from applicants requesting building permit applications supporting that replacement water heaters, HVAC systems, other appliances will be replaced. Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06 will be tracked to verify that assumed participation rates are achieved (i.e., 10 percent for energy-efficiency upgrades by 2030; 15 percent for energy conservation by 2030; and 30 percent for electrification by 2030).

Commenters also requested that the language of Measure GHG-06 be clarified to apply to multi-family housing, not only single-family mixed-fuel homes. This has been clarified in the Final CAP as the provisions and permitting requirements of Measure GHG-06 apply to both single-family and multi-family dwellings.

Other commenters expressed concerns that implementation of these measures would place undue financial burden on homeowners who seek permits for additions or alterations. A common example provided in the comments of a home-altering action requiring a permit is the upgrade of home windows, which would ultimately increase the energy efficiency of a building. To clarify, a window replacement would not trigger the requirements of Measure GHG-06. In fact, and in response to these concerns, language in the Final CAP has been revised to articulate the electrification requirements more clearly. Permits for upgrade or replacement of natural gas appliances or HVAC and/or water heating equipment would require electrical upgrade. The Final CAP also includes the requirement that permits that increase the square footage of conditioned space (e.g., building expansions) include an upgrade to an electrical panel or branch circuit that would support electric appliances in the future. Based on available evidence, the County believes that an upgrade to an electrical panel or branch circuit would not result in an infeasible increase in cost during the renovation or expansion of an existing building. In addition, the County has committed to outreach and education programs, evaluation of the permitting process, and partnering with SMUD to develop an incentive program that reduces costs associated with any necessary electrical panel and/or branch circuit upgrades to support additional electric appliances.

Also, with respect to the financial burden of replacing a natural gas-powered water heater, the Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District (SMUD) makes rebates available for homeowners. SMUD customers can secure up to \$2,500 for replacing natural gas water heaters with electric or heat pump water heaters. This rebate program incentivizes turnover of gas water heaters without placing financial burdens on SMUD customers. Funding for appliance and home upgrades can also be secured through off-site mitigation programs recommended for new developments that have exhausted all on-site GHG reduction measures during the CEQA review process as a form of mitigation.

Moreover, the January 2022 Governor's Budget proposal includes nearly \$1 billion for equitable building decarbonization efforts over the next 2 years, in addition to hundreds of millions for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program, which expands access to all-electric affordable housing through grants from the California Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. This funding will also support the Low-Income Weatherization Program and other initiatives to improve climate resilience and decarbonization of existing buildings in California. It is foreseeable that these Statewide funds will be secured by Sacramento County residents eligible for such programs.

Commenters also expressed concern that electric appliances and experienced contractors to install them will not be readily available by benchmark dates contained in Measure GHG-04. The wording of the Final CAP provides flexibility for compliance with Measure GHG-04. The Final CAP states, "[i]f the technology to

install all-electric water and/or space heating appliances equipment for manufacturing or industrial facilities or essential medical facilities is not feasible and available by July 1, 2025, the Board of Supervisors may consider extending the limited exemption until the technology is feasible and available.” This language is intended to address that the appliances may not be available in the future and provide the County with flexibility to amend this measure if such conditions arise. Regarding construction contractors, it is inferred that commenters are suggesting a shortage of construction contractors would not meet demand for appliance installation and, therefore, these measures may not achieve their reductions and would be infeasible. No evidence was submitted to support this statement. While contractors, handyman, and laborers are in demand primarily due to the Statewide housing crisis, the construction labor force is growing and has rebounded from historic lows in 2019. As of March 2022, year-over-year construction contractor jobs have increased across the U.S. with California seeing a 6.3 percent change in total construction employment (HBI 2022). There is no evidence to suggest that contractors and handyman would be unavailable to meet demands for residential remodels and appliance installations.

To provide greater detail and clarity for readers regarding the methodology used to estimate emissions reductions from Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06, Appendix E to the Final CAP has been revised. For example, the calculation assumptions for Measure GHG-04 now include a breakdown of assumed participation rates and information about the energy use assumed per square foot. Please see Appendix E for more details regarding the methodology used to calculate the emissions reductions associated with Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06.

A.1.6 Theme 6: Electrification of New Development

Comments made pertaining to Measures GHG-05 and GHG-07 generally either express support for the measure or recommend greater flexibility in the target years for compliance.

Measure GHG-05 instructs the County to adopt and develop a reach code beyond the mandatory requirements of Part 6 of the Title 24 California Building Code (California Energy Code) to decarbonize new commercial and nonresidential buildings. Measure GHG-07 directs the County to adopt a new reach code that would require prewiring for all-electric appliances and equipment in all mixed-fuel, new single-family dwellings and multi-family buildings, subject to future cost-effectiveness studies and feasibility analyses. The following electrification requirements are established by Measure GHG-07:

- building permit applications filed on or after January 1, 2023, or 6 months after the availability of a cost-effectiveness study, or feasibility analysis, whichever is later, for newly constructed residential buildings that are three stories or less to be all-electric buildings; and

- building permit applications filed on or after January 1, 2026, or 6 months after the availability of a cost-effectiveness study, or feasibility analysis, whichever is later, for newly constructed residential buildings that are four stories or more to be all-electric buildings.

Commenters requested that the requirements be pushed to a later date to provide flexibility for the building sector to comply. Commenters note that the 2022 California Energy Code (CEC) does not prohibit on-site natural gas usage in new development. This statement is correct. The 2022 California Energy Code allows for on-site natural gas usage; however, the code requires that electrical outlets be installed within the vicinity of a natural gas-powered appliance to facilitate the transition to electrical appliances at the homeowner’s discretion. Nevertheless, the CEC has intimated in its 2021 *Building Decarbonization Assessment* that future homes will be fully decarbonized to meet the State’s goal of carbon neutrality by 2045 (CEC 2021). While the composition of future iterations of the CEC are unknown beyond the current

2022 version, it is foreseeable that future updates could include prohibitions related to on-site natural gas combustion, but there is no evidence that this is a foregone conclusion at this time. Moreover, through the CEQA compliance process, new development in the County is becoming progressively decarbonized as projects comply with the recommendations of SMAQMD, which includes a best management practice (BMP) to eliminate on-site natural gas. Projects that utilize SMAQMD's guidance and seek to avoid a significant climate change impact must adhere to this BMP to demonstrate compliance and result in a less-than-significant impact.

It should be noted that there are a variety of jurisdictions with local reach code ordinances in place that improve energy efficiency and/or decarbonize new construction (commercial and residential) demonstrating the feasibility of implementation of such codes. A list of locally adopted energy ordinances for the 2019 and 2022 codes can be found on the California Energy Codes and Standards webpage (CECS 2022).

Appendix E to the Final CAP has been revised to provide greater detail and clarity regarding the methodology used to calculate the emissions reductions associated with Measure GHG-05 and GHG-07.

A.1.7 Theme 7: Use of Tier 4 Construction Equipment

Several comments expressed opposition to the adoption and implementation of Measure GHG-08 and noted concerns regarding the availability of Tier 4 engines.

Measure GHG-08 directs the County to establish requirements for the use of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-rated Tier 4 final diesel engines or cleaner electric-powered, hybrid, or alternatively fueled construction equipment in new construction. Use of Tier 4 engines is commonly recommended as a mitigation measure in CEQA documents to reduce emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM) based on air district guidance. This, combined with other efforts made by SMAQMD such as the upcoming Off-Road Equipment Replacement incentive (expected to take effect in the fall of 2022 or winter of 2023), has propelled the advancement of Tier 4 engine availability to meet regional and State needs.

The availability of Tier 4 engines is also projected to increase Statewide as CARB implements the reduction measures under the Mobile Source Strategy for the off-road sector. As has been the case for the availability and production of electric vehicles, which was spurred by California's stringent fuel economy standards and various on-road regulations and plans, the availability and production of Tier 4 engines is projected to increase to meet the regulatory requirements implemented by CARB and other air districts. Based on modeling performed by CARB for the Mobile Source Strategy, in 2022, 57 percent of all construction equipment was already rated Tier 4 Final, and projections for Tier 4 Final engines for 2030 and 2050 were 90 percent and 99 percent, respectively (DieselNet 2022). It is therefore foreseeable that Tier 4 engines will be available for compliance with Measure GHG-08.

This notwithstanding, the wording of Measure GHG-08 in the Final CAP has been expanded to provide flexibility to contractors in response to comments. If infeasible or unavailable, Measure GHG-08 now allows contractors to use equipment that would achieve similar GHG emissions. Also, Measure GHG-08 does not limit contractors to using only Tier 4 engines for their construction fleets as it allows contractors to also use electric-powered, hybrid, or alternatively fueled construction equipment. Additional revisions have been made to Measure GHG-08 to address the potential for the measure to disproportionately affect small businesses. As stated in the Final CAP, "[c]ontractors who demonstrate that they meet CARB's Off-Road Diesel Regulations as a small fleet can qualify for a waiver from this requirement." As indicated in the

revised measure, the County will work with SMAQMD to provide contractors designated as small fleets information on applicable incentives or grants for equipment upgrades. Also of note, the use of Tier 4 engines in future construction fleets will produce notable co-benefits to the Sacramento Region. Tier 4 engines produce about a 90 percent reduction in NO_x and respirable PM emissions compared to Tier 2 standards, and 45 percent less than Tier 3. The air pollutant NO_x is a precursor pollutant that combines with volatile organic compounds in the atmosphere when exposed to sunlight to form ground-level ozone. Ozone is a known criteria air pollutant for which Sacramento County is in nonattainment with respect to EPA's national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and California's California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS). Sacramento County is also in nonattainment with respect to the CAAQS for respirable PM (PM₁₀) and the NAAQS for fine PM (PM_{2.5}). Measure GHG-08 would assist the County and SMAQMD in long-term regional air quality planning to attain the NAAQS and CAAQS for these pollutants, thus improving air quality and the health of Sacramento County residents.

A.1.8 Theme 8: Carbon Farming

The Final CAP includes Measure GHG-01: Promote and Increase Carbon Farming. Implementation of this measure would require the development of a program by 2024 that, through targeted outreach and peer-to-peer learning, provides carbon sequestration education and resources to relevant stakeholders (e.g., farmers, ranchers, and land managers). The program would focus on educating stakeholders about the benefits of implementing carbon sequestration practices and the variety of financial and technical resources that are currently available to assist farmers and ranchers in implementation. This program can be coordinated with industry groups and nonprofits, such as the California Association of Resource Conservation Districts.

Commenters noted concerns with how GHG emissions reductions through increased carbon sequestration associated with this measure were developed. Specifically, commenters noted that the assumed participation rates were revised between the Final Draft CAP released in the fall of 2021 and the Revised Final Draft CAP and recommended clarification of the quantification assumptions. This methodology is described further below.

Baseline (2015) agriculture acres data was obtained from the [Sacramento County 2015 Crop and Livestock Report](#). Agriculture acres were categorized into the following land uses: field crops (excluding irrigated pasture and range land), irrigated pasture, range land, fruit and nut crops, seed crops, and vegetable crops. To estimate agriculture acres for each category in 2030, the 2015 acreage data was scaled by the anticipated gradual decline in agricultural land uses (1 percent per decade).

The carbon farming practices assumed in the Final CAP include compost application, grazing management, improved tillage, and conservation crop rotation. Assumptions for participating acres were derived using local historical data where possible. For example, tillage practices and cover cropping data were obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) 2017 Census of Agriculture – Sacramento County Profile. This data was used as a baseline to estimate potential growth in participation. Where local historical data was not available, assumed participation rates were derived using well-established examples and resources. These include the Marin County Climate Action Plan 2030, which was developed in partnership with the Carbon Cycle Institute, the California 2030 Natural and Working Lands Climate Change Implementation Plan, and the Statewide implementation data and projections from the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) Healthy Soils Program (HSP) (described further below).

Carbon sequestration rates for carbon farming practices in metric tons of carbon dioxide per acre per year (MTCO₂e/acre-year) were obtained from the [COMET-Planner Tool](#). COMET-Planner was originally

developed by USDA's Natural Resource Conservation Service. An additional CDFA HSP-specific version of COMET-Planner was "developed to support programs coordinated by CDFA and CARB" and "is designed to provide estimates of the net greenhouse gas reductions and payments associated with specific conservation practices included in the CDFA Healthy Soils Program (HSP)" (CDFA 2022). This version was used to estimate carbon sequestration potential for carbon farming practices included in the Final CAP. COMET-Planner is recommended and used by industry-leading carbon sequestration organizations and agencies, including CARB, Carbon Cycle Institute, and Marin Carbon Project. Carbon sequestration rates were applied to the applicable participating acres to estimate annual GHG emissions reductions. Importantly, the GHG emissions reduction estimates are calculated and shown in the Final CAP in terms of the annual reduction that would be achieved in the year 2030; they are not calculated as cumulative GHG emissions reductions. Therefore, varying participation rates between now and 2030 have no impact on annual GHG emissions reductions in 2030 (i.e., initially low participation rates do not impact emissions reductions in 2030 as long as the assumed participation rate in 2030 is achieved).

Assumed participating acres were reduced between the 2021 Final Draft CAP and February 2022 Revised Final Draft CAP in response to comments and feedback received from the public and stakeholders. This revision results in Measure GHG-01 accounting for approximately 30 percent of the total GHG emissions reductions that would be achieved through implementation of the Final CAP. While this represents a significant proportion of the Final CAP's emissions reductions, it is important to note that the Final CAP would still achieve and significantly exceed its GHG emissions reduction target in 2030 in the absence of this measure. (Refer to Table 4 of the Final CAP, which provides reductions achieved by Measure GHG-01 (i.e., 146,934 MT CO₂e) and all other measures and Table 3 in the final CAP, which provides a summary of forecast GHG emissions, targets, emissions reductions, and the emissions gap.)

The reductions associated with this measure are within the scale of potential GHG emissions from the working lands sector that have been described in State planning documents such as CARB's Draft 2022 Scoping Plan and Draft California 2030 Natural and Working Lands Climate Change Implementation Plan. The reductions associated with Measure GHG-01 comprise a greater percentage of the total reductions in 2030 than might otherwise occur because SMUD's projected near-zero-carbon electricity results in relatively smaller reductions from building energy-related reduction measures. As a result, the relative emissions reductions of measures targeting sectors other than building energy make up a larger proportion of the total emissions reductions.

Commenters note that additional details could be included for this measure. Since the Revised Final Draft CAP was published, a menu of specific funding and implementation resources have been added to the measure's Implementation section. For example, this section now includes details regarding CDFA's HSP, which provides technical support and direct financial assistance for carbon farming practices; and the Strategic Growth Council's Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation Program (SALC Program), which helps to protect agricultural lands from conversion by facilitating conservation easements and strategy plans. Inclusion of the SALC Program addresses some concerns that the proposed carbon farming practices may not result in permanent GHG emissions reductions. In general, these programs and resources can help to alleviate technical challenges and reduce upfront costs that may be associated with implementation. It is also important to note that while implementation of carbon farming practices may result in initial costs, research shows that these practices result in increased profitability through increased yields, improved quality, and enhanced resilience (i.e., avoided losses). Additionally, in response to comments received regarding the removal of interim Target Indicators that were included in previous versions of the CAP, interim Target Indicators have also been re-added to this measure to allow the County to track progress of implementation.

A.1.9 Theme 9: Landscaping, Native Plants, Water Conservation, and Urban Forests

Several comments were submitted providing input and support for Measures GHG-02, Temp-08, and GOV-WA-02. Measure GHG-02 directs the County to maintain and enhance an urban forest to both increase the County's carbon sequestration potential and mitigate the effects of the Urban Heat Island Effect (UHIE). Measure Temp-08 directs the County to increase parking lot shading, landscaping, and urban greening in communities that do not have existing tree cover. Measure GOV-WA-02 directs the County to conduct a turf landscape irrigation audit.

Comments recommend that the trees planted under Measures GHG-02 and Temp-08 be at least 50 percent native Valley Oaks, which are drought tolerant, native trees to the Sacramento Region. In response, the language of Measure GHG-02 has been modified in the Final CAP to prioritize drought-tolerant tree species, which is aligned with the sentiment of the commenters.

Comments also suggest that implementation of Measure GHG-02 should account for the loss of trees in the County, such that the target indicator is net trees planted (accounting for losses) rather than number of new trees planted. The addition of new trees is an appropriate target indicator for a measure to maintain and enhance urban forests because there are existing mechanisms in place to support tree preservation and protection enhance health of existing trees in the unincorporated County. Pursuant to the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance and General Plan policies, removal of native oak trees in the County's designated urban area requires a permit or approval through discretionary review. Permits are also required for trimming or removal of select landscaping trees, public trees, and landmark trees.

