

Rebecca Messinger

From: Clark County <webmaster@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 8:46 AM
To: publiccomment
Subject: Council Hearing Public Comment

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Clark County

Submitted on Tue, 11/28/2023 - 8:46 AM

Name

Margaret Tweet

Subject

Public Hearing: Climate Change and Resiliency Public Participation Plan

Date of Hearing

Tue, 11/28/2023

Comment

Washington State Civil Rights Act was enacted by People as Initiative 200 on the Washington ballot in November 1998 and it passed with 58.22% of the vote. It prohibits racial and gender preferences by state and local government. Full text of current law .

RCW 49.60.400 Discrimination, preferential treatment prohibited.

(1) The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.

(2) This section applies only to action taken after December 3, 1998.

(3) This section does not affect any law or governmental action that does not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.

(4) This section does not affect any otherwise lawful classification that:

(a) Is based on sex and is necessary for sexual privacy or medical or psychological treatment; or

(b) Is necessary for undercover law enforcement or for film, video, audio, or theatrical casting; or

(c) Provides for separate athletic teams for each sex.

(5) This section does not invalidate any court order or consent decree that is in force as of December 3, 1998.

(6) This section does not prohibit action that must be taken to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal program, if ineligibility would result in a loss of federal funds to the state.

(7) Nothing in this section prohibits schools established under chapter 28A.715 RCW from:

(a) Implementing a policy of Indian preference in employment; or

(b) Prioritizing the admission of tribal members where capacity of the school's programs or facilities is not as large as

demand.

(8) For the purposes of this section, "state" includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the state itself, any city, county, public college or university, community college, school district, special district, or other political subdivision or governmental instrumentality of or within the state.

(9) The remedies available for violations of this section shall be the same, regardless of the injured party's race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin, as are otherwise available for violations of Washington antidiscrimination law.

(10) This section shall be self-executing. If any part or parts of this section are found to be in conflict with federal law, the United States Constitution, or the Washington state Constitution, the section shall be implemented to the maximum extent that federal law, the United States Constitution, and the Washington state Constitution permit. Any provision held invalid shall be severable from the remaining portions of this section.

[2013 c 242 § 7; (2019 c 160 § 3, Referendum Measure No. 88 failed to become law); 1999 c 3 § 1 (Initiative Measure No. 200, approved November 3, 1998).]

PDF version at this link <https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=49.60.400&pdf=true>

From the CLARK COUNTY STAFF REPORT, DEPARTMENT: Community Planning, DATE: November 7, 2023

"The proposed PPP also outlines the approach for forming three advisory groups:

- The Clark County Council will appoint a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to develop goal and policy recommendations for the Planning Commission and County Council.
- The county will convene an Environmental Justice Coalition (EJC) made up of organizations who the county will hire to help design and implement community engagement with community groups who are most vulnerable to climate pollution and the impacts from climate change such as extreme heat, flooding, and wildfire smoke, and to guide the equity framework used throughout this project. Representatives of the EJC will also serve on the CAG."

My comment: The "Environmental Justice Coalition" consists of handpicked community members or groups who are paid by the county, which amplifies their voice. This coalition will also have the dual role of participation as a member of the Citizen Advisory Group also, which multiplies their voice even further. Meanwhile, some citizens & businesses are not included in lengthy stakeholder lists prepared by consultant. Please insure that the PPP fairly reaches out to all Clark County.

See article about costs of widespread and rapid EV adoption.

The Biden Administration's EV Goals Are an Expensive Fantasy November 21, 2023

The Biden administration is pushing for widespread electrification in less than 20 years through government subsidies and coercive regulations as part of its aggressive climate agenda. The truth is that President Joe Biden's goals are an illusion at the expense of the American people.

While EV proponents try to claim that EVs will soon be cheaper than gasoline vehicles, our new research demonstrates that EVs benefitted from hidden subsidies that total nearly \$50,000 per EV.

Who is footing that bill? Gasoline vehicle owners, taxpayers, and utility ratepayers are.

Electric vehicles primarily benefit from regulatory credits and generous fuel economy standards, which average \$27,881 per vehicle. EVs have been given an unlawful 6.67 multiplier to their rated fuel economy, so that an EV with a rated fuel economy of 100 miles per gallon is credited as if it is getting 667 miles per gallon. What's more, the EPA's proposed fuel economy standards are designed to require that 67% of new passenger cars sold be all-electric by 2032, demonstrating a clear government preference toward EVs without proper consideration of costs and benefits.

For gasoline vehicles, the price you see at the gas pump covers the cost of extracting, refining, and transporting the gasoline, but the same cannot be said for the cost of charging an EV. EVs require new charging infrastructure, and their large power draw increases the strain on electricity infrastructure. As our research highlights, a typical EV charging overnight at home consumes as much power as several homes, and an EV charging at a fast-charging station in 30 minutes consumes as much power as a small to medium-sized grocery store. A few extra EVs in the neighborhoods are manageable, but widespread EV adoption will require significant and expensive grid upgrades.

Adding insult to injury, EV owners alone aren't shouldering these increased electricity costs, which average \$11,833 per vehicle over 10 years. Until a utility starts charging EV owners for the extra infrastructure costs to serve them, those costs are shared among all the utility's customers. Residential electricity costs across the U.S. have risen 20% over the last three years, and a rapid forced adoption of EVs will only make this problem worse.

Direct federal and state subsidies provide EVs with another \$8,984 per vehicle over 10 years, including the widely publicized \$7,500 federal tax credit in the so-called Inflation Reduction Act and smaller state subsidies for EVs. Author: Brent Bennett, Ph.D., is policy director for Life:Powered and a former battery researcher & engineer. https://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2023/11/21/the_biden_administrations_ev_goals_are_an_expensive_fantasy_994010.html

© 2023 Clark County Washington