AGENDA
Lynnwood Planning Commission
Thursday, August 28, 2008 — 7:00 pm
Council Chambers, 19100 - 44th Ave. W., Lynnwood WA

A. CALL TO ORDER
   Chair WRIGHT
   Commissioner ELLIOTT, First Vice Chair
   Commissioner AMBALADA
   Commissioner DAVIES
   Commissioner LARSEN
   Commissioner PEYCHEFF
   Commissioner WOJACK, Second Vice-chair

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
   Meeting of August 14, 2008

C. COUNCIL LIASON REPORT

D. CITIZEN COMMENTS – on matters not on tonight's agenda.

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS:
   1. 2008 Comp. Plan Amendments - MUGA Land Use Plan
      Draft Initial Land Use Plan for the City’s Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA).

F. WORK SESSION:
   1. 2008 Comp. Plan Amendments – Energy & Sustainability Element

G. OTHER BUSINESS:
   None

H. DIRECTOR’S REPORT:
   1. Upcoming Commission Meetings
   2. Annexation Project Update

I. ADJOURNMENT

The public is invited to attend and participate in this public meeting. Parking and meeting rooms are accessible to persons with disabilities. Upon reasonable notice to the City Clerk’s office (425) 670-6616, the City will make reasonable effort to accommodate those who need special assistance to attend this meeting.
ACTION
Hold public hearing, and then make recommendation on this proposed amendment to the City Council.

PROPOSAL
This amendment would adopt a land use plan for the City’s Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA), including:

- A Future Land Use Plan Map (enclosed with Aug. 14 meeting packet); and
- Descriptions of two new land use categories (attached to Aug 14 meeting packet).

BACKGROUND
The Municipal Code provides a process for annual consideration of amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Review of these amendments is a major component of the Planning Commission’s annual work program.

Pursuant to City Council resolution 2007-14, the City is considering annexing the City’s MUGA. As part of annexation, the City needs to adopt a land use plan for the area.

DECISION CRITERIA AND OTHER LEGAL CITATIONS
The Implementation Element of the Comprehensive Plan states the following criteria for taking action on proposed Plan amendments:

“Each component of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment package shall be reviewed and approved only if it meets all of the following criteria:

- “The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act and will not result in Plan or regulation conflicts; and
- “The proposal will change the development or use potential of a site or area without creating significant adverse impacts on existing sensitive land uses, businesses, or residents; and

...
• "The proposed amendment can be accommodated by all applicable public services and facilities, including transportation; and
• "The proposal will help implement the goals and policies of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan; and
• "If the proposal could have significant impacts beyond the Lynnwood City Limits, it has been sent to the appropriate Snohomish County officials for review and comment."

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
A Determination of Non-Significance is being issued for this proposed amendment.

ANALYSIS/COMMENT
Staff has developed the draft land use plan for this area using a set of principles (see Attachment A). Key elements of these principles include:

Consistency with the County’ Land Use Plan: Maintaining consistency with current land use designations (where reasonable) minimizes the change for property owners in moving from County to City jurisdiction. In much of the MUGA, existing County non-residential land use designations have been converted into the most-similar City designation. In some areas, where County residential designations encompass more than one City designation, existing zoning designations provide direction for land use designations.

Protecting Single Family Neighborhoods: A major concern of land use planning by the County has been permitting of higher density development in existing single family neighborhoods (LDMRs and PRDs). As City SF-1 and SF-2 (single-family residential low and medium density) land use designations do not permit small-lot or air-condominium projects, applying City designations will stop this practice.

“Grandfather” Vested Applications and Built Projects: State law and court decisions provide rights for development applications that have been vested under County jurisdiction. In addition, higher density single-family developments (permitted by the County) have recently been built and are occupied. The draft plan recognizes these developments without making them “non-conforming” by creating a new land use category specifically for these projects (SF-4). As described, this category could not be applied to other properties in the MUGA or in the existing City.

Urban Centers: The County land use plan designates urban centers at the I-5 / Ash Way interchange and at Highway 99 / 148th St. SW as the primary location for accommodating growth (population and employment) in this part of the County. As annexation includes accepting responsibility for accommodating growth forecast for the annexation area, the draft City plan carries forward the designation of these urban centers.