Comments highlighted the need to expand the urban canopy in underserved communities as proposed under Measures GHG-02 and Temp-08. The County agrees. The implementation plan for Measure GHG-02 includes prioritizing planting in the County's Environmental Justice Communities and Measure Temp-08 would prioritize communities with less urban tree cover. Both measures would include collaboration with regional partners to identify incentives, grants, or other resources to support planting of parking lot or street trees, maintaining tree health, and establishing community gardens. The intent of Measures GHG-02 and Temp-08 is to expand the County's urban forestry to areas that do not currently receive benefits from tree coverage such as improved air quality and aesthetics, as well as decreased UHIE. Comments suggest that the turf audit proposed under Measure GOV-WA-02 should identify all essential and nonessential turf and phase out nonessential turf by 2030. In response, the language of Measure GOV-WA-02 has been amended in the Final CAP to include these provisions (see Section 2.2, "Government Operations Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures").

A.1.10 Theme 10: Electric Vehicles

Many commenters express support for increased expansion of electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure. Measure GHG-10 directs the County to implement the Sacramento Area Plug-In Electric Vehicle Collaborative's Electric Vehicle Readiness and Infrastructure Plan to increase EV network capacity through infrastructure, fleet changes, funding mechanisms, utility coordination, and education. The measure also establishes a target of 1,000 chargers composed of 95 percent Level 2 and 5 percent DC Fast Charge by 2025 and 2,500 total chargers installed by 2030.

Through Measure GHG-10, the County would facilitate the transition of internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs) to EVs through investments in charging infrastructure. An existing challenge to ICEV

turnover is the perception that infrastructure is unavailable to meet charging demands of EVs. While this may be the case in certain portions of the country or State, implementation of Measure GHG-10 will increase the County's capacity to accommodate EV trips and charging needs. This level of investment would work in tandem with the efforts undertaken by the California Energy Commission (Commission) to invest in the charging infrastructure and technologies needed to transition the on-road mobile source sector to EVs throughout the State through its Clean Transportation Plan. The Commission supports strategic regional planning efforts (i.e., Regional Transportation Plans/Sustainable Communities Strategies [RTP/SCSs]) to facilitate the transition to EVs and other zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs). The Commission is the primary State agency leading this transition and is building a corridor of connecting, conveniently located direct-current fast chargers to allow drivers of EVs the freedom to travel throughout the State. As of January 2021, the State currently supports approximately 70,000 public and shared EV charging stations, including nearly 6,000 direct current fast chargers, with additional investments underway to meet the 2025 goal of 250,000 public and shared EV charging stations as directed by Executive Order B-48-18. Pursuant to AB 2127, the Commission is required to publish a biennial report on the charging needs of 5 million ZEVs by 2030 and will adjust the level and degree of investments based on the reports' findings.

This measure will be implemented concurrently with existing efforts undertaken by the cities of Sacramento and Elk Grove, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG's) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, and investments made by CARB in the existing Advanced Clean Cars Program and upcoming Advanced Clean Cars II Program and the Commission's Clean Transportation Plan.

Commenters also expressed uncertainty regarding the methodology used to estimate reductions from Measure GHG-10. For clarification, the modeling is based on a combination of baseline EV data from the CA Open Data Portal (a compilation of public data collected by the State through its routine business activities), baseline EV charger data from the Sac County EV Readiness Plan (a 2017 report prepared by the Sacramento County Electric Vehicle Working Group, which includes Sacramento County), and the number of new EV chargers Countywide needed to meet the State's EV targets. Appendix E to the Final CAP has been revised to provide greater detail and clarity regarding the methodology used to calculate the emissions reductions associated with Measure GHG-10.

A.1.11 Theme 11: Environmental Justice, Community Resilience, and Community Health

Several commenters highlighted the important issues of environmental justice, community resilience, and community health. As described further in the Theme 3 discussion, the Board adopted Resolution No. 2020-0856 declaring a climate emergency in December 2021. This Climate Emergency Resolution described the devastating and extreme effects of climate change as well as the disproportionate impacts experienced by low-income communities, communities of color, indigenous communities, the young, the disabled, and the elderly.

The County agrees that the communities disproportionately affected by climate change should receive priority regarding implementation of climate action programs. According to the Environmental Justice Element of the County's General Plan, "Environmental Justice Communities can be more vulnerable to the effects of climate change, these communities need to be prioritized in programs that are part of the Climate Action Plan." Environmental Justice Element Policy 28 memorializes this as follows:

It is the policy of Sacramento County that programs developed as a part of a Climate Action Plan such as incentive programs, fee mitigation programs, adaptation and resiliency programs, and County-funded programs shall prioritize Environmental Justice Communities.

Such support for our environmental justice communities is included in the Final CAP and can be acted upon as soon as the Final CAP is adopted.

The Final CAP also includes a climate change adaptation strategy that establishes the adaptation measures that the County can use to address climate vulnerabilities and increase Countywide resiliency. These include measures to prepare for anticipated effects of climate change. As described in Section 3 of the CAP, the proposed climate adaptation measures “may also reduce GHG emissions, improve public health, and achieve other co-benefits that further the County’s sustainability and environmental justice goals and improve community resilience.”

Measure Temp-03 would educate residents of disadvantaged communities on heat-related risks and strategies to prevent heat-related illness through coordination with the National Weather Service by delivering robust, multi-lingual education and outreach materials accessible across multiple media forms (e.g., radio, text messaging, social media) to publicize the symptoms and dangers of heat-related illness, where cooling centers are located, how to sign up for Sacramento Alert Emergency Notification System, and practical methods for preventing heat-related illness during periods of high heat. Through this measure, the County would also expand partnerships with local governments, nongovernment organizations, places of worship, and businesses to provide additional cooling centers within disadvantaged communities, where households and residents may not have access to air conditioning during periods of extreme heat. The County would survey disadvantaged communities to identify community preferences regarding the appropriate location and accessibility of cooling centers, based on proximity to public transit.

Comments also identified actions intended to improve environmental justice and overall community well-being such as raising the minimum wage, investing in affordable housing, and creating food hubs to address food insecurity. These actions are beyond the scope of the Final CAP. However, the Final CAP includes measures that implement the Environmental Justice Element policy to focus investments in the County’s environmental justice communities to address climate-related effects.

A.1.12 Theme 12: Funding for Final CAP Implementation

Commenters requested quantitative evaluation of the costs associated with implementing CAP measures and suggested means of obtaining funding. Final CAP Appendix G includes a qualitative cost analysis for community measures and government operation measures and is a high-level assessment of the administrative costs for the County to implement the measures, considering staff time and resources needed to create policies and enforce actions associated with the measures. County budgeting and funding of programs is determined on an annual basis for the next fiscal year. An adopted Final CAP would direct County departments to budget for work related to implementing these measures, including application for grants to supplement County funds. As described in Theme 3, above, the Climate Emergency Mobilization Task Force can also assist in identifying supplemental funding sources.

A.1.13 Theme 13: Final CAP Measure Specificity and Enforceability

Several comments state that additional detail should be provided for the GHG reduction measures of the Revised Draft Final CAP, with some asserting that additional details are needed for the CAP to meet CEQA requirements for a qualified GHG reduction plan (CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5[b]). Commenters say that the CAP fails to include “enforceable measures,” inappropriately includes measures based on “voluntary actions” and “partnerships,” and does not “identify costs and funding sources” or “commit to specific schedules and interim performance metrics.” The response below describes the criteria set forth in CEQA for a Final CAP to be considered a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Refer to Theme 1 for the County’s response to comments that appear to conflate the CEQA Guidelines requirements for mitigation measures in an environmental document and the level of detail provided for GHG reduction measures included in the Final CAP.

CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR A PLAN FOR THE REDUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 sets forth voluntary criteria in which, “(l)ead agencies may analyze and mitigate the significant effects of greenhouse gas emissions at a programmatic level,” by preparing a “plan for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions” so that, “(l)ater project-specific environmental documents may tier from and/or incorporate by reference that existing programmatic review.” (Section 15183.5[a]) The Guidelines establish criteria for such “Plans for the Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions” in Section 15183.5(b)(1), which are provided in full below:

- A. Quantify greenhouse gas emissions, both existing and projected over a specified time period, resulting from activities within a defined geographic area;
- B. Establish a level, based on substantial evidence, below which the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions from activities covered by the plan would not be cumulatively considerable;
- C. Identify and analyze the greenhouse gas emissions resulting from specific actions or categories of actions anticipated within the geographic area;
- D. Specify measures or a group of measures, including performance standards, that substantial evidence demonstrates, if implemented on a project-by-project basis, would collectively achieve the specified emissions level;
- E. Establish a mechanism to monitor the plan's progress toward achieving the level and to require amendment if the plan is not achieving specified levels;
- F. Be adopted in a public process following environmental review.

LEVEL OF DETAIL REQUIRED FOR MEASURES IN A PLAN FOR THE REDUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The County has prepared the Final CAP to meet the above-referenced criteria, including criterion (D) regarding the Final CAP’s GHG reduction measures, which states that “substantial evidence” is required to demonstrate that the measures will achieve the reduction targets set forth in the Final CAP. Substantial evidence is defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15384(a) to mean “enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached...Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or

narrative, evidence which is clearly erroneous or inaccurate...does not constitute substantial evidence.” According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15384(b), “Substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts.”

GHG REDUCTION MEASURES IN THE FINAL CAP ARE SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

As described in Final CAP Section 2, “Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy,” the Final CAP presents a detailed GHG reduction measure analysis, including the following details for each measure:

Measure: A description of the program, policy, or project the County will implement that will reduce GHG emissions.

Implementation: Specific actions the County will take to achieve the described measure’s objective.

Implementing County Department: The County department(s) responsible for implementation. Also includes information on external partners that can collaborate for measure implementation, if applicable.

Timeframe: When the measure will be implemented, categorized as near term (2020-2023), midterm (2024-2026), and long term (2027-2030).

GHG Reduction Potential: Estimated MT CO₂e reduced in 2030, if a measure is quantified. Appendix E, Table E-6 provides the modeling assumptions for each quantified measure. Measures unable to be estimated are identified as “Not Quantified”.

Sector: Describes which emissions sector from the GHG Inventory to which the measure applies.

Target Indicator: Describes metrics that can be used to monitor progress toward goal achievement.

In total, Section 2 of the Final CAP provides 20 pages of detail describing the measures the County will implement to reduce GHG emissions, including the specific actions that will be taken by the County to achieve each measure, along with each measure’s anticipated timing and estimated reduction in annual GHG emissions by 2030. The target indicator provided for each measure serves as a performance standard against which progress on each measure can be measured. In addition, Final CAP Appendix E provides the data, reports, and evidence relied upon to establish the assumptions in the modeling and analysis. For example, the Calculation Assumptions for Measure GHG-14 in Appendix E notes a 0.5 percent reduction in passenger commute VMT in 2030, which is based on CAPCOA’s methodology for LUT-5. As another example, the Calculation Assumptions for GHG-01 outline the underlying data and sources for inputs and assumed participation rates. For the measures where quantified GHG reductions were relied upon to reach reduction targets, published and verified data were available to support modeling assumptions.

Thus, Section 2 of the Final CAP, along with the detailed GHG reduction measure modeling assumptions presented in Final CAP Appendix E, provide sufficient evidence and relevant information to support the County’s conclusion that implementation of the Final CAP’s GHG reduction measures would result in emissions reductions above and beyond the level of reduction needed to meet the County’s 2030 target (as explained in Final CAP Section 1.3, “Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for 2030”). Therefore, the details provided in Final CAP Section 2 and Appendix E constitute the substantial evidence required to demonstrate that implementation of the Final CAP’s GHG reduction measures would achieve the County’s 2030 target and meet the requirement of Section 15183.5 (b)(1)(d) related to the measures included in a plan for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Regarding measure enforceability, the Final CAP is an enforceable policy document that once adopted, requires the County to track, measure, implement, and monitor GHG measure implementation to ensure that adequate progress and ultimately the reduction targets are achieved. The Final CAP provides a menu of measures with varying assumptions and requirements including County-controlled actions, voluntary participation actions, partnership actions, and actions that would seek future funding mechanisms to implement. The Final CAP offers measures that are quantified and measures that are qualitative (i.e., measures that can reduce GHG emissions, but were not relied upon for achieving the target). All measures were constructed consistent with the framework identified above in CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b)(1). Regardless of a measure's quantified or qualified status, all measures and the assumptions used in the analysis were based upon the best available data and evidence as outlined in Appendix E. Where measures are voluntary, there are assumptions based on data that supports the voluntary participation rates are feasible. Where partnerships are needed, there is evidence presented that supports the feasibility of entering into such partnerships. Where new funding is required to implement measures, while not currently secured, there is evidence to support that funding sources or authority over funding decisions exist to implement those measures. Importantly, the measures that are quantified within the analysis are documented and verified, the assumptions are reasonable and could feasibly be implemented. These measures are then the focus of implementation of the Final CAP and once adopted will be tracked, measured, and monitored for their success. Collectively, the County has implemented a reasonable, feasible, substantiated framework of GHG measures whose implementation will be enforced through adoption of the Final CAP and its implementation program.

A.2 INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

The County received 96 individual letters commenting on the Revised Final Draft CAP. The following discussion responds to each letter with reference to the themed discussions above and supplemental information as appropriate.

Letter 1

2/17/2022

Herman Barahona, Sacramento Environmental Justice Coalition

The comment expresses concern for the residents of the South Sacramento community due to the use of leaded fuel at Sacramento Executive Airport and the number of permits issued by SMAQMD. While lead is a source of environmental pollution, it is not a GHG. In addition, emissions associated with aircraft operations are outside of the County's jurisdictional control. For these reasons, it is not addressed in the Final CAP.

SMAQMD permits are required for businesses that may release or control air pollutants to ensure that all SMAQMD rules and regulations are considered. They are obtained from SMAQMD through a process separate from the County's permitting and environmental review. The air district is tasked with protecting air quality. For example, SMAQMD has established the South Sacramento/Florin Steering Committee representing the South Sacramento/Florin Community. The Steering Committee will help the SMAQMD implement the Community Air Monitoring Plan to monitor and improve air quality in the South Sacramento/Florin community.

Letter 2
2/20/2022
Clara Watters

The comment expresses concern regarding the new program for organic waste collection and provides suggestions that may be less burdensome for seniors and others with disabilities. For clarification, the new program for organic waste collection was initiated by the County's Waste Management and Recycling Department to comply with Senate Bill 1383 (2016), which requires that organic materials are kept out of landfills. Per the law, all residents must separate organics from their garbage and place food scraps, food-soiled paper, and yard trimmings (grass, leaves) in the organics cart (formerly called the green waste cart) for weekly collection. This program is not the result of a measure in the Final CAP.

The Final CAP includes Measure GHG-24 to support organic waste diversion with the goal of achieving full compliance with Assembly Bill 1826 and SB 1383 because keeping organic material out of landfills reduces the production of methane - a potent GHG. However, Measure GHG-24 is related to providing the infrastructure for processing the waste and how the gathered organic waste will be used and applied after collection. The specifics related to residential pickup will continue to be managed by the County's Waste Management and Recycling Department.

Letter 3
2/23/2022
Herman Barahona, Sacramento Environmental Justice Coalition

The comment submits an "Environmental Justice 101" presentation with the note "FYI- feel free to share." No comments regarding the environmental analysis are provided. The comment is noted. See also Theme 11 regarding environmental justice.

Letter 4
3/16/2022
Megan Shumway

The comment suggests that all electric appliances should be required by 2023, rather than 2026. Refer to the Theme 6 discussion regarding the electrification of new construction.

The comment offers support for expanded EV infrastructure, EV car conversion, EV car sharing, and expanded transit. This comment is noted. Refer to Theme 10 for further discussion of these topics.

Letter 5
3/16/2022
Barbara Ray

The comment expresses the opinion that the Revised Final Draft CAP document contains "Very little new vision." This comment is noted. The County has continued to refine the Final in response to public comments, in an effort to identify the feasible measures with community support that will achieve the necessary GHG reductions to meet State targets.

Letter 6

3/17/2022

Stanley Okumura

The comment expresses general support for a “strong” CAP. No comments regarding the Revised Final Draft CAP content or conclusions are provided. The comment is noted.

Letter 7

3/18/2022

Ann Amato, Sacramento Climate Coalition

The comment includes recommendations for the City of Sacramento and County related to solar power; environmental justice; community resilience and resilience hubs; and composting, community gardens, and a “greener community.”

The comment’s recommendation to incentivize rooftop solar to lower residential energy costs is noted. However, as noted in the Final CAP, because carbon-neutral electricity would be available from the grid, this would not result in GHG reductions at the 2030 CAP target date. Therefore, this recommendation is not included in the CAP. Note, however, that the Final CAP does include Measure GOV-BE-02, through which the County would use solar power for all County building electricity through on-site renewable energy systems or participation in SMUD’s commercial SolarShares and/or Greenergy programs.

With respect to environmental justice, the recommendations provided in the comment (e.g., affordable housing, access to food programs, raising the minimum wage) are largely outside the scope of the Final CAP. The Climate Change Adaptation Strategy provided in the Final CAP is an adaptation framework that presents measures that the County would take to address climate vulnerabilities and increase Countywide resiliency. The adaptation framework follows the process outlined in Phase 3 of the California Adaptation Planning Guide and relies on the vulnerability assessment prepared for the Final CAP (refer to CAP Final Appendix B). See also the Theme 11 discussion regarding environmental justice.

Refer to the Theme 9 discussion regarding landscaping and urban forestry. Note also that the Final CAP includes Measure GHG-24 to support organic waste diversion and is related to the infrastructure for processing and applying the gathered organic waste. Municipal composting is now required by California law.

Letter 8

3/19/2022

Robert Rosenbaum

The comment provides information about the health effects of climate change, and provides recommendations and opinions on several adaptation policies. The information about the health effects of climate change and opinions on adaptation policies are noted. No specific comments on the environmental analysis are provided.

Regarding funding for cooling centers identified in Measure Temp-03, refer to the Theme 12 discussion of Final CAP funding.

Through Measure Temp-07, as revised, the County would develop and incorporate cool pavement standards into the County’s roadway design manual for use in public rights-of-way. These cool pavement standards would apply to construction or modification of County-owned facilities and can vary based on location. Measure Temp-10, “Expand Educational Programs to Address Vector and Waterborne Diseases,”

would address vector-borne diseases by “[e]xpending greater resources to expand upon existing educational programs.” See also the Theme 9 discussion of urban forest policies and the Theme 11 discussion regarding environmental justice.

This Final CAP complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State’s Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State’s targets. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion.

Letter 9
3/17/2022
Goli Sahba

The comment expresses support for the need to use 2030 as the carbon neutrality goal. Please refer to Theme 3.

The comment provides several specific remarks on Final CAP measures and provides suggestions to finance Final CAP implementation. The funding suggestions are noted. See Theme 12 for further discussion of Final CAP funding. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in Theme 13.

The comment regarding programs that could be added to GHG-01 are noted. GHG-01 has been revised to reflect community input. See also Theme 8 above.

Measure GHG-02 has been revised to encourage planting of drought-tolerant trees, consistent with the opinions expressed in the comment.

The comment suggests that a 50 percent requirement for native trees be added to Measures Temp-08 and Water-04. These suggestions are noted and will be considered in the development of the County ordinances and codes required by these measures. See also the Theme 9 discussion of landscaping, native plants, and water conservation. The comment regarding the timeframe for Measure GHG-28 is noted. The timeframe for Measure GHG-28 is midterm (2024-2026). Because this measure requires coordination with SMAQMD and update of rules and regulations outside of the County’s direct control, the County believes that a midterm implementation goal is appropriate.

Letter 10
3/18/2022
North State Building Industry Association, Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange, Associated Builders and Contractors, Northern California Chapter

The comment requests flexibility in demonstrating compliance with the CAP through a combination of alternatives. This comment is noted.

The commenter objects to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment offers recommendations for further consideration regarding the language and requirements of GHG-07, GHG-11, GHG-15 and GHG-02. All other comments are noted.

Please refer to Theme 6 for a discussion regarding electrification of new construction (GHG-07).

Regarding the VMT goal in Measure GHG-11, the comment requests additional flexibility in the requirement and additional language about economic feasibility and housing production. As written, Measure GHG-11 requires a 15 percent reduction in daily VMT compared to the regional average as specified in Sacramento County's Transportation Analysis Guidelines for all new residential and office/business professional development in the County, consistent with Policy CI-5 of the Circulation Element. Projects that do not meet these VMT thresholds will be required to implement all feasible mitigation measures to ensure that the VMT targets are met. As indicated in the measure, "[d]etailed feasibility criteria will be developed and will include appropriate economic considerations." As part of the implementation of this measure, the County would develop and adopt a VMT mitigation program that would identify projects.

The comment suggests that the pedestrian network upgrades identified through Measures GHG-15 may be appropriate projects to include in the VMT mitigation program as improvements that could be funded by projects that cannot feasibly meet the VMT reduction target. The comment further suggests that development projects that have incorporated all feasible on-site GHG mitigation should be permitted to contribute financially to the urban forest program identified in Measure GHG-02. This is reflected in the measure as currently drafted.

The comment expresses concern about the unintended consequences of adopting a CAP that is more aggressive than surrounding jurisdictions because costs could "drive homebuilders and homebuyers to neighboring jurisdictions." This comment is noted.

Letter 11

3/21/2022

Erin Teague, Sacramento Association of Realtors

The comment expresses concern with the language for Measure GHG-06. Please see the Theme 5 discussion of electrification of existing residential and commercial development.

Letter 12

3/21/2022

Sacramento Poor People's Campaign

The letter expresses support for the Climate Emergency Mobilization Task Force and provides suggestions related to collaboration, environmental justice, the unhoused, and community resilience. The actions of the Task Force will be separate from, although complementary to, implementation of the Final CAP. The letter does not comment on the Revised Final Draft CAP or the Addendum but is noted.

Letter 13

3/22/2022

Sean Falvey

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 14
3/22/2022
Edward Primasing

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 15
3/22/2022
Daniel Steinberg

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 16
3/22/2022
Craig Sweeney

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 17
3/22/2022
John Stump

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted.

Letter 18
3/22/2022
Josh Wertz

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 19
3/22/2022
Rosie Yacoub, 350 Sacramento

The comment's support of Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06 are noted. The suggestion to replace "will" with "shall" has not been implemented. The County uses "will" when committing to an action it will undertake and "shall" when requiring the action of another entity. "Should" is not used to express a binding requirement.

The comment suggests that the requirements of Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06 should apply to propane appliances. The County has carefully considered this suggestion but has not implemented the change at this time due to the potential implications to existing users in rural areas of the unincorporated County that may be disproportionately affected by the requirement.

The comment expresses concern about compliance with Measure GHG-06 and suggests that compliance measures are implemented. As stated in the measure, the County Building Permits and Inspection Division will require documentation at the time of building permit application for replacement of water heaters, HVAC systems, and other appliances requiring a permit. Furthermore, the target indicator identified in the Final CAP is a 10 percent participation rate for existing residences. This is in line with the statistics provided in the comment.

Finally, the comment highlights the need to take action on the CAP soon in order to achieve the established target dates. The County agrees.

Letter 20
3/22/2022
Michael Corbett, Bradford White Corporation

The commenter expresses opposition to Measure GHG-04, GHG-05, and GHG-06. This comment is noted. Please refer to Theme 5 for a discussion of electrification of existing structures and Theme 6 for a discussion of electrification of new development. Measures have been revised in the Final CAP to provide flexibility and ensure feasibility.

Letter 21

3/22/2022

Kimberly Oldehoeft

The comment states that the CAP "lacks a clear commitment to take climate action and does not update the 2011 CEQA Analysis." The comment mischaracterizes the CEQA review as a process that would "provide the CAP with much-needed direction." the purpose of the CEQA review is to understand and mitigate the effects of implementing proposed projects, in this case the Final CAP. The Final CAP uses a 2015 baseline year for assessment of environmental conditions and reflects the current regulatory environment. Refer to the discussion in Theme 1 for further clarification regarding the CEQA process.

The comment suggests that more detail is needed to clarify and enforce the measures in the CAP. Please refer to the Theme 13 discussion of Final CAP measure specificity and enforceability.

The comment suggests that CAP implementation should be an iterative process. As explained in Section 4 of the Final CAP, to successfully implement the GHG emissions reduction and adaption strategies described therein, the CAP in its entirety will need to be continuously assessed and monitored. This will entail preparing an annual report for the Board of Supervisors that describes progress on the GHG reduction and adaptation strategies described in the Final CAP. This report will provide the status of each measure in achieving the implementation and target indicators for the timeline specified. The implementation and monitoring strategy described in Section 4 also includes "identifying new and enhanced carbon reduction strategies to incorporate into a CAP update in the 2024-2025 timeframe that brings the County to full carbon neutrality by 2030 in accordance with the County's Climate Emergency Resolution. '

The comment specifically suggests that Measure GHG-01 be revised to include cooperation with resource conservation districts. This revision has been made. Please refer to the Theme 8 discussion for more information about carbon farming.

Finally, the comment reiterates comments provided for prior versions of the CAP for six topics that could result in direct or indirect reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Many of these topics are addressed in some way in the Final CAP (for example, implementation of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan through Measure GHG-26 would result in protection of native plants and Measure GHG-24 would improve organic waste diversion). Other actions, such as creating green jobs and creating a plan to support farmers during extreme weather conditions, are beyond the scope of the Final CAP. The County considered previous comments received on prior versions of the CAP and has prepared the Final CAP. The CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures would achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State's Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State's targets. It is a planning document intended to identify ways that the community can achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions "that substantial evidence demonstrates, if implemented on a project-by-project basis, would collectively achieve the specified emissions level" (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b)(1)(D)). None of the comments offer evidence that information included in the Final CAP and addendum are inadequate.

Letter 22
3/22/2022
Christian McGlade

The comment expresses concern regarding the requirements in Measures GHG-06. Refer to the Theme 5 discussion, above.

Letter 23
3/22/2022
Michael Paris

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 24
3/22/2022
Steve Harder

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 25
3/22/2022
Harry Wang, Physicians for Social Responsibility

The comment suggests that the CAP should “include precise metrics that can be carefully monitored to achieve the 2030 goal of becoming carbon zero.” The comment is noted. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State’s Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State’s targets. Theme 3 above provides further information about the County’s emergency declaration and its relationship to the Final CAP.

Letter 26
3/22/2022
Tom Ford

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 27

3/22/2022

Jessica Robison

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to Theme 7 for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 28

3/22/2022

Vince Bernacchi

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to Theme 7 for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 29

3/22/2022

Russell Snyder, California Asphalt Pavement Association

The comment suggests revision of Temp-07 to eliminate the requirement for cool pavement. The County recognizes the nuance with this developing technology and the need to further evaluate the requirement. The measure has been revised to require further analysis before development of standards for inclusion in the County's roadway design manual.

Letter 30

3/22/2022

Betsy Reifsnider

The comment suggests that more work should be done to "strengthen" the CAP and suggests that the CAP focus on infill development and public transit rather than the highway system. The Final CAP does not propose expansion of the highway system, but does include policies to incentivize infill and transit use. Please refer to Theme 2 for further discussion of the County's land use policies and their relationship to the Final CAP.

The comment requests emphasis on the tree canopy in underserved communities. Note that the Final CAP includes Measure GHG-02, through which the County would maintain and enhance urban forests. The measure establishes that “Priority planting locations shall be in the County’s Environmental Justice Communities identified in the Environmental Justice Element.” See also Theme 9 regarding urban forests and Theme 11 for a discussion of environmental justice.

The comment suggests strengthening the CAP through the climate emergency declaration. This comment is noted. Theme 3 provides further information about the County’s emergency declaration and its relationship to the Final CAP.

Letter 31

3/22/2022

Environmental Council of Sacramento, the Sacramento Valley Chapter of the California Native Plant Society, the Sacramento Audubon Society, the Sierra Club Sacramento Group, and the Xerces Society

The comment offers several recommendations related to the government operations and adaptation measures in the Revised Final Draft CAP.

Specifically, the comment suggests that the requirement to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water usage in Measure GOV-WA-01 should be increased and requirements for irrigation and signage should be added. The recommendation that Measure GPV-WA-02 is expanded to include all of the County’s landscaping, rather than focus on lawns, has been incorporated into the Final CAP. In addition, the measure has been revised to include the requirement to identify all essential and non-essential turf, and remove non-essential turf by 2030, as suggested in the comment. Refer also to the Theme 9 discussion of landscaping and water conservation. Information about funding is provided in the Theme 12 discussion.

The comment suggests improvements to drought measures. The County notes that Sacramento County is already a signatory to the Water Forum, water catchment is proposed, and turf will be reduced to a maximum of 20 percent of new landscaping. In response to the input provided on Measure WATER-05, the measure has been revised in the Final CAP to include encouraging water districts to provide educational materials to water users through websites and customer bills. Collaboration with regional agencies and support for groundwater recharge projects is included in Measure WATER-06. Measure FLOOD-03 has been revised in the Final CAP to include identification of priority projects in coordination with resource conservation districts, Groundwater Sustainability Agencies, the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), flood control agencies, and other organizations, and begin the CEQA process.

Measure FLOOD-08 has also been revised to include identifying diversion points, as recommended in the comment. Other flood-related suggestions, including County responsibility for culvert maintenance and requiring that development attenuate flows so that there is no net increase in peak flow, are current County practices. Moving levees and floodwalls requires extensive coordination with State and Federal agencies and is beyond the scope of the Final CAP. The County acknowledges the commenter’s offer of assistance in implementing Measure FLOOD-11.

Letter 32
3/22/2022
Inga Olson

The comment expresses support for the Climate Emergency Mobilization Task Force and provides recommendations related to the ongoing monitoring and reporting of the Task Force's activities. These recommendations are noted. As explained further in Theme 3, the activity of the Task Force is outside the scope of the Final CAP.

Letter 33
3/22/2022

Paul Philley, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

The comment suggests that the County should provide an explanation of all changes made to the baseline and forecast GHG emissions since the 2021 draft. Refinements to the calculations and assumptions in the Final CAP have been made throughout the public review process in response to comments, new information, and adjustments to measure language. For example, in response to comments regarding the feasibility of SMUD's target for carbon-free electricity by 2030, the emissions factor for SMUD electricity used throughout the GHG emissions modeling was revised from 100 percent carbon-free in 2030 to 90 percent carbon-free in 2030. As another example, a commenter noted the availability of an updated emissions factor for natural gas used in the modeling; in response, the natural gas emissions factor was updated in the calculations to reflect the most current information and data. These types of refinements resulted in changes to the GHG emissions inventory, forecasts, and GHG emissions reduction quantifications. Refer to Appendix E for additional information about calculation assumptions. Suggestions for edits to the presentation of materials in tables and charts are noted. As noted in the comment, past coordination with SMAQMD has resulted in enhancements to several Final CAP measures.

The Climate Emergency Resolution seeks to address the climate emergency through eight actions described in the Final CAP, including development of the CERP through the Climate Emergency Mobilization Task Force. Comments are provided regarding the implementation of the Climate Emergency Response Plan. Comments are noted and will be taken into account once the plan is developed. Similarly, comments regarding implementation of Final CAP measures that may generate funds are appreciated and noted.

The submittal also provides commentary on several specific measures proposed in the Revised Final Draft CAP. Refer to the Theme 8 discussion for additional information about carbon farming and Theme 9 for a discussion of Measure GHG-02. Electrification requirements, public outreach, and quantification are discussed in Theme 5. The calculation of emissions reductions in this measure includes savings from electrifying cooktops/ovens. The actual retrofit requirements focus on space and water heating; however elective conversion to electric cooktops could occur. In fact, the Implementation section says, "eligible upgrades may include... induction cooktops..." Theme 5 addresses the feasibility of Measure GHG-07, which would prohibit natural gas in new residential construction. Appendix E has been revised to clarify the assumptions used in the modeling.

Measure GHG-12 includes a reference to Section 5.9.6 of the Zoning Code. The Zoning Code establishes the content of a Transportation System Management Plan (Section 5.9.6.G). Duplicating that information in the CAP measure would be redundant and could lead to future conflicts. The quantification for the measure is based on the CAPCOA handbook, as noted in Appendix E.