A final comment: staff envisions this proposal as an initial land use plan for the MUGA, with opportunities for review and revision during the next few years. For example, in the fall, as part of the public outreach into the MUGA, staff will review this plan with residents and owners. Changes identified during these meetings will be presented to the City Council for action as part of approval of this proposal. Additional meetings are envisioned in early 2009, and changes identified in those meetings would be included in the 2009 Docket (or 2010 Docket). And property owners may always submit an application for a land use amendment in the annual docket process.
**Evaluation**

Consistent with GMA

Basing the proposed Plan on the County’s adopted land use plan, and particularly by including the County’s designation of urban centers, (as discussed above), the proposed land use plan maintains consistency with GMA. The process of converting the County’s land use designations into City designations was managed to avoid any conflicts with the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

**No Adverse Impact**

For much of the MUGA, the proposed plan does not change the development or use potential of properties because the plan is based on the current County land use plan. In some single family areas, the development potential will be reduced, which would result in less impact on existing sensitive land uses, businesses or residents than would the existing County land use plan.

**Adequate Public Services**

The EIS for the County plan found that public agencies currently serving the MUGA were adequate to support development under the County plan (with review of service plans and staffing through the County’s budget process).

As a separate item, the Annexation Project is completing a fiscal study of the impact on City services. The results of that study will be reviewed with the City Council and Planning Commission prior to formally initiating annexation of the MUGA.

**Help Implement Comprehensive Plan**

The proposed land use plan will help to protect existing single family neighborhoods, which is a priority for the City’s Comprehensive Plan, and it will accommodate growth and development projected for the MUGA primarily in urban centers.

**Impacts Outside City**

Staff is reviewing the proposed land use plan with County staff and residents and property owners in the MUGA as part of the annexation process.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Land Use Plan for the MUGA.

**ATTACHMENTS**

A. Principles for Land Use Plan in MUGA
Principles for Land Use Plan in MUGA

- Wherever possible and reasonable, maintain consistency with the existing County Land Use Plan. Translate County Map designations to the nearest corresponding City land use plan map designation;
- Make Plan map adjustments to protect existing single family neighborhoods and eliminate the potential for higher-density rezonings/developments in established lower density residential areas;
- Comply with legal requirements to “grandfather” approved projects vested under County zoning,
- Recognize projects recently completed in compliance with County zoning (that is, do not make recently-completed projects non-conforming);
- Support the County’s plans for two urban centers (Ash Way and Hwy 99 / 148th St.) and apply new designations appropriate to the special purpose and character of these areas;
- Develop zone for Scriber Creek Village;
- Meet growth targets (population and employment) from Buildable Lands process; either within MUGA areas or by increasing densities in other areas of the City.
- Use annual Comprehensive Plan updates to refine the MUGA land use map based upon ongoing community outreach before and after annexation.
### Lynnwood Planning Commission  
**Meeting of August 28, 2008**

#### Staff Report

|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**Lynnwood Dept. of Community Development — Staff Contact: Keith Maw, Senior Planner**

**ACTION**

Discussion only at this work session.

A public hearing on this proposal is scheduled for the Planning Commission meeting of September 11, 2008. Following the hearing, the Planning Commission will be asked to make recommendations on this proposed amendment to the City Council.

**PROPOSAL**

RCW 36.70A.080 allows for inclusion of optional elements in a GMA Comprehensive Plan. This amendment would add a new Energy & Sustainability Element to the plan.

**BACKGROUND**

The Municipal Code provides a process for annual consideration of amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Review of these amendments is a major component of the Planning Commission’s annual work program.

The City received a $30,000 grant from the Washington Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development in 2006 to develop a prototype GMA Energy Element. Staff briefed the commission on the preliminary results of this work on 4/26/2007.

Recent developments in the Legislature and court system have added impetus to the City’s desire to broaden consideration energy conservation, climate change, and sustainability into the City’s decision-making process.

**DECISION CRITERIA AND OTHER LEGAL CITATIONS**

The Implementation Element of the Comprehensive Plan states the following criteria for taking action on proposed Plan amendments:
“Each component of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment package shall be reviewed and approved only if it meets all of the following criteria:

- "The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act and will not result in Plan or regulation conflicts; and"
- "The proposal will change the development or use potential of a site or area without creating significant adverse impacts on existing sensitive land uses, businesses, or residents; and"
- "The proposed amendment can be accommodated by all applicable public services and facilities, including transportation; and"
- "The proposal will help implement the goals and policies of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan; and"
- "If the proposal could have significant impacts beyond the Lynnwood City Limits, it has been sent to the appropriate Snohomish County officials for review and comment."

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
A Determination of Non-Significance is being issued for this proposed amendment.

ANALYSIS/COMMENT
This proposal is intended to set the City government and the community on a new course by establishing sustainability (as defined in the draft Element) and energy conservation as fundamental principles of City operations and community activities. Just as stewardship of financial resources is a fundamental principle of City government, business operations and household management, the proposed Element would make stewardship of energy and other environmental resources a fundamental principle.

This element differs in several respects from other elements in the Comprehensive Plan. By setting out a new course/direction for public and private activities, and it is intended to lead to reconsideration of the goals and policies of the other Elements – this Element would serve as a first-among-equals for the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the impacts of climate change and sustainability are very broad, and full consideration of these impacts is not possible within a single amendment cycle. The proposed Element provides a framework for dealing with climate change and sustainability issues as well as an initial roadmap of actions required. In that way, the proposed element is “prospective” and begins a process to redefine City (and community) daily activities. Staff expects that increasingly detailed plans and recommendations will be forthcoming in 2009 and 2010, with full incorporation of sustainability principles in the 2011 update.

RECOMMENDATION
No action at this work session.

ATTACHMENT
Energy & Sustainability Element Initial Draft version 8-22-08
ENERGY & SUSTAINABILITY ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

We live in a time of ever-increasing demands on our environment. Energy, climate change, and sustainability are three closely related issues that are driving major changes in the way that communities and their local governments function. Despite significant gains in productivity and energy efficiency, we continue to increase our consumption of energy. Energy and natural resource consumption is growing at an even higher rate across the globe, as developing economies strive to attain higher living standards. This growth is challenged by declining resources – fossil fuels, water, land, and air. Worldwide increases in energy consumption competing for dwindling resources will result in higher and more volatile prices for petroleum products and will drive the development of renewable and distributed energy systems. Efforts to mitigate climate change will further change our use of fossil fuels, increasing prices as carbon caps or similar measures are implemented. The challenge of sustainability is to achieve a balance between resource supplies and societal demand that can be continued for future generations. In order to assure that these future generations will have adequate resources and working ecological systems, we must increase our efforts to plan for sustainable development and land use practices. The challenge of planning for energy, climate change, and sustainability will also require the development of new tools and approaches to comprehensive planning.

It is the intent of this inaugural Energy & Sustainability Element to establish the intention of the City to fully embrace sustainability as a strategic principle framing a set of values from which critical current and future decisions made in the city will take direction and focus. It includes an examination of the current planning and regulatory context around these three issues – energy, climate change, and sustainability. The element is prospective in intent, focusing on a framework for establishing city goals and policies and the application of those policies to existing elements of the comprehensive plan, offering only a few specific new policies. It is anticipated that the 2009 and 2010 updates to the Comprehensive Plan will expand and more fully develop this framework, leading to a full integration of sustainability policies in the 2011 major update.

Lynnwood’s efforts will initially focus on the twin challenges of climate change and unprecedented changes in world energy markets. These issues are at the core of the larger question of sustainability, and demand immediate attention if we are later to have sufficient
resources to deal with the broader relationships between community and environment over the following decades.

PLANNING CONTEXT

The Sustainability Imperative

The harsh economic reality of $4 gasoline and growing concern over global warming has brought renewed focus to energy and sustainability planning. The modern roots of our concern with environmental pollution and its effects on worldwide ecosystems can be marked as the first American Earth Day in 1972. Sustainability and associated concepts were first addressed at the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Subsequently, the United Nations in 1983 created the World Commission on Environment and Development. The commission was headed by former Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland. In 1987 the commission published its report, Our Common Future, now generally remembered as the “Brundtland report.” The report established a foundational definition of sustainability – “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” — that still serves us well today.

The Resource Funnel concept (diagram at right) illustrates our dilemma. We live in a global economic system with a declining supply of life sustaining resources, but with an increasing demand for these resources – both renewable and non-renewable. The combination of these two forces is continually narrowing our margin for action – without action we will likely reach a point where we have insufficient resources to meet our demands. Overall, the challenge is to both reduce the decline in resources by strengthening our natural systems and to reduce resource demands by becoming more efficient producers and consumers.

Sustainability is a very broad concept and principle. While the effective range of influence that a community can have on sustainability is considerable, we will be most effective by focusing on a narrow set of initial objectives: city operations; decision-making and community action directed at energy conservation; ecoliteracy; climate change; health; and associated public policy and local economic development issues. At the same time, the city can adopt the basic framework of sustainability as guideposts for all of our operations and decisions. The elements of this framework are addressed in more detail in the Goals area of the element.