The suggestion to “remove minimal parking standards” is unclear. Measure GHG-13 has been retained in the CAP. The comment suggests expansion of Measure GHG-19 to set standards for the number of parking spaces that should be EV Ready, in addition to the 100 percent ESVE requirement. This change has been implemented. The specific types of carbon capture and sequestration projects that could be permitted through a future amendment to the Zoning Code have not been determined at this time but could include actions consistent with the State’s 2022 Scoping Plan, such as naturalizing lands in the Delta.

Comments on the government operations measures highlight the evolving landscape of GHG policy and market trends. Implementation and monitoring will be key to adjusting the Final CAP to account for these changes.

The comment provides support for many of the adaptation measures. The funding opportunities for Measure Temp-03 are noted, as are other detailed comments regarding greywater incentives, the importance of trees, use of buses in evacuations, and defining critical facilities for the purpose of implementing Measure FLOOD-06. These will be considered during implementation of the measures.

Suggestions for plan implementation, including financing, reporting, and coordination are noted. Specific edits to the Consistency Checklist (Final CAP Appendix I) are noted and have been considered for applicability.

Letter 34
3/22/2022

Chatten-Brown, Carstens & Minter on behalf of 350 Sacramento, Sierra Club Sacramento Group of the Mother Lode Chapter, and the Environmental Council of Sacramento

The following response is organized by the bolded headings provided in the comment letter.

Introductory Text

The comment consists of a summary of the comments to follow, states that previous comments on the Revised Final Draft CAP have not been addressed, the Revised Final Draft CAP does not meet the requirements of CEQA, and there has been undue delay in implementation of the CAP. These comments are noted. These topics are discussed further below.

I. Carbon Neutrality

The comment states that the CAP target should be carbon neutrality in 2030. Refer to Theme 3 for further discussion of the carbon neutrality goal and the County’s framework for achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.

The comment expresses support for development of a CERP and states the CERP does not need to be tied to the CAP. This comment is noted. The Emergency Mobilization Task Force and CERP discussed further in Theme 3.

II. Final CAP Inventory

The comment states that the County failed to account for GHGs from pending and approved projects outside of the UPA/USB in its inventory and forecast. Therefore, achievement of the CAP’s targets is inaccurate. As described in Theme 2 above, the General Plan and General Plan EIR did include growth projections and environmental impact analysis for certain planned communities and pending master plans in greenfield areas. The comment offers no evidence to dispute this. As a point of clarification, the County has removed Measure GHG-30 from the Final CAP. No projects outside the UPA/USB are covered by the

Final CAP or could streamline their respective CEQA analysis of GHG emissions from the Final CAP's GHG analysis. Please refer to the Theme 4 discussion above.

The comment states that the 2015 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecasts Memo did not include VMT associated with any of the SACOG-designated Sphere of Influence (SOI) areas within Sacramento County which results in an artificially low number of "needed" reductions. It is true that the 2015 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Forecast Memo indicates that VMT associated with SACOG-designated "Sphere of Influence (SOI) Areas within Sacramento County" were not included. This means that VMT associated with projects that were in unincorporated Sacramento County but within a City's SOI and would require incorporation as part of the project were not counted towards the projected emissions of the unincorporated county. This appropriately reflects regional planning.

The comment states that an EIR is needed to evaluate the in-process and approved projects that were left out of the Revised Final Draft CAP inventory. The County disagrees that any projects were left out of the CAP inventory. As described in Theme 2 above, the General Plan and General Plan EIR did include growth projections and environmental impact analysis for certain planned communities and pending master plans in greenfield areas. The comment offers no evidence that new significant impacts would occur based on its comment, and, as such there is no evidence that an EIR should be prepared. Further, the County has removed Measure GHG-30 that would have allowed projects outside the UPA/USB to streamline from the Final CAP by achieving carbon neutrality. Therefore, the arguments that the CAP has not evaluated emissions associated with projects that would be facilitated by Measure GHG-30 are moot.

The comment states that GHG impacts of development beyond the UPA had not been evaluated in the General Plan EIR. As described in Theme 2 above, the General Plan and General Plan EIR did include growth projections and environmental impact analysis for certain planned communities and pending master plans in greenfield areas. The commenter offers no evidence to dispute this. The County has removed Measure GHG-30 from the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for a discussion of land use assumptions included in the General Plan.

The comment states that all nine, already-approved master plans are not incorporated into the CAP inventory and business-as-usual (BAU) forecast. The comment also states the CAP's failure to incorporate GHG emission from the approved plans that extend development beyond General Plan land use designations means that the GHG inventory, forecast, and targets lacks substantial evidence. The Final CAP's GHG Emissions Inventory and Forecasts are based on predicted growth in existing demographic forecasts, including population, jobs, and household growth between 2012 and 2036 for unincorporated Sacramento County. The 2012 data were directly sourced from SACOG's 2016 MTP/SCS. These growth factors were used to forecast emissions for 2030 for most sectors in the inventory.

The areas with pending and approved master plan development outside of the UPA are identified as Developing Communities in the 2016 MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS assumed that housing units in the Developing Communities throughout the SACOG region would increase from 31,422 in 2012 to 146,258 and total employment would increase from 20,037 to 88,922 (see Table 3.6). Specific projects included in the MTP/SCS as developing communities in unincorporated Sacramento County include Mather South, Newbridge, Jackson Township, West Jackson, North Vineyard Station, Vineyard Springs Comprehensive Plan, Florin Vineyard Community Plan, and Elverta Specific Plan. Portions of the approved major development projects were included in the 2015 Inventory and Forecasts, and additional development was anticipated through the planning horizon. While this partial buildout assumption does not account for the total amount of housing units and employment growth possible at the earliest conceivable construction date, it more accurately reflects the VMT in partially built communities wherein the full value of planned

land uses that would reduce the VMT rates for residents are not realized until full buildout of complementary uses and transit. The Final CAP relies upon these jobs and employment assumptions but does not assign growth to a specific geographic location because GHG emissions are a regional air quality concern.

The County used interpolation from the 2012, 2020, and 2036 data points to calculate dwelling units for the 2015 baseline year used in the GHG Inventory and 2030 target year for the CAP. Projections assume a gradual buildout of the developing communities, consistent with the assumptions of the MTP/SCS. Based on a 1.1 percent annual rate of growth, the CAP assumed that there would be 214,214 total dwelling units in 2030. The CAP indicates that without implementation of the CAP, the community emissions in 2030 would be 3,309,712 metric tons of CO₂e annually for an assumed population of 668,726; government operations would account for an additional 109,172 MT CO₂e in 2030.

As demonstrated above, the pending and approved master plans that would expand the UPA are within the geographic scope of the GP EIR evaluation and were captured in the assumptions of the CAP. As described in the addendum checklist, the GP EIR concludes that implementation of the General Plan would result in a significant and unavoidable contribution to climate change. As a result, implementation of the CAP would result in fewer GHG emissions than evaluated in the GP EIR and would not facilitate development beyond the geographic scope or residential holding capacity of the General Plan.

As discussed in note 8 (page 5) of the comment, the Consistency Checklist for the CAP previously permitted demonstration of CAP consistency where “[p]rojects are consistent with existing General Plan land use and zoning designations, do not require a General Plan Amendment, and do not require an amendment to the UPA or USB, absent demonstrating carbon neutrality.” As previously drafted, projects outside of the UPA would have to quantify emissions, identify means to achieve carbon neutrality, provide substantial evidence of such reductions to demonstrate CAP compliance and “streamline” analysis of GHG emissions under CEQA using the checklist. However, as discussed further in Theme 4, Measure GHG-30 has been removed from the Final CAP. As a result, the Consistency Checklist has been revised. In response to public concern regarding the implications of greenfield development, the checklist now excludes all projects that require amendment of the UPA or USB from streamlining review of GHG emissions by demonstrating CAP consistency. These projects would be required to conduct a full GHG impact analysis for the project as part of the CEQA process.

The comment expresses support for including a carbon neutrality target in the CAP. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 3 discussion for the County’s framework for achieving carbon neutrality by 2030 in the Final CAP.

The comment states Measure GHG-30 may increase GHG emissions by facilitating greenfield sprawl and that an EIR is required to evaluate these impacts. The commenter offers no evidence to support that new significant impacts exist. The County has removed Measure GHG-30 from the Final CAP. Arguments suggesting that an EIR must be prepared to evaluate GHG emissions associated with this measure are moot. Please refer to the Theme 1 discussion on why preparation of an Addendum is appropriate.

The comment states that Measure GHG-30 and the carbon offset program will increase emissions, but the commenter offers no substantial evidence to support this statement. No further response can be provided.

The commenter states that the CAP and Addendum fail to include cumulative impacts of Measure GHG-30 for the pending and approved projects outside the UPA/USB. As described in Theme 2 above, the General Plan and General Plan EIR did include growth projections and environmental impact analysis for certain planned communities and pending master plans in greenfield areas. The County has removed Measure

GHG-30 from the Final CAP. Arguments suggesting that an EIR must be prepared to evaluate GHG emissions associated with this measure are moot. Regarding cumulative impacts, the County prepared an addendum based on the analysis certified in the GP EIR. The GP EIR has a comprehensive evaluation of the cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan, and as described in Theme 2 above, includes evaluation of projects located outside the UPA/USB. Further, the land use assumptions used in the General Plan are inherently cumulative and consider regional growth and development. Please refer to the Theme discussion for a more detailed discussion of the land use assumptions in the General Plan, CAP, and Addendum. The comment seems to suggest that because an EIR was not prepared, cumulative impacts were not considered. This is incorrect. The Addendum evaluates the project and cumulative impacts of implementing the Final CAP based on the approved and legally adequate GP EIR, which itself had a robust cumulative analysis.

The comment states that the CAP does not explain the expected GHG reduction projected to be achieved from State, Federal, and regional efforts. Adopted legislative actions at the State, Federal, and regional levels that would affect emissions without any local action are accounted for in the legislative-adjusted BAU forecast. For example, regulatory requirements to increase vehicle fuel efficiency, such as Pavley Clean Car Standards, are reflected in future vehicle emissions factors modeled in CARB's EMISSIONS FACTOR (EMFAC2021) model, which was used to forecast emissions in the on-road transportation sector. Refer to Table 2: Legislation or Regional Policies Resulting in County GHG Emissions Reductions by 2030 in the Final CAP for the exact reduction values associated with each legislative action, and refer to Section E.2: Forecasts in Appendix E for additional information.

The comment also states that the CAP does not explain how GHG reductions through SMUD will be enforced. Refer to Table 2: Legislation or Regional Policies Resulting in County GHG Emissions Reductions by 2030 in the Final CAP for the exact reduction values. County staff engaged with SMUD staff to review and discuss the identified emission reduction values. After thorough review and several discussions, SMUD staff concluded that the reductions reflected are reasonable and are in line with SMUD's 2030 Zero Carbon Plan emissions reduction goals. Further details are included in the letter from SMUD dated March 22, 2022 (included as Letter 35 and summarized below). Lastly, SMUD's Board of Directors approved the 2030 Zero Carbon Plan which identifies actions needed to achieve a zero-carbon electricity supply by 2030.

The comment states the CAP references offset measures but does not provide information on what these offsets will entail. The County's proposed carbon offset program is described in Section 2.3 of the Final CAP. As explained therein, new development projects that have incorporated all feasible on-site GHG mitigation may be permitted to fund energy efficiency and electrification retrofits of existing buildings subject to quantification of the costs per MT CO₂e through their individual application processes. This quantification shall be submitted by applicants for review and verification by the County or a qualified third party selected by the County. Any offset program approved by the County must include carbon offsets that are real, quantifiable, verified, additional, and permanent within the timeframe of the program or project. The offset program could allow for investments in GHG reducing activities occurring outside of the County's control. However, the success of these investments in reducing GHG emissions must be validated by a third-party organization and be in addition to any GHG emissions reductions required by a plan, policy, or regulation for that activity. The programs selected could also include projects with climate change adaptation co-benefits.

The comment expresses the opinion that the County should not allow purchase of carbon offsets from voluntary agencies, and that use of offsets should be a measure of last resort. This comment is noted.

III. Carbon Offsets

The comment states that the CAP does not provide any information on protocols, GHG quantification, or performance standards to ensure carbon offsets are real, verifiable, additional, and quantifiable. No specific evidence is offered by the comment. Refer to more detailed comments below.

The comment requests clarification regarding the CAP's statement that new development that has incorporated all feasible on-site GHG mitigation may be permitted to fund energy efficiency and electrification retrofits of existing buildings subject to quantification of the costs per MT CO₂e through their individual application processes. This is an idea the County will be exploring, if needed, to account for any GHG reducing legislation or policies described in Table 2 that fail to come to fruition or meet stated objectives and more details would be developed as part of the exploration process.

The comment states that the CAP does not provide adequate protocols, safeguards, or performance standards for a carbon offset program and references the *Golden Door Properties, LLC v. County of San Diego (2020) 50 CAL.App.5th 467,507*. The County disagrees. While the comment offers no evidence to support its statement, the County offers the following response on the adequacy of the program as described in the Final CAP, and the relationship to the *Golden Door Properties, LLC v. County of San Diego (2020) 50 CAL.App.5th 467,507*.

The comment states the County needs to provide more information on how it will enforce the offset program. The County's proposed carbon offset program is described in Section 2.3 of the Final CAP. As explained therein, new development projects that have incorporated all feasible on-site GHG mitigation may be permitted to fund energy efficiency and electrification retrofits of existing buildings subject to quantification of the costs per MT CO₂e through their individual application processes. This quantification shall be submitted by applicants for review and verification by the County or a qualified third party selected by the County. Any offset program approved by the County must include carbon offsets that are real, quantifiable, verified, additional, and permanent within the timeframe of the program or project. The offset program could allow for investments in GHG reducing activities occurring outside of the County's control. However, the success of these investments in reducing GHG emissions must be validated by a third-party organization and be in addition to any GHG emissions reductions required by a plan, policy, or regulation for that activity. The programs selected could also include projects with climate change adaptation co-benefits. The carbon offset program would support local GHG reductions by prioritizing project locations in the following order:

- Sacramento County's environmental justice communities,
- Countywide (including incorporated cities without adopted CAPs),
- SACOG region, and
- Central Valley.

Offsets are specifically identified as potential options under the two measures that would increase the energy efficiency and electrification of existing commercial/nonresidential buildings and facilities (Measure GHG-04 and Measure GHG-06).

Regarding enforcement, the description of the offset program in Section 2.3 of the Final CAP states that verification by a third-party organization would be required. As noted above, this is an idea the County will be exploring, if needed, to account for any GHG reducing legislation or policies described in Table 2 that fail to come to fruition or meet stated objectives and more details concerning enforcement would be developed as part of the exploration process.

The comment states that the offset program must go through separate environmental review. The comment is correct. As described in Section 2.3 of the Final CAP, the County may explore a carbon offset program. The details of such program are currently undefined. Once defined, the County will engage in a process to determine whether the proposed actions would potentially result in physical environmental impacts and whether it would qualify as a project under CEQA.

IV. GHG Measures

The comment states the CAP relies on vague measures that lack performance standards. The comment offers no evidence to support this statement.

The comment states that the CAP does not include an economic analysis. As described above in Theme 12, Appendix G of the Final CAP includes a qualitative cost analysis for community measures and government operation measures and is a high-level assessment of the administrative costs for the County to implement the measures, considering staff time and resources needed to create policies and enforce actions associated with the measures.

The comment expresses appreciation for those instances where the County has incorporated the comments suggestions. This comment is noted.

The comment states that lack of enforceable measures, reductions in the transportation sector, and approval of greenfield sprawl projects are analogous to the flaws in *Sierra Club v. County of San Diego (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1172*. Please refer to the discussion in Theme 1 above.

The comment states the County needs to substantiate how claimed reductions from Measure GHG-11 are “actually additional.” Measure GHG-11 addresses VMT from new residential and office/business professional development. It requires a 15 percent reduction in daily VMT compared to the regional average as specified in Sacramento County’s Transportation Analysis Guidelines for all new residential and office/business professional development in the County, consistent with Policy CI-5 of the Circulation Element. As part of the implementation of this measure, the County would develop and adopt a VMT mitigation program that would identify projects (some that would reduce VMT and others that would reduce GHG emissions from other sectors). To demonstrate compliance with this measure, individual projects that cannot substantiate the required VMT reductions would need to quantify the CO₂e from the VMT that exceeds the threshold and fund projects that would achieve those CO₂e reductions (through VMT reductions or other means). In this manner, the measure would provide a means for projects to “offset” – or compensate for – emissions through a County-specific program to reduce emissions from VMT. There is no requirement that such programs do not achieve several goals (i.e., VMT reduction and less GHG emissions). The comment seems to improperly conflate this program with the requirements related to purchase offset credits. These credits are required to meet several standards to be considered project-level mitigation, including demonstrating that the reductions are “additional” to emissions reductions that would otherwise occur.

The comment states that many of the measures relied upon are unfunded and therefore would be inadequate based on the facts offered as flaws in *Sierra Club v. County of San Diego (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1172*. Please refer to the discussion in Theme 1 above.

The comment states that no rationale behind the factors and multipliers used to calculate Measure GHG-01. The comment suggests that the measure should have been improved with financial incentives. Refer to the Theme 8 discussion for information about the assumptions applied in the modeling of emissions reductions in Measure GHG-01. The measure has been revised to include additional information about funding and implementation resources that can support the program.

The comment state that Measure GHG-30 is inadequate because it lacks performance standards. The County has removed Measure GHG-30 from the Final CAP. This argument is moot. Refer to the Theme 4 discussion for further information on this topic.

The comment supports inclusion of Measures GHG-05 and GHG-07. This comment is noted.

The comment states that Measures GHG-05 and GHG-07 have not yet determined to be feasible because they are subject to future feasibility and cost-effectiveness studies. This is a misinterpretation of the measure language. While criteria for determining when specific requirements would not apply to particular projects (i.e., potential exemptions for affordable housing) have not yet been prepared and would be developed through measure implementation, Measures GHG-05 and GHG-06 are considered reasonably feasible. Additionally, as explained further in Theme 13, the County has implemented a reasonable, feasible, substantiated framework of GHG measures whose implementation will be enforced through adoption of the CAP and its implementation program. The County will measure overall success in achieving the established targets and make adjustments during the implementation period. These studies are an important component of preparing an ordinance for Board review. The feasibility/cost-effectiveness provisions of the Final CAP's electrification proposals are necessary because the electrification proposals are reach codes. When a local government adopts a reach code, they must make an official finding that the new requirements save energy and are cost-effective. Therefore, exploring cost effectiveness is a key step that will be completed as part of the preparation process prior to code adoption. Regarding measure feasibility, please refer to Theme 12.

The comment states that Measure GHG-06 fails to ensure GHG reductions. Please refer to Theme 5 for a discussion of electrification of existing structures and Theme 6 for a discussion of electrification of new development.

The comment restates objections to Measures GHG-11, GHG-21, and GHG-23. No specific comments are provided. This comment is noted.

The comment states that the County's approval of sprawl development undermines measures to increase carbon farming. Please refer to the discussion in Theme 2 regarding the CAPs evaluation of growth in the General Plan. Regarding carbon farming, please refer to Theme 8.

V. CEQA Addendum

The comment states that the CAP improperly relies on an addendum rather than a Supplemental EIR. The County disagrees. Please refer to Theme 1 for a discussion of the project's consistency with CEQA and the appropriateness of an Addendum for the Final CAP.

The comment states the General Plan EIR deferred mitigation and analysis of GHG impacts by adoption of Mitigation Measures CC-1 and CC-2. The comment offers no evidence to support this statement. The General Plan EIR was certified in 2011 and remains valid and adequate under the requirements of CEQA. Any arguments that the General Plan EIR resulted in deferred mitigation have expired. Please refer to Theme 1 for a discussion of the project's consistency with CEQA and the appropriateness of an Addendum for the Final CAP.

The comment suggests that because the General Plan EIR was certified over 10 years ago and additional information regarding climate change has emerged, a supplemental EIR should be prepared. The County disagrees. For the reasons described in Theme 1 above, age and new information by itself does not render an environmental document inadequate. Rather, a fundamental requirement to determine the adequacy of a document is whether that new information would lead to the conclusion that a new or substantially more severe environmental impact would occur. The County has determined through evaluation and

substantiation that none of the conditions requiring a higher level of environmental review are triggered by implementation of the Final CAP. Please refer to the discussion in Theme 1 for additional details.

The comment states that because the CAP includes greenfield sprawl development whose impacts were not included in the General Plan EIR, the County must prepare an EIR. While the comment is not specific on which greenfield developments it is referring to, we assume this is in reference to Measure GHG-30. This measure has been removed from the Final CAP; therefore, this argument is moot. As described in Theme 2 above, the General Plan and General Plan EIR did include growth projections and environmental impact analysis for certain planned communities and pending master plans in greenfield areas. The comment offers no evidence to dispute this.

The comment states that the General Plan EIR did not include the CAP's ability to streamline future projects and implies the analysis is inadequate. The General Plan EIR was prepared a programmatic environmental document consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. The General Plan EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of the proposed land uses, growth assumptions, and mitigation required to lessen the environmental effects of that growth. The CAP was mitigation identified in the General Plan EIR and was described at the level of detail known at that time. Since approval of the General Plan, several changes were enacted in the CEQA statutes and CEQA Guidelines, one of which is CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, which outlines the requirements that must be met when preparing a qualified plan for the reduction of GHG emissions (i.e., qualified CAP). If the requirements are met, then CEQA allows future projects that are consistent with the prepared CAP to streamline the preparation of individual GHG analysis. This has been enacted through CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines under the premise that projects that are determined to be consistent with the CAP, would not result in any new GHG impacts. It is incorrect to postulate that the General Plan EIR, and by association the analysis contained in the Addendum are somehow inadequate because it did not include the CAP's ability to streamline future projects at the time of adoption in 2011. As described in the Addendum, program EIRs like the General Plan EIR are constructed to allow future tiering where it can be demonstrated that no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur consistent with the requirements outlined Section 15126-151264 of the CEQA Guidelines. A project that demonstrates that it is consistent with the CAP, demonstrates that its GHG impacts would be less than significant. It also demonstrates in the case of the Final CAP, that no new significant GHG impacts would occur from that identified in the certified General Plan EIR. Therefore, the adequacy of the Addendum and the General Plan EIR is maintained regardless of whether the General Plan EIR envisions the streamlining provisions when it was adopted in 2011.

The comment states that the CAP Addendum did not evaluate impacts associated with the potentiality that the CAP fail to achieve promised reductions. The objectives of the project are to achieve State GHG reduction targets. Evaluating a scenario where that does not occur is not required under CEQA. Without the project, status quo conditions would be maintained.

The comment states that preparation of an addendum is analogous to the improper use of an addendum in *Sierra Club v. County of San Diego (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1172*. Please refer to the discussion in Theme 1, above.

The comment states that the use of an addendum avoids CEQA's mandate that all feasible mitigation and alternatives be implemented including a required Smart Growth Alternative. *Sierra Club v. County of San Diego (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1172*. Please refer to the discussion in Theme 1, above.

VI. Sustainable Communities Strategy and Senate Bill 375

The comment states that the CAP fails to incorporate any measures that promote infill development. The County disagrees. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion for description of the County's policies that support infill development.

The comment states the CAP should incorporate infill "Strategy 1" option. This comment is noted.

The comment states that the Addendum's finding that the CAP is consistent with the MTP/SCS lacks substantial evidence. The commenter offers no evidence to support this statement. In fact, as discussed above and in Theme 2, the CAP is consistent with the land use projections in the 2016 MTP/SCS. Sections 3.3, "Air Quality," 3.8, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions," and 3.11, Land Use and Planning," of the Addendum provide evidence that the proposed CAP is consistent with the MTP/SCS. In addition, the Final CAP includes a new measure (Measure GHG-31) related to the County's participation in regional programs to promote infill, including SACOG's Green Means Go program.

The comment states the CAP is inconsistent with the County's Phase 1 CAP Strategy and Framework Document regarding VMT reductions. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of the land use authority of the climate action plan and consistency with regional growth assumptions.

VII. Feasible Mitigation Measure and Infill Alternative

The comment implies that because the County has direct authority over land use certain measures in Appendix F of the CAP are feasible and should be implemented. The comment offers no evidence to support this statement. Further, no specifics are provided.

The comment states the Board should direct staff to implement CAP measures now and implement Strategy Option 1: Infill Development. This comment is noted. No specific comments on the Revised Final Draft CAP or Addendum are provided.

The comment states the CAP should achieve a carbon neutrality target. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 3 discussion for the County's framework for achieving carbon neutrality by 2030 in the Final CAP.

VIII. Conclusion

The comment provides a summary of comments discussed previously. This comment is noted.

Letter 35

3/22/2022

Steve Johns, SMUD

The comment provides confirmation that the reductions reflected in the CAP are reasonable and in line with SMUD's 2030 Zero Carbon Plan. This comment is noted.

Letter 36

3/22/2022

Tom Alkire

The comment expresses concern regarding the feasibility and potential hardships caused by proposed CAP Measures GHG-04, GHG-05, GHG-6, and GHG-07, which are related to electrification. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 5 and Theme 6 discussions of these measures.

Letter 37
3/22/2022
Ruth McDonald

The comment provides the generic assertion that the CAP “needs to be stronger, include more specific actions and timeliness, and reflects the climate emergency.” This CAP complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State’s Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State’s targets. Where adjustment is required, the County will adaptively manage the timing and scope of implementation of the measures to demonstrate ensure the goals and objectives of the Final CAP, performance measures, and ultimately Mitigation Measure CC-1, are met. The appropriate specificity Final of CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion. The County’s framework for advancing towards carbon neutrality by 2030 is discussed in Theme 3.

Letter 38
3/22/2022
Karen Jacques

The comment indicates that “staff needs to be instructed to strengthen” the CAP. The Final CAP complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State’s Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State’s targets. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion. The County’s framework for advancing towards carbon neutrality by 2030 is discussed in Theme 3.

The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County’s land use policies. Upon adoption, the Final CAP would support the policies of the General Plan.

Letter 39
3/22/2022
Anthony DeRiggi

The comment offers changes to Measures GHG-09, which indicate how the County would establish a program to trade in fossil fuel-powered landscaping equipment for electric equipment. The measure has been revised in the Final CAP to include the potential for partnering with other agencies to expand the number of drop-off points throughout the County.

The comment suggests a measure wherein the County would require all contractors and landscaping crews to use electric leaf blowers by 2025 and all electric landscape equipment by 2028. The County has not included the suggested measure. Through coordination with the County’s Department of General Services and Regional Parks, it was determined that some regional facilities do not have adequate infrastructure to support charging.

Letter 40
3/22/2022
Laurie Heller

The comment provides insight to the grant funding process. The comment is noted.

Letter 41
3/23/2022
Sacramento Climate Coalition

The comment recommends specific transportation actions and strategies to reduce GHG emissions, acknowledging that the CAP “covers many of the issues discussed.” The County agrees that actionable measures to reduce VMT are included in the Final CAP, including developing best practices for charging stations, promoting walking and biking, and integrating environmental justice and equity in all phases of Final CAP implementation. The suggestions offered by the comment are noted. Some of these actions such as improving access to alternative transportation and adopting electrification ordinances, are included in the Final CAP. However, other suggestions are largely outside the purview of the County and the Final CAP. For example, the County cannot impose restrictions on the number of cars in each household or require carpooling to churches, synagogues, and mosques. Refer to Theme 10 for a discussion of electric vehicles and Theme 5 and Theme 6 regarding electrification. Note that Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06 related to electrification do include education components.

The comment highlights social inequities and the challenges around climate resilience in disadvantaged communities. Refer to the Theme 11 discussion of environmental justice, community resilience, and community health. Specific suggestions to improve community resilience include providing funding for solar panels with battery backup at residences and for critical infrastructure, investing in affordable housing in economically neglected communities, raising the minimum wage, and creating “resiliency hubs that may include safe campgrounds and permanent shelters.” These actions are largely beyond the scope of the Final CAP, although the Final CAP does include a commitment to improving community resilience and focusing on environmental justice. As indicated in the comment “[a]ny opportunity to reduce carbon will lead to better air quality and lessen the environmental impacts of climate change that impact the homeless, the poor, and communities of color first.”

Related to organic waste, gardening, and urban trees, Measure GHG-24 would require the County to amend the Zoning Code to support the use of diverted organic waste within the County and urban tree planting is included in Measure GHG-02. Community gardens are included in Measure Temp-08. Refer also to the Theme 9 discussion of landscaping requirements. Refer to Theme 8 for an in-depth discussion of the carbon farming measure proposed in the Final CAP.

The comment expresses urgency related to the goal of achieving carbon neutrality in 2030. The comment provides several specific comments on Final CAP measures and provides suggestions to finance Final CAP implementation. The funding suggestions provided in the CAP are noted. See Theme 12 for further discussion of Final CAP funding. Please refer to the Theme 3 discussion regarding the relationship between the Climate Emergency Declaration and the Final CAP.

The comment provides a series of anecdotes about the cost of “inaction” in response to climate change. The County notes these concerns. Finally, the comment recommends that the City, County, and SMUD collaborate to develop a joint plan that identified high priority projects and adopt ordinances and

regulations. The implementation and monitoring strategy (see Section 4 of the Final CAP) includes such collaboration.

Letter 42
3/23/2022
Mike Isle

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 43
3/23/2022
Marion Randall

The comment suggests that more work should be done to “strengthen” the CAP and suggests that the CAP focus on infill development and public transit rather than the highway system. The Final CAP does not propose expansion of the highway system, but does include policies to incentivize infill and transit use. Please refer to Theme 2 for further discussion of the County’s land use policies and their relationship to the Final CAP.

The comment requests that tree canopy increase in underserved communities. Note that the Final CAP includes Measure GHG-02, through which the County would maintain and enhance urban forests. The measures establish that “Priority planting locations shall be in the County’s Environmental Justice Communities identified in the Environmental Justice Element.” See also Theme 9 regarding urban forests and Theme 11 for a discussion of environmental justice.

The comment expresses support for the emergency declaration. The Theme 3 discussion provides further information about the County’s emergency declaration and its relationship to the C Final AP. The Final CAP complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State’s Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State’s targets.

Letter 44
3/23/2022
Rick Codina

The comment offers general commentary and opinion about the electrification measures in the CAP. Theme 6 described proposed electrification requirements for new and the electrification of existing buildings discussed in Theme 5. The comment expresses concern about compliance with Measure GHG-06 and suggests that compliance measures are implemented. As stated in the measure, the County Building Permits and Inspection Division will require documentation at the time of building permit application for replacement of water heaters, HVAC systems, and other appliances requiring a permit. Furthermore, note that the target indicator identified in the Final CAP is a 10 percent participation rate for existing residences. This is in line with the statistics provided in the comment.

The comment suggests that the requirements of Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06 should apply to propane appliances. The County has carefully considered this suggestion but has not implemented the change at this time due to the potential implications to existing users in rural areas of the unincorporated County that may be disproportionately affected by the requirement.

Letter 45
3/23/2022
Karen Gale

The comment suggests that the CAP should be strengthened to include detailed actions and ways to review their efficacy. The Final CAP includes these actions. Furthermore, it complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State's Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State's targets. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion.

Letter 46
3/19/2022
Amy Terrell

The comment states that the CAP does not have a means of measuring carbon reduction and is unenforceable. The County disagrees. Regarding measurement of GHG reductions, the County will track and monitor implementation of GHG reduction measures' progress in terms of GHG emissions reductions. Annual reports will be prepared for the Board of Supervisors that describe the progress made. Refer to Section 4, "Implementation and Monitoring Strategy." Regarding the enforceability of the Final CAP, refer to the discussion in Theme 13.

The comment states that projects "fitting" the CAP will not be subject to environmental review. As explained in detail in Theme 1, this is also an incorrect interpretation of the CEQA process.

The comment offers changes for inclusion in the CAP including encouraging infill development and "Forbid development beyond the urban growth boundaries." Forbidding development beyond urban growth boundaries is a land use policy consideration that supersedes the role of the Final CAP. Refer to Theme 2 for discussion of the relationship between the CAP and the General Plan and a discussion how the Final CAP supports infill development.

Letter 47
3/20/2022
Dan Woo

The comment expresses support for the emergency declaration and provides recommendations regarding the specific composition of the Task Force. As explained further in Theme 3, the composition of the task force is separate from adoption and implementation of the Final CAP. Consistent with the Climate Emergency Resolution, the County has prioritized adoption of the Final CAP.