Global Energy and Climate Change Issues

Energy is our most immediate sustainability challenge. We are clearly in a narrowing “funnel” of increasing demand and declining supplies of petroleum – a fossil fuel that
pervades nearly every aspect of modern life. But as the case with many sustainability issues, the problem does not stop there. We now have conclusive evidence that greenhouse gas emissions from our increasing worldwide use of petroleum and other fossil fuels are changing the global climate.

In 1988, two United Nations organizations, the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Program, established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to assess the "scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant for the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change." Over the past twenty years, the IPCC has released periodic assessments. The First Assessment, completed in 1990, supported the negotiations at the 1992 Rio de Janeiro "Earth Summit" leading to creation of UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. The U.S. ratified the convention in October, 1992.

In the intervening years, there has been a growing consensus in the worldwide scientific community around the role of manmade (anthropogenic) greenhouse gases (GHG) in increasing global warming. This consensus reached a critical milestone in February 2007 with the release of the Fourth Assessment, which concluded that "warming of the climate system is unequivocal"4, and that "[m]ost of the global average warming over the past 50 years is very likely due to anthropogenic increases." In scientific terms, "very likely" means at least a 90% probability. The Washington State Department of Ecology estimate that temperatures in the Pacific Northwest will warm by 0.5° per decade5, and the University of Washington Climate Impacts Group warns of widespread environmental impacts including rising sea levels, increasing percentage of annual precipitation as rainfall, increase in irrigation demands, increased susceptibility of forests to disease and wildfire, and varied human health impacts6.

**Washington State Government Response**

While the federal government has been slow in responding to the challenge of global climate change, many state governments -- including Washington -- have launched serious programs aimed at mitigating GHG emissions and adapting to climate change impacts.

**Governor’s Climate Change Initiative**

On February 7, 2007, Governor Gregoire signed Executive Order No. 07-02 directing the departments of Ecology and Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) to lead the "Washington Climate Change Challenge". In the order, the Governor noted several significant actions previously undertaken by the state, including the 2005 Clean Car Act, the widely acclaimed Energy Code, and citizen approval of the Washington Clean Energy Initiative (I-937). The order, for the first time, formally established statewide GHG emissions reduction targets:

- **By 2020**, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels (10MMT below 1994)
- **By 2035**, reduce GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels (30MMT below 1994)
- **By 2050**, "do it’s part” to reach climate stabilization by reducing emissions to 50% below 1990 levels

The order also directed Ecology and CTED to create what became known as the Governor’s Climate Action Team8, or CAT. The Climate Action Team then formed five Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and five Preparation/Adaptation Working Groups (PAWG) to research specific measures for achieving the targets.
During 2007 and early 2008, the CAT held several public meetings and released numerous interim reports, including policy evaluations from the TWGs and PAWGs. The 2008 Climate Change Interim Report, Leading the Way on Climate Change: The Challenge of Our Time, identifies twelve recommendations for a “broad, flexible and long-term response to Washington’s Climate Change Challenge.”

- **Recommendation 1**: Build market-based mechanisms to unleash investment in the creativity and innovation of Washington’s economy to deliver cost effective emission reductions.
- **Recommendation 2**: Establish emissions reporting so that progress in emission reduction can be tracked and acknowledged.
- **Recommendation 3**: Analyze greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation options early in decision-making, planning processes, and development projects.
- **Recommendation 4**: Invest in worker training for the emerging clean economy to ensure having a skilled workforce and to provide meaningful employment opportunities throughout the state.
- **Recommendation 5**: Build and continue to redesign communities that offer real and reliable alternatives to single occupancy vehicles.
- **Recommendation 6**: Ensure Washington has vehicles that are as efficient as possible and use non-carbon or lower carbon intensity fuels developed sustainably from regional resources.
- **Recommendation 7**: Focus investments in Washington’s transportation infrastructure to prioritize moving people and goods cleanly and efficiently.
- **Recommendation 8**: Design, build, upgrade, and operate new and existing buildings and equipment to maximize energy efficiency.
- **Recommendation 9**: Deliver energy from lower or non-carbon sources and more efficient use of fuels.
- **Recommendation 10**: Restore and retain the health and vitality of Washington’s farms and forest lands to increase carbon sequestration and storage in forests and forest products, reduce the releases of greenhouse gas emissions, and support the provision of biomass fuels and energy.
- **Recommendation 11**: Reduce waste and Washington’s emissions of GHGs through improved product choices and resource stewardship.
- **Recommendation 12**: Allocate sufficient state resources to maintain Washington’s leadership role regionally and nationally and to fulfill its responsibilities for structuring and guiding implementation of emission reduction strategies.

While each of these recommendations will have some impact on local government, seven of them – #2, #3, #5, #7, #8, #10, and #11 – depend upon some level of local government action.

**Legislative Policies and Actions**

Following upon Governor Gregoire’s Executive Order 07-02, the 2007 legislature enacted ESSB 6001, effectively codifying the administrative targets in the Executive Order. In the following session, the legislature took the additional step, through HB2815, replacing the administrative targets with legally binding, enforceable targets. The 2008 legislation also directed Ecology and CTED to:

- develop specific policy recommendations for reducing emissions and implementing several recommendations of the Governor’s Climate Action Team;
- develop systems for monitoring and reporting GHG emissions by large emitters;
coordinate with the Western Climate Initiative to develop a regional cap-and-trade
system for GHG emissions, including methods for local government

Perhaps most importantly for local government, HB2815 recognized the major contribution of
transportation to GHG emissions, and established benchmarks\textsuperscript{10} for reducing \textit{per capita}
vehicle miles of travel:
\begin{itemize}
  \item 18 percent by 2020;
  \item 30 percent by 2035; and
  \item 50 percent by 2050.
\end{itemize}

The 2008 legislature also recognized the importance of land development and transportation
decisions and critical role of the state’s Growth Management Act (GMA) in reducing GHG
emissions. As initially proposed SB 6580 would have placed significant new responsibilities
on local government, adding climate change language to the GMA goals and requiring a
climate change element. While these dramatic changes were not enacted in 2008, SB6580
as passed into law requires CTED to review possible changes to GMA required to meet the
GHG emissions reductions goals set forth in HB2815 and to report these recommendations to
the legislature by December 1, 2008. SB6580 also expands CTED technical assistance role in
developing protocols for measuring the GHG emissions impacts of local land use decisions,
and created a small competitive grant program.

\textbf{The Western Climate Initiative}

The Western Climate Initiative (WCI) is a collaborative effort between seven western states
and four Canadian provinces to establish regional strategies to address climate change. The
primary efforts of WCI have been directed toward the creation of a framework for a regional
cap-and-trade system for reducing GHG emissions. While simple in concept, realization of a
workable cap-and-trade system deals with a very complex set of relationships required
for allocation of emissions among the region’s impacted industries, determination of available
offsets, standardizing emissions measurement, and working with the complexities of the
regional electrical generation and supply system.

\textbf{Washington’s Growth Management Act (GMA)}

While the GMA does not directly address the issue of climate change, several broad GMA
goals – reducing sprawl, encouraging efficient multimodal transportation systems, preserving
agricultural and resource land, and protecting the environment – are common to most
climate change action plans. RCW 36.70A.080 allows for inclusion of optional elements, and
the Energy & Sustainability Element is incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan in that
spirit. As noted above, there are likely to be significant changes to GMA in response to
evolving state climate change policies. By adopting this Energy & Sustainability Element, the
City is taking a major step towards compliance with these emerging requirements.

\textbf{The Emerging Regulatory Framework – Two Key Federal Court Cases}

While a federal climate change policy has been very slow to develop, both environmental
groups and state governments have challenged the adequacy of the implementation of
current environmental law. Two important federal court cases in 2007 have altered the
regulatory landscape. In April 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court issued an opinion in
\textit{Massachusetts v. EPA}, holding that carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}) was an air pollutant subject to
Under terms of the Agreement, participating cities commit to take following three actions:

- Strive to meet or beat the Kyoto Protocol targets in their own communities, through actions ranging from anti-sprawl land-use policies to urban forest restoration projects to public information campaigns;
- Urge their state governments, and the federal government, to enact policies and programs to meet or beat the greenhouse gas emission reduction target suggested for the United States in the Kyoto Protocol -- 7% reduction from 1990 levels by 2012; and
- Urge the U.S. Congress to pass the bipartisan greenhouse gas reduction legislation, which would establish a national emission trading system.