The comment suggests strengthening the CAP and offers suggestions related to community cohesion and resilience. The comment suggests that the County should "incorporate meaningful opportunities for community engagement" and prioritize equity in implementation of the Final CAP, recommending that racial equity and health impact analyses are used to prioritize the strategies. The County continues to work

with stakeholders and is committed to adopting the best possible Final CAP, as soon as possible, in light of the Climate Emergency Resolution. See also the Theme 11 discussion of environmental justice.

Letter 48
3/20/2022
Steve Wirtz

The comment notes that the CAP does not demonstrate communitywide carbon neutrality by 2030. The Theme 3 discussion provides further information about the County's emergency declaration and its relationship to the Final CAP.

The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment incorrectly asserts that "a CAP without a current EIR will allow all future development to proceed without their own current EIR" and expresses concern regarding litigation risk. Refer to the Theme 1 discussion for an explanation of CEQA, the appropriateness and adequacy of the Addendum, and relevant CEQA Guidelines requirements and case law.

The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion.

The comment offers opinions about community messaging and suggestions to re-frame the message to garner support for infill development, which is integral to the General Plan and the Final CAP. This comment will be considered as the County moves into implementation of the Final CAP.

Letter 49
3/17/2022
Goli Sahba

The comment expresses support for the County's Emergency Declaration and the goal of achieving carbon neutrality in 2030. Please refer to the Theme 3 discussion regarding the relationship between the Climate Emergency Declaration and the Final CAP.

The comment provides several specific comments on CAP measures and provides suggestions to finance CAP implementation. The funding suggestions provided in the Final CAP are noted. See Theme 12 for further discussion of Final CAP funding. See also the Theme 9 discussion of landscaping, native plants, and water conservation.

The suggestions to create additional bicycle infrastructure, reduce car lanes, and fund public transit are noted. Sprawl and land use planning are addressed in Theme 2.

Letter 50
3/22/2022
Jim Wiley, Taylor and Wiley on behalf of the Jackson Township Specific Plan and the West Jackson Master Plan

The comment suggests that additional consideration is required to address equitability and program details so that the "CAP will be effective and timely." The comment requests a meeting to discuss this issue. No further details are provided. The County met with the commenter to understand their concerns.

Letter 51
3/22/2022
John Norman

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 52
3/23/2022
Laura Lunetta

The comment suggests that the CAP should be made enforceable. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion.

The comment suggests that education should be included in the CAP. Education is an important component of the Final CAP. There are five GHG reduction measures that include an explicit education component (see Measures GHG-01, GHG-04, GHG-06, GHG-10, and GOV-EC-01).

Letter 53
3/23/2022
Chris Paros

The comment supports the CAP and suggests that it include “more immediate-action plans.” Four specific proposals are provided in the comment. The comment suggests requiring assessment of carbon capture capability of trees proposed for removal. As explained further in Theme 9, the Final CAP includes Measure Temp-08 to increase parking lot shading, landscaping, and urban greening. Measure GHG-02 directs the County to maintain and enhance an urban forest to both increase the County’s carbon sequestration potential. The established permitting process applies to pruning or removal of select landscaping trees, native oaks, public trees, and landmark trees. Pursuant to the County’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, removal of native oak trees in the County’s designated urban area requires a permit or approval through discretionary review. The County has not incorporated the suggested modification of the established permit process into the Final CAP but notes that these existing requirements provide for protection and replacement of trees lost to removal.

The comment suggests that County vehicles are converted to flex-fuel. This is included in Measures GOV-FL-01 and GOV-FL-02.

The comment suggests that the County require that new residential developments offer climate-related homebuyer purchase options. As noted in the comment, the suggestions are not strictly GHG-reducing items. The building code mandates certain energy efficiency and water saving features and would be updated through the Final CAP. Additional “options” would be offered by homebuilders in response to market demand.

Letter 54
3/23/2022
Muriel Strand

The comment offers opinions about the use of fossil fuels. The comment specifically suggests that gas-powered landscape equipment be banned. Final CAP Measure GHG-09 would establish program to trade in fossil fuel-powered landscaping equipment for electric equipment.

The comment suggests that the County review the State's 2022 Scoping Plan to determine the CAP's consistency. The County has reviewed the 2022 Draft Scoping Plan; however, the plan is still in draft form and not expected to be adopted until later this year.

Letter 55
3/22/2022
Neil Dubrovsky

The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP fails to adequately address sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment suggests that the CAP should include a commitment to set aside land for artificial groundwater recharge. Collaboration with regional agencies and support for groundwater recharge projects is included in Measure WATER-06.

The comment states that the CAP is inadequate because it relies on voluntary and unenforceable measures. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State's Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State's targets. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion.

Letter 56
12/7/2021
Chris Paros

The comment provides suggestions for "urgent action." Four specific proposals are provided. The first is requiring assessment of carbon capture capability of trees proposed for removal and providing funding for urban tree planting. As explained further in Theme 9, the Final CAP includes Measure Temp-08 to increase parking lot shading, landscaping, and urban greening. Measure GHG-02 directs the County to maintain and enhance an urban forest to both increase the County's carbon sequestration potential. The established permitting process applies to pruning or removal of select landscaping trees, native oaks, public trees, and landmark trees. Pursuant to the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance, removal of native oak trees in the County's designated urban area requires a permit or approval through discretionary review. The County has not incorporated the suggested modification of the established permit process into the Final CAP but notes that these existing requirements provide for protection and replacement of trees lost to removal.

The second suggestion is related to roadway design and providing separate bike and pedestrian lanes to reduce VMT. This concept is included in the Final CAP through Measure GHG-21, which would update community and corridor plans to include complete streets, and Measure GHG-22 related to connecting key destinations. Regarding the third suggestion that County vehicles are converted to "flex fuels," this is

included in Measure GOV-FL-01, which focuses on transitioning the County's vehicle fleet to "renewable or low-carbon fuels." Comments regarding trading organic waste in exchange for biofuel are noted.

The final suggestion to require new residential developments to offer climate-related homebuyer purchase options is noted. As noted in the comment, the suggestions are not strictly GHG-reducing items. The building code mandates certain energy efficiency and water saving features and would be updated through the Final CAP. Additional "options" would be offered by homebuilders in response to market demand.

Letter 57

3/22/2022

Ken Giberson

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 58

3/23/2022

Taylor Bollinger

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 59

3/22/2022

Steven Sander

The comment expresses disappointment in the CAP. This comment is noted.

The comment states that the public has not been adequately consulted. The County disagrees. Refer to Final CAP Appendix D, which lists over 40 Stakeholder Meetings and Public Workshops.

The comment states that the CAP must lay out a path to get to carbon neutrality by 2030. Please also refer to the Theme 3 discussion for a description of the County's framework for achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.

The comment states that the County does not understand the issues of environmental justice. The County disagrees. Refer to the Theme 11 discussion of environmental justice, community resilience, and community health.

The comment raises concerns regarding environmental justice. Specifically, the potential for unintended consequences to disadvantaged communities that could result from streamlining the permitting processes as described for Measure GHG-24. These important concerns would be addressed as the changes to the zoning code and permitting process are developed. Refer also to Theme 11 regarding environmental justice.

Letter 60

3/23/2022

Jane Lamborn

The comment suggests that the CAP should include more support for use of electric vehicles and solar power. Specific recommendations include installing more EV chargers and financing installation of solar panels for multifamily and low-income residential units. These suggestions are noted.

The comment suggests that the County collaborate with SMUD. The County has an ongoing and successful relationship with SMUD. The County appreciates the stated support for the Final CAP and shares in the desire to begin implementation.

Letter 61

3/23/2022

Anabel Crouch

The comment expresses concern that carbon offsets are not carbon sequestration. This statement is incorrect. Offsets available for use and purchase in the voluntary markets are typically generated from the following sectors: (1) agriculture, (2) industrial, (3) landfill gas capture, (4) reforestation and avoided deforestation, and (5) renewable energy. An example of an agricultural offset project includes the use of a dairy digester, which anaerobically metabolizes manure and captures and converts fugitive methane emissions to renewable natural gas (RNG), thus avoiding the escape of methane emission into the atmosphere which exacerbates climate change. Industrial offset programs are frequently the least expensive option for offsets and comprise a large portion of those currently available. Offsets are generated from the elimination of high global warming potential gases from industrial sources.

Forestry offset projects would be considered carbon sequestering through direct capture of carbon through biological processes; however, to be considered an offset, projects must demonstrate the capacity of offset GHG emissions in perpetuity, generally considered 100 years. Offset projects often have co-benefits and can reduce the generation of other pollutants that degrade water or soil quality and prevent erosion. It is reasonable, therefore, for responsible agencies and the communities surrounding proposed projects to impress upon an applicant and lead agency to prioritize GHG reduction measures such as local carbon offsets that may also improve the livability of the surrounding project area. Moreover, there is increasing community pressure directing local decision makers and project applicants to invest in reduction strategies to reduce community-wide emissions in perpetuity through incorporation of green building practices, decreased fossil fuel usage, and increased renewable energy generation and consumption, among others. As such, the structure of the proposed Offset Program under the Final CAP prioritizes local investments within the County and the Sacramento Valley.

Letter 62
3/23/2022
Jasmine Ripoyla

The comment states that the CAP does not meet State requirements, is inconsistent with the County's Climate Emergency Declaration, and does not fulfill "promises" made in the EIR for the 2030 General Plan. The County disagrees.

This CAP complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State's Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State's targets. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion.

Final CAP funding is addressed in Theme 12. The County has determined that the measures in the Final CAP are feasible and cost effective. Budgeting and funding of programs is determined on an annual basis for the next fiscal year. An adopted Final CAP would direct County departments to budget for work related to implementing these measures. Enforcement and monitoring are required components of the Final CAP that will be implemented. Refer also to the Theme 3 discussion for explanation of the relationship between the Final CAP and the Task Force. Theme 10 provides a comprehensive discussion of the relationship between the mitigation measures in the EIR for the 2030 General Plan and the Final CAP.

Letter 63
3/23/2022
Kent Lacin

The comment expresses concern about the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies. Upon adoption, the Final CAP will be one of several policy plans adopted into the General Plan.

Letter 64
3/23/2022
Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors Association of California

The comment expresses concern about the applicability and feasibility of the timeline of Measures GHG-04, GHG-04, and GHG-06. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 5 discussion for details regarding Measures GHG-04, GHG-05, and GHG-06.

Letter 65
3/23/2022
Citizens' Climate Lobby

The comment emphasizes that the group's "overriding focus" is to encourage the County to "tackle VMT" through "freezing development in greenfield areas." This comment is noted. Reference the Theme 2 discussion, above, regarding the relationship between the Final CAP and other County land use policies.

The comment questions the CEQA adequacy of the CAP and Addendum. Please refer to Theme 1 regarding the appropriateness of an addendum for review of the Final CAP pursuant to CEQA, Final CAP

consistency with commitments in the GP EIR mitigation, and confirmation that the GHG reduction measures in the Final CAP are supported by substantial evidence.

The comment suggests that because Measure GHG-11 “can be satisfied through offsets of GHG from other sources” it will not be effective in reducing GHG emissions. The measure requires the County to develop and adopt a VMT mitigation program (e.g., VMT mitigation fee, bank, or exchange) to offset project-level and cumulative unmitigated VMT impacts from projects with funding allocated toward projects that reduce GHG emissions. This is an effective method of achieving the GHG reduction targets of the Final CAP.

Refinements to the calculations and assumptions in the Final CAP have been made throughout the public review process in response to new information and adjustments to GHG measure language have been made. Although the comment points to these changes as appearing “arbitrary,” the comment does not specifically request information about any specific measures. Refer to Final CAP Appendix E for information about calculation assumptions.

The comment asserts that there was “insufficient” public outreach conducted for the plan. The County disagrees. Refer to Final CAP Appendix D, which lists over 40 Stakeholder Meetings and Public Workshops.

The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP “ignores” the emergency declaration and does not follow the Board’s direction therein. As provided in the language cited by the comment (page 10), the feasible and enforceable measures identified by the County – through a long process that involved extensive public outreach – would not achieve county-wide carbon neutrality by 2030. As noted in other comments and explained in Theme 13, the Final CAP measures must be feasible and enforceable. The measures provided in Section F.2 of Appendix F, many of which were derived directly from outreach with stakeholder groups, were determined not to meet these standards at this time. As noted in the Final CAP, these measures could be added to the Final CAP following additional technical review. However, they are not required for the County to adopt a legally defensible Final CAP and present some technical issues that require further consideration and evaluation. Refer to the Theme 3 discussion for explanation of the relationship between the Final CAP and the Task Force. Please also refer to the Theme 3 discussion for a description of the County’s framework for achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.

The strategy options in Section F.2 of Appendix F, specifically, were developed in response to comments received from stakeholders through the County’s public outreach process on the Final CAP. County staff offered stakeholders and decisionmakers an analysis of potential strategy options that could be implemented by the County in the CEQA document. That analysis provided a summary of the potential environmental conditions that would occur with implementation of those options. Further discussion of the strategy options is provided in Theme 1. Potential strategies to achieve additional GHG emissions reductions beyond those quantified in the Final CAP that can be explored further by the Task Force.

The comment suggests that the County should move forward with implementing select aspects of the CAP under the auspices of the Emergency Declaration, rather than adopt the CAP. The Final CAP, as a complete plan, is characterized as “inadequate” and “weak.” The County disagrees. In fact, the Final CAP complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures will achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State’s Climate Change Scoping Plan through quantified reductions from detailed programs. The apparent basis for the determination that ad hoc implementation of the Final CAP measures would be more effective than adopting the comprehensive program is the streamlining provision for CAPs that meet the qualifications set forth in Section 15183.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. As explained in detail in Theme 1, the streamlining provisions of the Final CAP would not remove the obligation of new projects to consider GHG impacts. Projects would still need to provide substantial evidence to document how the project demonstrates consistency with the Final CAP.

That information, together with the entirety of other environmental analysis, would be brought forward to decisionmakers for consideration. The Final CAP, as a qualified GHG reduction plan, would provide an opportunity to streamline project-level GHG analyses and ensure that all projects demonstrate consistency with the applicable policies outlined in the Final. This streamlining provision would not eliminate the County's decision-making authority regarding whether to approve a project or not.

The comment suggests that the County should provide explanations for all calculation changes that occurred between the September 2021 draft and the February 2022 draft. Calculations and assumptions were refined based on community input, review of additional information, and agency coordination. Appendix E provides the fundamental assumptions applied to the calculations. Theme 8 provides an explanation of the changes in the projections for implementation of Measure GHG-01. The CAP has, and will continue to, evolve in response to advancements in science, realized reductions, and opportunities to collaborate.

The comment expresses concern regarding Measure GHG-30. As explained in Theme 4, this measure has been removed from the Final CAP.

The comment suggests that the GHG emissions reductions from implementation of Measures GHG-05 and GHG-07 should not be quantified because implementation includes a study of cost-effectiveness and feasibility. These studies are an important component of preparing an ordinance for Board review. The feasibility/cost-effectiveness provisions of the Final CAP's electrification proposals are necessary because the electrification proposals are reach codes. When a local government adopts a reach code, they must make an official finding that the new requirements save energy and are cost-effective. Therefore, exploring cost effectiveness is a key step that will be completed as part of the preparation process prior to code adoption. Development of the reach codes will occur following Final CAP adoption and a separate Board action will be required to adopt the reach codes. Quantification is based on whether there is substantial evidence available to support a certain reduction, not on the likelihood of implementation. If the Board were to reject the proposed reach codes, based on the feasibility analyses or some other concern, the Final CAP would be revised to reflect this change. Revision of the Final CAP in this scenario would not invalidate the CAP. Rather, the County would adapt to this situation and enhance other GHG-reduction measures or bring forward new measures to ensure that Final CAP stays on track to meeting reduction targets and timelines.

The comment suggests that by defining "timeframes" for measures, rather than "timelines means that there are no steps, or deadlines." In fact, the timeframes provided in the Final CAP are defined by relatively discrete windows of time: "near term" (2023, 1.5 years), "midterm" (2024-2026, 2 years) and "long term" (2027-2030, 3 years). The comment offers no evidence that providing a relatively short window for implementation of specific measures would make the Final CAP less effective. Moreover, as described in Section 4, "Implementation and Monitoring Strategy," of the Final CAP, an annual report of measure status would be presented to the Board. Where adjustment is required, the County would adaptively manage the timing and scope of implementation of the measures to demonstrate ensure the goals and objectives of the Final CAP, performance measures, and ultimately Mitigation Measure CC-1, are met. Refer to the Theme 12 discussion of funding.

Appendix G provides decision-makers with sufficient information to weigh the relative costs of implementing measures against the associated GHG reduction potential when prioritizing funding. The County would conduct detailed cost analysis and provide funding recommendations of specific measures or groups of measures as they are proposed. A detailed cost analysis for the entire Final CAP would be a

significant investment of time and resources that would quickly go stale as changes in technology or demand affect resource costs and the availability of grants and other funding sources changes.

The relationship between the Final CAP and the Climate Emergency Declaration is discussed in Theme 3. The Final CAP does include a roadmap to carbon neutrality; it identifies clear and actionable steps to set the County on the right path with a commitment to update the plan to achieve more robust reductions in the future.

As explained above, Final CAP Appendix F includes Strategy Options (Section F.1) and Measure Options (Section F.2). The Strategy Options in Section F.1 are considered potentially feasible and were evaluated in the Addendum based on stakeholder comments to inform the Board's decision making (see Theme 1). The Strategy Options are not required to for the Final CAP to meet the requirements established by CEQA or to fulfill the obligations of the mitigation measures in GP EIR. One of the Strategy Options is "Communitywide Carbon Neutrality." If this Strategy Option is not adopted by the Board, it may inform future iterations of the Final CAP, as the County takes the necessary actions to meet the goals of the Climate Emergency Resolution.

Section 15183.5(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines sets forth six elements that a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions should include. Item (D) is "...measures...that substantial evidence demonstrates, if implemented on a project-by-project basis, would collectively achieve the specified emissions level." The County does have substantial evidence in the administrative record for the Final CAP to support the reductions estimates for the Final CAP. The comment suggests that the "County should freeze development on greenfield sites and use existing infill capacity to meet housing needs." Theme 2 discusses infill development and the County's land use and development policies.

The comment suggests that the CAP should identify measures to achieve greater reductions in GHG emissions from on-road vehicles. Local governments have substantial discretion in choice of methodology and may identify appropriate methods to address the variety of GHG emissions sources consistent with the General Plan. As shown in Table 1, total CO₂e emissions from on-road vehicles is projected to decrease slightly between 2015 and 2030, despite population growth. The Final CAP seeks reductions in future auto traffic through the following measures:

- GHG-11 - Reduce Emissions from New Residential and Office/Business Professional Development Vehicle Miles Traveled
- GHG-12 - Update Transportation System Management Plan for Nonresidential Projects
- GHG-13 - Revise Parking Standards for Nonresidential Development
- GHG-14 - Improve Transit Access
- GHG-15 – Improve Pedestrian Network and Facilities
- GHG-16 – Implement Traffic Calming Measures
- GHG-17 – Improve Bicycle Network and Facilities
- GOV-EC-01 – Establish Employee Transportation Program
- GOV-EC-02 – Expand Transit Subsidy Program
- GOV-EC-03 – Determine Feasibility of Employee Shuttle System
- GOV-EC-04 – Expand Secure Bicycle Storage Facilities
- GOV-EC-05 – Provide Carpool-At-Work Incentives

The Final CAP sets the horizon at the General Plan horizon year, consistent with the OPR guidance and provides interim target indicator for each measure. The Final CAP is intended to address the GHG emissions of the General Plan through 2030. The environmental impacts of implementing the Final CAP would not exceed those disclosed in the adopted GP EIR. There is no aspect of the Final CAP that would increase impacts in other resource areas. The legal basis for preparing an addendum is further described in Theme 1.

Letter 66

3/23/2022

Rohimah Moly/Joshua Greene

The comment expresses concern about the applicability and feasibility of the timeline of Measures GHG-04 and GHG-6. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 5 discussion for details regarding Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06.

The comment expresses concern about the Measure GHG-07 and electrification challenges. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 6 discussion for details regarding Measure GHG-07 and electrification challenges.

Letter 67

3/23/2022

350 Sacramento

The comment suggests that the CAP lacks credible substantiation for the identified GHG reductions. Appendix E has been updated to clarify the assumptions used in the Final CAP. The technical calculations have been peer reviewed by SMUD (see Letter 35) and the County has substantial evidence to support its assumptions. See also the Theme 12 discussion of funding for Final CAP implementation and the Theme 13 discussion regarding measure specificity. Note that the Final CAP demonstrates that the County will achieve a locally adjusted GHG emissions reduction target consistent with the State's Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State's targets, through mandatory and quantifiable measures. Measures to which the County has not demonstrated a firm commitment are not included in these totals. However, as a point of clarification, use of the word "will" is not "discretionary, aspirational language." The County uses "will" when committing to an action it will undertake itself and "shall" when requiring the action of another entity.

The comment suggests that non-quantified measures are infeasible. This is incorrect. The comment suggests that projects implementing GHG measures that are not quantified would require subsequent project-level CEQA review (i.e., would not be eligible for streamlining). This is incorrect and a misinterpretation of the streamlining provisions offered through the Final CAP. Measures are not quantified because the GHG reduction potential in 2030 cannot be estimated with the required accuracy, not because they are infeasible measures for implementation. All Final CAP measures and adaptation strategies are evaluated in the Addendum for their potential to result in direct or indirect physical environmental impacts consistent with the requirements of CEQA. The potential environmental impacts are described throughout each environmental resource section. As additional information becomes known about how and where GHG measures would be implemented, they would be reviewed considering the information contained within the General Plan EIR and Addendum. If they are determined to be consistent with the analysis, no additional environmental review of the GHG measure would be required before implementation.

Regarding the streamlining provisions of the qualified CAP, new development projects within the UPA and USB would be required to demonstrate consistency with the reduction targets of the Final CAP by implementing approved GHG measures, quantified and unquantified. This means that the actual reductions realized by the project could exceed the quantified projections in the Final CAP. The process of verification of GHG reductions is consistent with the approach for project-level analysis of GHG emissions, regardless of Final CAP consistency. Refer to the Theme 1 discussion of CEQA requirements and the relationship between the GP EIR mitigation and the Final CAP.

The comment provides commentary about the assumptions and calculations for the CAP measures that would achieve the most GHG reductions. Measure GHG-01 is discussed in Theme 8. Measures GHG-04 and GHG-06 are discussed in Theme 5. Regarding the target indicators for GHG-06, these are expressed in terms of therms of natural gas, as this metric will be the most useful for the County in tracking progress of implementation. In addition to the target indicator for 2030, an interim target indicator is provided for 2026 to help the County track implementation. The therms of natural gas can be converted to GHG emissions using the natural gas emissions factor provided in the Calculation Assumptions in Appendix E. Measures GHG-05 and GHG-07 are discussed in Theme 6. Regarding the number of forecasted dwelling units assumed in calculations for GHG-07, the information used reflects the best data that was available at the time of modeling. Data has evolved throughout the CAP development process, and implementation of the Final CAP, including this measure, will be tracked and monitored by the County. If monitoring results in evidence that assumptions need to be adjusted, the County will address these accordingly. Regarding the concern that there is no description of how local capacity for composting would be increased, the measures state that this would be facilitated through amendment of the Zoning Code.

Refer to Theme 10 for a discussion of electric vehicles and the assumptions used in GHG-10. The number of new EV chargers was determined using a combination of existing Sacramento County EV data from the California Open Data Portal, existing Sacramento County EV charger data from the Sacramento County EV Readiness and Infrastructure Plan, and the number of new EV chargers Countywide needed to meet the State's EV targets.

Measure GHG-11 identifies the GHG reductions associated with achieving a 15 percent reduction in daily VMT compared to the regional average as specified in Sacramento County's Transportation Analysis Guidelines. The measure requires that projects achieve the GHG reductions that would be associated with this measure or participate in a VMT mitigation program with equivalent GHG reduction benefits. This measure, and a determination of consistency for the purpose of the Final CAP, would occur separate from the analysis of VMT as a transportation impact pursuant to SB 743. Update of the Transportation Management System, as would occur with implementation of Measure GHG-12 would, as stated in the measure, ensure that it is consistent with the GHG reduction target. The CAPCOA source referenced in Appendix E is a standard industry source that provides typical GHG reductions for standard traffic management measures. It is also the source of the reductions assumed for Measure GHG-13.

Measure GHG-08 and use of Tier 4 equipment is discussed in Theme 7.

Regarding the potential for offsets to be "illegitimate" or "legally problematic," the County has structured the program to avoid these concerns. The Final CAP indicates that the County will explore creating a Carbon Offset Program. If established, this program could fund a variety of GHG reducing activities such as retrofitting existing buildings to be more energy efficient or carbon sequestration programs. The County is committed to keeping funds local. The emphasis would be on local/regional reductions first, before expanding further. Additionally, the General Plan's Environmental Justice Element indicates the County's environmental justice communities shall be prioritized when creating programs such as the Carbon Offset

Program. The Carbon Offset Program would be implemented with oversight from a third-party organization to validate GHG reductions. This oversight would include annual monitoring and tracking.

Note that the provision in Measure GHG-11, through which the County would develop a VMT mitigation program that allows project applicants to fund projects that result in equivalent GHG emissions reductions in the County, is vastly different from the purchase of offsite mitigation credits through a third party. The VMT reduction requirements of SB 743 and SB 375 are separate from the Final CAP and would be evaluated separately during project-level environmental review. Refer to Theme 2, above for further discussion of land use planning and its relationship to the Final CAP.

The comment states that a number of the options presented in CAP Appendix F may in fact be feasible. The County agrees. Final CAP Appendix F includes Strategy Options (Section F.1) and Measure Options (Section F.2). The Strategy Options are, as explained in the text quoted in the comment, alternative approaches to the Final CAP that would result in greater GHG emission reductions. These strategy options are considered potentially feasible and were evaluated in the addendum based on stakeholder comments to inform the Board's decision making. Refer to the Theme 1 discussion for additional information about the strategy options. The Measure Options are individual measures that were considered in developing the Final CAP with a reason for dismissal of each measure.

Letter 68
3/23/2022
ENGEO

The comment expresses concern regarding Measure GHG-08. Please refer to the Theme 7 discussion for more detail about Measure GHG-08 and the availability of Tier 4 engines.

Letter 69
3/23/2022
Alan Vail

The comment does not address the adequacy of the CAP. No further response is required.

Letter 70
3/23/2022
Leah Frame

The comment questions why an EIR was not prepared and stated it should do more to reduce traffic. Please refer Theme 1 for a discussion of how an Addendum is an appropriate CEQA document. No specific comments on how to reduce traffic were provided. This comment is noted.

Letter 71
3/23/2022
Stephanie Craft

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion. Refer to the Theme 4 discussion, above, for a discussion of this measure.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 72
3/23/2022
Meghan Cook

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl and promote infill. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

Letter 73
3/23/2022
Steve Letterly

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion. Refer to the Theme 4 discussion, above, for a discussion of this measure.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6. This comment is noted.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. This comment is noted. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 74
3/23/2022
John Lane

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. Refer to Theme 7 for a discussion of this measure.

The comment recommends softening the language of Measure Temp-07, which requires the use of cool pavements for new roadways. In response to public input, the language of Measure Temp-07 has been modified to provide additional flexibility in its implementation.

Letter 75
3/23/2022
Rebecca Cotterman

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl and promote infill. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment states that the County hasn't fulfilled its requirements under CEQA. The County disagrees. Please refer to Theme 1 for a discussion of the County's requirements under CEQA and the project's compliance with these requirements.

The comment expresses support for more EV charging stations in the county. Please refer to the Theme 109 discussion of the relevant Final CAP policies that address EV investments and how such policies would work concurrently with other nearby local jurisdictions and regional and State agencies.

Letter 76
3/23/2022
Susan Solarz

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl and promote infill. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies. Upon adoption, the Final CAP will be one of several policy plans adopted into the General Plan.

The comment recommends an ordinance requiring all electric new affordable homes. Please refer to the Theme 6 for a discussion of electrification of new development.

The comment recommends investing in tree canopies and more water conservation strategies. Please refer to the Theme 9 discussion for relevant language about urban forestry and water conservation measures in the CAP.

The comment suggests continued engagement in environmental justice communities. Please refer to the Theme 11 discussion for relevant information about how environmental justice is addressed in the Final.

Letter 77
3/23/2022
ECOS

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

Letter 78
3/23/2022
Jordan Burns

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-30. This comment is noted. Measure GHG-30 is no longer included in the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for further discussion. Refer to the Theme 4 discussion, above, for a discussion of this measure.

The comment voices support for the feasibility criteria for conversion to all electric appliances, as discussed further in Theme 6.

The comment expresses opposition to Measure GHG-8. Refer to the Theme 7 discussion for a discussion of this measure.

Letter 79
3/23/2022
Nick Avdis

The comment opposes Measure GHG-30. Measure GHG-30 has been removed from the Final CAP. Please refer to Theme 4 for a discussion of the removal of Measure GHG-30 from the Final CAP.

Letter 80

3/23/2022

Sierra Club Sacramento Group

The comment highlights the role of land conservation in carbon sequestration and expresses a desire that certain measures summarized in Appendix F be included in the Final CAP. Appendix F details measures that were suggested by the County's own staff, consultant, and the public. Appendix F also provides evidence for why certain measures were dismissed from consideration or deemed infeasible.

Regarding land conservation, there are several actions at the State level intended to result in the conservation of open space. Specifically, Governor Newsom signed his Nature Based Solutions Executive Order N-82-20 in October of 2020, elevating the role of natural and working lands in the fight against climate change and advancing biodiversity conservation as an administration priority. In addition, the State's Draft 2022 Scoping Plan Update also includes an action to conserve 30 percent of the State's natural and working lands and coastal waters by 2030.

The County also has existing policies to support land conservation. The Agricultural, Conservation, and Open Space Elements in the County's existing General Plan already address land conservation in the County. The Final CAP also includes a measure to implement the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (Measure GHG-26). The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan is projected to create an interconnected regional preserve system of over 36,000 acres. Moreover, one of the Board's actions under the Climate Emergency Resolution is to review the Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy for the feasibility of GHG reduction and carbon sequestration measures that can be implemented by local governments. Therefore, the County is moving forward with land conservation programs that align with State targets and the measures included in the Final CAP would support these efforts.

The comment states that any carbon offsets used to increase carbon sequestration must be done within the County. To the degree that a carbon offset can, in actuality, offset the County's GHG emissions, the credits generated by offset projects and companies must meet the criteria of being real, additional, permanent, verified, and enforceable. These terms are defined below.

Real – GHG reductions are measured using advanced, conservative, comprehensive, and valid accounting substantially by scientific evidence.

Additional – GHG reductions met through carbon offsets must occur in the absence of GHG reductions achieved as a result of an existing law or regulation.

Permanent – GHG reductions achieved by carbon offsets must exist in perpetuity (typically assumed 100 years or more).

Verifiable – GHG reductions must be objectively reviewed, documented, and monitored by an unbiased verification body.

Enforceable – a carbon offset must be supported by a legal instrument that defines exclusive ownership and is therefore not double counted.

The need to meet these criteria has given rise to the formation of Approved Registries, which are third-party entities that serve as carbon offset brokers and facilitate the buying and selling of carbon offsets internationally. Approved Registries also oversee the development of advanced, peer-reviewed offset protocols for assessing the efficacy of a carbon offset. Offset protocols are a set of technical standards and calculation methods that ensure emissions reductions associated with offset projects are real, additional, and permanent. Examples of third-party Approved Registries overseeing the effectiveness of carbon

offsets projects include the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and the Verified Carbon Standard. These Approved Registries use advanced, peer-reviewed protocols that measure and monitor the GHG emissions sequestered or avoided by carbon offsets and include contact information for suitable brokers.

Approved Registries disclose the availability and retirement of the offset projects they oversee, typically on websites for review by the public and potential buyers. For example, the Climate Action Reserve monitors a publicly available website that summarizes the available offsets it oversees and manages. Potential clients procure offsets through coordination with brokers working for an Approved Registry, who can help facilitate the purchase of offsets that meet the client's needs. For instance, a lead agency that uses carbon offsets to mitigate its project may work with a broker to obtain offsets prioritizing geographic location if it intends to maximize co-benefits regionally, if available. If cost is an issue of feasibility, a broker may work with a lead agency or project applicant to secure offsets that are sources from cheaper offset projects.

Using basic economic principles, the price differentiation between these geographic landscapes further indicates that availability affects cost. California-based carbon offsets are scarcer when compared to US or international projects. This is an important consideration for lead agencies and project applicants that are encouraged by local stakeholders and other responsible agencies to prioritize regional- and State-produced offset projects if the price per metric ton becomes financially overly burdensome.