Local Government Response

Local governments across the U.S., and especially in Washington and Oregon, have been in a leadership role in formulating a response to the challenge of climate change. The cities of Seattle, Portland, Olympia, Kirkland and Bellingham, as well as King County, have been early adopters of programs aimed at reducing GHG emissions and, more recently, using SEPA as one tool. But beyond individual local actions, success in dealing with the complexities of climate change and creating a sustainable economy requires the development of strong networks to cooperatively develop solutions. Two of these networks will be especially helpful to the City of Lynnwood in formulating goals and implementing solutions.

USCM Climate Protection Agreement

On February 16, 2005, the Kyoto Protocol for the reduction of greenhouse gases became law in the 141 countries. On the same day, Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels began a campaign to encourage U.S. cities to strive to meet the goals of the Kyoto Protocol through their own local initiatives. By the 2005 U.S. Conference of Mayors annual meeting in June, 2005, Mayor Nickels and eight other mayors had gathered 141 signatures to the original version of what was to become the “U.S. Mayors Climate Protection Agreement.” By May 2007, 500 cities had signed on; as of August 15, 2008, some 850 cities – including 32 in Washington State – had become signatories to the agreement. Under terms of the Agreement, participating cities commit to take following three actions:
ICLEI Local Governments for Sustainability

The International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives – ICLEI – is an international association of local governments dedicated to climate protection chartered in 1990. ICLEI USA was founded in 1995 and counts 32 Washington State cities and counties among its more than 450 members.

Originally conceived to establish local laws to phase out ozone-depleting chemicals, ICLEI built upon this success to address broader sustainability issues. In 2003, members voted to change the name to ICLEI—Local Governments for Sustainability to reflect this broader mandate. Through ICLEI’s Cities for Climate Protection campaign, local governments and funding organizations have come together to create a range of tools and support programs to help local governments measure their needs, create local actions programs, and measure success toward these community-based goals. ICLEI has been successful in attracting funding to develop tools for local government, including development of web-based software tools underwritten by Microsoft and the Clinton Foundation.

The ICLEI Five Milestone Process

Organizing an effort to deal effectively with the challenge of climate change can be a daunting task. The ICLEI Cities for Climate Protection campaign has developed a set of five important milestones to serve as a broad framework.

1. Conduct a baseline emissions inventory and forecast

The baseline inventory is the important first step towards understanding the energy needs of our community. The emissions inventory describes how various activities in the community contribute to GHG emissions, both now and in the future. The inventory separately tracks emissions from municipal operations and community activities. ICLEI’s Clean Air and Climate Protection (CACP) software provides a tool to create an emissions inventory for at least a base year and a forecast year.

2. Adopt an emissions reduction target for the forecast year

The reduction target is the specific GHG emissions reductions goal for the community. It is expressed as a percentage reduction to be achieved in the target year relative to the baseline year. The target makes a clear statement of the local government’s commitment and provides a framework to guide planning and implementation.

3. Develop a Local Action Plan

The Local Action Plan describes the policies and measures that will be undertaken to reach the emissions reduction target. Plans should include timelines, financing mechanisms, and assignment of responsibilities for implementation. Strong community input, both from residents and business, should be included in order to build stakeholder consensus needed to implement the chosen measures. ICLEI provides the Climate and Air Pollution Planning Assistant (CAPPa) Decision Support Tool to assist in the process of identifying and prioritizing measures that fit each community’s needs.

4. Implement policies and measures

The local government implements the policies and measures contained in the Local Action Plan. Some measures – so-called “low hanging fruit” such as interior lighting efficiency and
traffic signal retrofits – may be implemented in advance of the Local Action Plan. Other policies and measures that require new capital investments or changes in organizational culture will required a level of cooperation and political will that will likely only evolve following consensus on the Local Action Plan coupled with some early successes.

5. Monitor progress and report results

The monitoring program measures and verifies that the policies and measures are having the desired effect. Feedback provides local government and the community with a sense of success from implementing the measures in the action plan. Monitoring also can be used to alter measures or the Local Action Plan as required to help achieve reduction targets. Annual updates of the emissions inventory, using CACP, are an important tool in monitoring progress. The new ICLEI – US Green Building Council Star Community Index will provide a standardized framework for tracking and evaluation of community sustainability projects. Other tools, like the EPA’s Energy Star Portfolio Manager, can help in tracking and evaluating energy use by municipal buildings.