Any carbon offsets purchased by the County would need to meet the criteria of being real, additional, verifiable, permanent, and enforceable as confirmed by an Approved Registry. Nevertheless, the Revised Final Draft CAP removed reference to offsets procured outside of the Central Valley to maximize local co-benefits of carbon offset programs.

The comment suggests that new development include spaces large enough to plant shade trees. Please refer to Theme 9 for a discussion of the relevant measures of the Final CAP that addresses urban forestry.

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

Letter 81

3/24/2022

Sacramento Environmental Commission

The comment expresses concern that the CAP will not be found adequate or qualified under CEQA because it is not enforceable. Chapter 4 of the Final CAP includes an implementation and monitoring strategy that instructs the County to track the Final CAP's progress, coordinate with relevant agencies to ensure adequate implementation, update strategies that are underperforming, update the Final CAP with new strategies during future updates, and provide the public with monitoring data on the Final CAP portal website. Please refer to the Theme 1 discussion of the project's consistency with CEQA. Please refer to the Theme 13 discussion of the Final CAP's enforceability.

The comment encourages infill development. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment states that the CAP does not identify plastic use as a significant GHG source. The comment is correct that the production of plastic entails the use of fossil fuels. However, these are upstream emissions beyond the scope of Sacramento County and are not claimed in the Final CAP. The emissions that can be claimed by Sacramento County, for which reduction measures were developed to reduce

emissions, are typically methane emissions from the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste at landfills. Measure GHG-24 directs the County to increase organic waste diversion by 75 percent by 2025 to reduce these emissions.

The comment suggests the measures in the CAP be implemented immediately. The County must consider the feasibility of how measures would be implemented with the understanding that extensive coordination, investments, and funding must be secured prior to the implementation of the Final CAP measures. Where the County has determined that a measure can be implemented in the near-term, the Final CAP provides that timeframe for implementation.

Letter 82

3/27/2022

Laurie Heller

The comment states that sufficient equipment does not exist to make all buildings all-electric. Please refer to Theme 5 discussion for additional detail pertaining to the availability of electric appliances and the timeline of the Measure GHG-04.

The comment expresses support for the electrification of all new development now. Please refer to Theme 6 for a detailed discussion of the electrification of new development under the Final CAP.

Letter 83

3/25/2022

Etgen Family

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies. Upon adoption, the Final CAP will be one of several policy plans adopted into the General Plan.

The comment expresses concern that there are not sufficient traffic calming measures on 4-lane roadways. This comment is not relevant to the content of the Final CAP.

The comment expresses concern over the efficacy of the light rail system operating in the County. The comment provides Bus Rapid Transit as the solution to this problem. Measure GHG-14 of the Final CAP directs the County to install full bus rapid transit infrastructure along priority corridors.

The comment expresses that the County needs to build a station for the Amtrak's Capitol Corridor in northeastern Sacramento County on Watt Avenue. This would need to be an action directed by Amtrak; however, the Final CAP includes several measures related to reduced driving and alternative transportation modes.

Letter 84

3/31/2022

Guy Hall, Dwight MacCurdy, Cynthia Shallit

The comment provides input and recommendations for text changes to Measures GHG-04, GHG-10, GHG-11, GHG-12, GHG-13, GHG-14, GHG-19, GHG-27, GOV-EC-01, GOV-EC-02, GOV-EC-05, GOV-FL-01, GOV-BE-03, GOV-BE-04, and GOV-AR-01. Please refer to the Theme 10 discussion of the relevant Final CAP policies that address EV investments and how such policies would work concurrently with other nearby local jurisdictions and regional and State agencies.

The comment recommends that Measure GHG-EC-01 include more stringent language to create two new staff positions. Measure GHG-EC-01 directs the County to assign a staff position under the Chief of Fleets (or County Executive Office) to establish and operate a County Employee Transportation Demand Management Program.

The comment recommends combining Measures GHG-EC-01 and GHG-EC-02. These two measures do complement one another, but for GHG reduction tracking and reporting, the County has elected to keep these measures separate.

The comment suggests that Measure GOV-EC-05 be expanded to provide incentives for any employee traveling via a zero-emission method. One goal of the Final CAP is to reduce VMT from single-occupancy vehicles to reduce congestion and the additional GHG emissions that can be associated with cars idling in traffic. Single-occupancy EVs can contribute to congestion within the County, which can increase emissions from other, conventional vehicles. Therefore, the County has elected to retain the language of the Measure GOV-EC-05 to apply to carpooling and transit use.

The comment provides additional recommendations for text changes to other measures. The County has reviewed these recommendations and have, where appropriate, updated the text of various measures as reflected in the Final CAP. Where text has not been amended, the County has deemed such recommendations as infeasible.

Letter 85

5/11/2022

Dr. Tom Suchanek

The comment expresses concern that the CAP will not be sufficient to protect Sacramento County residents from the effects of climate change. The comment instructs the County to prioritize infill and minimize sprawled development. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies. Upon adoption, the Final CAP will be one of several policy plans adopted into the General Plan.

The comment encourages the County to invest in EV charging infrastructure. Please refer to the Theme 10 discussion of the relevant Final CAP policies that address EV investments and how such policies would work concurrently with other nearby local jurisdictions and regional and State agencies.

The comment suggests that the CAP has no implementation strategy. Chapter 4 of the Final CAP includes an implementation and monitoring strategy that instructs the County to track the Final CAP's progress, coordinate with relevant agencies to ensure adequate implementation, update strategies that are underperforming, update the Final CAP with new strategies during future updates, and provide the public with monitoring data on the Final CAP portal website. Please refer to the Theme 13 discussion of the Final CAP's enforceability.

The comment expresses concern over the CAP's legal defensibility and the appropriateness of the County's consultant. With regard to the appropriateness of the Addendum for the project, please refer to the discussion in Theme 1.

With regard to consultant selection, the County is afforded the discretion with respect to what consultants it uses. The CAP consultant was selected through the County's established procurement process, which required the submittal of detailed qualifications and resumes of qualified individuals. While the commenter appears to suggest that the facts surrounding the San Diego CAP planning process are the same as here,

they are not. County staff have directed the development of the Final CAP and directed the approach to be used for environmental analysis. The County's consultant advises and makes recommendations to staff based on the facts specific to this Final CAP. The County is the agency responsible for conducting an independent review of the project and ultimately making a decision on whether the environmental approach meets CEQA requirements, and whether the project should be approved. Please refer to the Theme 1 discussion about relevant case law that applies to Final CAPs and use in CEQA.

Letter 86

5/11/2012

Diane Wolfe

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

Letter 87

5/13/2022

Pamela McClanahan

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment states the CAP violates State goals to protect wild areas. Regarding the State's land conservation goals, California committed to the goal of conserving 30 percent of lands and coastal waters by 2030 as part of Governor Newsom's 2020 Nature Based Solutions Executive Order N-82-20, The Executive Order directs the California Natural Resources Agency (CRNA) to coordinate the execution of 30x30 with other State agencies and stakeholders through a series of actions. For clarification, this executive order does not establish requirements for Final CAPs.

The County also has existing policies to support land conservation. The Agricultural, Conservation, and Open Space Elements in the County's existing General Plan already address land conservation in the County. The Final CAP also includes a measure to implement the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (Measure GHG-26). The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan is projected to create an interconnected regional preserve system of over 36,000 acres. Moreover, one of the Board's actions under the Climate Emergency Resolution is to review the Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy for the feasibility of GHG reduction and carbon sequestration measures that can be implemented by local governments. Therefore, the County is moving forward with land conservation programs that align with State targets and the measures included in the Final CAP would support these efforts.

Letter 88

5/14/2022

Margie Tomenko

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment states the CAP should protect wild areas. Regarding the State’s land conservation goals, California committed to the goal of conserving 30 percent of lands and coastal waters by 2030 as part of Governor Newsom’s 2020 Nature Based Solutions Executive Order N-82-20, The Executive Order directs the California Natural Resources Agency (CRNA) to coordinate the execution of 30x30 with other State agencies and stakeholders through a series of actions. For clarification, this executive order does not establish requirements for Final CAPs.

The County also has existing policies to support land conservation. The Agricultural, Conservation, and Open Space Elements in the County’s existing General Plan already address land conservation in the County. The Final CAP also includes a measure to implement the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (Measure GHG-26). The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan is projected to create an interconnected regional preserve system of over 36,000 acres. Moreover, one of the Board’s actions under the Climate Emergency Resolution is to review the Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy for the feasibility of GHG reduction and carbon sequestration measures that can be implemented by local governments. Therefore, the County is moving forward with land conservation programs that align with State targets and the measures included in the Final CAP would support these efforts.

Letter 89

5/17/2022

Michael McClanahan

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County’s land use policies.

Letter 90

5/18/2022

Debbie Koerner

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County’s land use policies.

Letter 91

5/18/2022

Kathy Dodson

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses the opinion that the Final CAP doesn’t entail stringent enough policies to combat climate change. The County disagrees. The comment offers no evidence to support its statement. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County’s land use policies.

Letter 92
5/18/2022
Elisa Zitano

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. This comment is noted. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment expresses support for more EV charging stations throughout the County. Please refer to the Theme 10 discussion of the relevant Final CAP policies that address EV investments and how such policies would work concurrently with other nearby local jurisdictions and regional and State agencies.

Letter 93
5/13/2022
Pamela McClanahan

The comment expresses concern with the efficacy of the CAP. The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP should stop sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment states the CAP violates State goals to protect wild areas. This is incorrect and no evidence is offered to support this statement. Regarding the State's land conservation goals, California committed to the goal of conserving 30 percent of lands and coastal waters by 2030 as part of Governor Newsom's 2020 Nature Based Solutions Executive Order N-82-20. The Executive Order directs the California Natural Resources Agency (CRNA) to coordinate the execution of 30x30 with other State agencies and stakeholders through a series of actions. For clarification, this executive order does not establish requirements for Final CAPs.

The County also has existing policies to support land conservation. The Agricultural, Conservation, and Open Space Elements in the County's existing General Plan already address land conservation in the County. The Final CAP also includes a measure to implement the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (Measure GHG-26). The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan is projected to create an interconnected regional preserve system of over 36,000 acres. Moreover, one of the Board's actions under the Climate Emergency Resolution is to review the Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy for the feasibility of GHG reduction and carbon sequestration measures that can be implemented by local governments. Therefore, the County is moving forward with land conservation programs that align with State targets and the measures included in the Final CAP would support these efforts.

Letter 94
5/20/2022
Katherine Williamson

The comment expresses concern that the CAP does not do enough to address GHG emissions from VMT in the County. The comment expresses an opinion that the Final CAP should stop sprawl. These comments are noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

Letter 95

5/18/2022

Virginia Volk-Anderson

The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP should stop sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comments states that the CAP included unenforceable, unfunded measures that will not bring us to carbon neutrality. The Final CAP complies with State and local requirements. The Final CAP demonstrates how the GHG reduction measures would achieve a locally adjusted target consistent with the State's Climate Change Scoping Plan; thereby addressing its fair share of the GHG reductions required to achieve the State's targets. The appropriate specificity of Final CAP measures and the enforceability of the measures proposed in the Final CAP is addressed further in the Theme 13 discussion. The County's efforts toward carbon neutrality are discussed in Theme 3.

Letter 96

5/18/2022

Cindy Suchanek

The comment expresses an opinion that the CAP should stop sprawl. This comment is noted. Please refer to the Theme 2 discussion of how the Final CAP relates to the County's land use policies.

The comment expresses opposition to the project. This comment is noted.

REFERENCES

California Department of Food and Agriculture. 2022. COMET-Planner. Available: <http://comet-planner-cdfahsp.com/>.

California Energy Commission. 2021 (August). *California Building Decarbonization Assessment*. Available: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/publications/2021/california-building-decarbonization-assessment>

California Energy Codes and Standards. 2022. Locally Adopted Energy Ordinances. Available: <https://localenergycodes.com/content/adopted-ordinances>

CECS. See California Energy Codes and Standards.

CDFFA. See California Department of Food and Agriculture.

DieselNet. 2022. US: Nonroad Diesel Engines. Available: <https://dieselnet.com/standards/us/nonroad.php#:~:text=The%20Tier%204%20standards%20require,2010%20standards%20for%20highway%20engines>. Accessed August 2, 2022.

HBI. 2022. The HBI Construction Labor Market Report. <https://hbi.org/wp-content/uploads/Spring-2022-HBI-Construction-Labor-Market-Report.pdf>. Accessed August 22, 2022.

Sacramento County. 2011. Sacramento County Climate Action Plan Strategy and Framework Document. Adopted November 9, 2011.

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General

State of California
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE



1300 I STREET, SUITE 125
P.O. BOX 944255
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2550

Public: (916) 445-9555
Telephone: (916) 327-7877
Facsimile: (916) 322-5609
E-Mail: Lisa.Trankley@doj.ca.gov

March 7, 2011

Supervisor Roberta MacGlashan
Chair, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
700 H Street, Suite 2450
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Comments on General Plan Update: Proposed Vision and Growth Management Strategy

Dear Chair MacGlashan:

The Attorney General's Office appreciates this opportunity to comment on the vision and growth management strategy that your staff has proposed for your review at the Board hearing on March 9th. We are submitting these comments on the Attorney General's behalf, pursuant to her independent duty to protect the public health and natural resources of the State and not on behalf of any other entity.

As you may know, the Attorney General's Office submitted detailed comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (draft EIR), has met several times with both the environmental and planning staffs, and also met with Interim County Executive Steven Szalay. Our concerns have been focused on the County's need to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in its General Plan Update process. The County's EIR found that the General Plan, even at the levels of growth now being projected, will have a significant adverse impact on climate change. We believe the same is true with respect to impacts on air quality.

We have consistently encouraged the County to fully explore all feasible mitigation measures to reduce these significant impacts, as required by CEQA.¹ We have emphasized the need for the County to consider measures to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and resulting greenhouse gas emissions, and to look at requirements for increased density, mixed use development, and transit-oriented development. Accordingly, we congratulate the County on its decision to suspend the General Plan adoption process to re-examine, with the assistance of the

¹ Cal. Public Resources Code, § 21002; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15021, subd. (a)(2).

County's consultant, DC&E, the growth management and land supply assumptions that went into the proposed General Plan land use element.

In light of the significant impacts of the proposed General Plan, and the need to look at all feasible means of reducing VMT, we believe it is critical for the County to require that new residential developments provide: (1) sufficiently high densities to support transit; (2) infrastructure, including transit, that is put in place at the same time the project is developed; (3) a jobs-housing balance that reduces the need for long commutes and ensures low VMT; (4) a project design that will enable residents to walk, ride bicycles, or take transit to their jobs and schools; and (5) a reasonable amount of mixed-use development. A recent report from the Center for Clean Air Policy (summary attached) found that "[A]n inclusive planning process following smart growth principles that yields more walkable neighborhoods with broader options for housing and transportation can help communities, businesses and individuals make money, save money and improve quality of life."

The recommendations in the DC&E Report and, to a large degree, the recommendations in the staff report, would substantially achieve these objectives. We therefore urge the County to adopt, at a minimum, the recommendations set forth in the staff report. If the County chooses to adopt alternative measures, we stress that these measures must be equally effective to those that the staff has proposed to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.

There may, of course, be other means to achieve the County's environmental and quality of life goals. In the Attorney General's settlement with the City of Stockton, for example, Stockton agreed to consider a differential fee program that allows infill developments to pay lower fees than developments in outlying or greenfield areas, and a phasing program where Stockton will locate a specified number of new housing units in infill areas, and consider limiting greenfield development until certain criteria are met. Sacramento County may or may not want to consider these types of mitigation measures. This office recognizes that the planning process is a local prerogative and, as long as mitigation is sufficient, specific actions to be adopted are within a local jurisdiction's discretion.

This is a golden opportunity for Sacramento County to become a leader in smart growth planning and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, a path that all local governments will have to follow to comply with the State's climate change goals and emission reductions under AB 32 and SB 375. Consistent with the purposes of CEQA, our comments are intended to support the County in improving its General Plan. Please let us know if we can assist in any way.

Sincerely,

LISA TRANKLEY
Deputy Attorney General

For KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General

LT:pc

cc: Vice Chair Don Nottoli
Supervisor Susan Peters
Supervisor Phil Serna
Supervisor Jimmy Yee