Lynnwood’s Role in Energy & Sustainability

What can the City of Lynnwood, or any other community, do to help meet the climate change challenge? Public attention has been focused by media coverage of alternative energy, fuel economy standards, melting glaciers and ice caps, and vanishing species, little attention, if any, attention has been given to the role of local governments and communities. But as the Governor’s Climate Action Team has so clearly pointed out, local government in fact has a crucial role in guiding communities through the kinds of changes needed to slow and eventually stabilized GHG emissions. Transportation and buildings are the two largest contributors to GHG emissions. While state and federal governments can do their part by mandating higher efficiency standards for vehicles and appliances, providing higher funding levels for transit, and supporting development of alternative energy sources, these policies are only half-measures without complementary changes in locally controlled land use patterns, building codes, and infrastructure that allow these larger initiatives to have real impact.

What has Lynnwood done?

Our City has made some wise investments and decisions in the past few years in recognition of its responsibility to reduce energy consumption and begin planning for a climate change. Under a low-interest loan program from the State of Washington, the City was able to make several investments in energy-efficient technologies, with annual estimated savings in excess of $50,000:

- Replace incandescent lighting in traffic signals with LEDs
- Modify motors and pumps in the wastewater treatment plant
- Update lighting and HVAC systems in the library and civic center complex

While Lynnwood’s Comprehensive Plan has recognized a few sustainability issues, it has lacked a comprehensive treatment of energy issues. In 2006, the City pursued and was awarded a $30,000 competitive grant towards the development of an Energy Element. While this grant, a first for CTED, was able to underwrite the development of an initial energy inventory and explore policy options, matching city resources were insufficient to either complete the inventory or fully develop a model element.
What do we need to do next?

Local governments are a key to success in dealing with climate change and other emerging challenges to sustainability. Lynnwood should:

- **Lead by example** – As one of the largest and most visible enterprises in the local community, Lynnwood can exercise both significant market power and provide leadership in demonstrating sustainable solutions.

- **Empower our citizens** – Lynnwood can empower citizens to make sustainable choices by removing antiquated zoning and building code restrictions and providing incentives to make sustainable choices.

- **Regulate when markets fail** – Market mechanisms are frequently absent or too slow to act. Lynnwood can develop and enforce zoning and building regulations to accelerate adoption of new technologies and elimination of wasteful practices.

- **Act as a regional partner** – The city can also act as the voice of the community in proposing and implementing regional sustainability solutions that are beyond the capability of any single local government.

- **Education** – As the city gains experience with climate change mitigation and sustainable development measures, this knowledge can be shared with local business and citizens through outreach programs and environmental education initiatives such as E3 Washington. The city is in a unique position to establish partnerships with energy utilities, developers, the construction industry, and local educational institutions to build sustainability as a community value.

## INITIAL ENERGY INVENTORY

Our baseline inventory is a crucial step in understanding how both city government as an enterprise and the broader community use energy. Analysis of these energy use patterns leads to estimates of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Although the initial energy inventory is not complete, we know enough to make a few key observations. Transportation, at 46%, is the largest use of energy in the community. As nearly all of this energy is in the form of liquid petroleum (gasoline and diesel fuels), transportation accounts for a full 76% of Lynnwood’s GHG emissions. This percentage is significantly higher than the statewide contribution of 52%. Residential buildings account for another 21% of our energy use, while commercial buildings add about 21%. Electricity, at 29% ranks second behind petroleum as an energy source, but contributes only 19% of our GHG emissions due to our abundance of hydroelectric power.

## SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- Sustainability critical to long term growth of the community
- Energy is the first critical issue
- Local government has a key role
- Solutions are available
- State and federal governments are moving – it’s time to get on board
Comprehensive Plan

Additional text TBD

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Overview

As stated in the Introduction, the Energy & Sustainability Element is different in both structure and intent than other element of the Comprehensive Plan. Rather than a statement of detailed city policies, the Goals, Objective, and Policies section provides an initial high-level blueprint to guide the city’s actions over the next three years. Most objectives and policies will be developed over this time period and incorporated into the major update of the Comprehensive Plan required in 2011. Those specific objectives and policies that are presented are in areas where either a substantive need has already been demonstrated or where the performance of certain activities – such as completion of the emissions inventory or developing the local climate action plan – are necessary steps to support overall goals.

GOAL 1: Sustainability

Fully embrace Sustainability as a key strategic principle providing direction and focus for current and future critical city decisions.

Subgoal E&S-1.1: Sustainability Framework

The city establishes the following framework for guiding actions and moving toward creating a Sustainable Lynnwood. In order to be sustainable the City must make choices that:

- Reduce our dependence upon fossil fuels, extracted underground metals, and minerals
- Reduce our dependence on chemicals and other manufactured substances that can accumulate in nature
- Reduce our dependencies on activities that harm life-sustaining ecosystems
- Meet the hierarchy of present and future human needs fairly and efficiently

Subgoal E&S-1.2: Sustainability as a Strategic Principle

The city will seek to establish sustainable practices in the conduct of all city programs, services, operations, and capital projects.

Policy E&S-1.2.1  Sustainability, as a key strategic principle, is the responsibility of all elected officials, appointed officials, employees of the City, citizens, and business
Subgoal E&S-1.3: Incorporate Sustainability principles into city comprehensive and operational plans.

Policy E&S-1.3.1 Future amendments to the city comprehensive plan and operational plans will include consideration of sustainability principles. This policy will be phased in coordination with existing schedules and planned updates and be fully implemented by 2011.

GOAL 2: Climate Change

Develop a Lynnwood local action plan response to the challenge of climate change that reflects the unique situation of our community and the need to develop and monitor plans with time horizons of forty (40) years or longer.

Subgoal E&S-2.1: Develop a Lynnwood response to the challenge of climate change through the use of the ICLEI Five Milestone process.

Milestone-1: Conducting an Emissions Analysis

Policy E&S-2.1.1 The City, under the leadership of the Community Development department and with the full cooperation and action of all other city departments, will complete the baseline inventory by January 31, 2009.

Policy E&S-2.1.2 The initial baseline inventory will describe energy use and emissions separately for city government operations and the community as a whole with a primary 2006 base year.

Policy E&S-2.1.3 The baseline inventory will include estimates of city government and community energy use and emissions for a secondary 1990 base year to assure compatibility with emissions targets derived from the Kyoto protocol and to assure recognition and calculation of energy efficiency measures adopted by the city prior to 2006.

Policy E&S-2.1.4 The baseline inventory will include forecasts of energy use and emissions for the future target years of 2020, 2035, and 2050 consistent with state targets.

Milestone-2: Setting the Target

Policy E&S-2.2.1 The City, under the leadership of the Community Development department and with the full support cooperation of all other city departments, shall set emissions reduction targets no later than _____, 2009.

Policy E&S-2.2.2 Emissions targets shall reflect Lynnwood’s fair-share proportion of statewide emission reduction targets established under HB2815.

Milestone-3: Developing the Climate Action Plan

Policy E&S-2.3.1 The City will develop a focused Climate Action Plan (CAP) for city government operations no later than _____, 2009. The effort to develop the CAP shall be led by the Community Development department with the full cooperation of all city departments.
Policy E&S-2.3.2 The Mayor will establish a "Green Team" consisting of at least one representative of each department to develop and review measures for incorporation into the plan.

Policy E&S-2.3.3 The Mayor will appoint a Green Ribbon Task Force to guide development of a comprehensive, community wide Climate Action Plan (CAP). This effort will be jointly coordinated by the Community Development and Economic Development departments. The City will make its best efforts to complete the initial draft of the plan by _______ 2009.

Milestone-4: Implementing the Climate Action Plan

Policy E&S-2.4.1 The citywide "Green Team" shall submit recommendations for implementation priorities as a part of the initial CAP. Recommended measures that may have budget impacts for the 2010 mid-biennium budget shall be identified and presented to departments. The departments will review the potential costs and benefits of these measures and develop decision packages for the mid-biennium budget.

Policy E&S-2.4.2 Departments are encouraged to analyze their own operations to identify and implement measures that provide immediate energy savings or GHG emissions reductions without significant budget impact.

Milestone-5: Monitoring Progress and Reporting Results

Policy E&S-2.5.1 The city will establish a public and transparent process for monitoring the results of both city government and community measures.

Policy E&S-2.5.2 All recommendations proposed under Milestone 3 should be, to the greatest extent possible, linked to measurable objectives that can be clearly reported to employees and our citizens.

Subgoal E&S-2.2: Incorporating Climate Change into the Environmental Review Process

Policy E&S-2.2.1 The Community Development department, in cooperation with the Public Works department, shall establish an interim process for incorporating consideration of GHG emissions into the city’s environmental review process under SEPA no later than _______ 2009. These procedures shall include an emissions schedule and applicant-friendly estimating methodology and apply only to such developments that are over a reasonable threshold as determined by the SEPA responsible official.

Policy E&S-2.2.2 Upon completion of new SEPA guidance from the Washington State Department of Ecology, and after review by the Mayor’s Green Ribbon Task Force, the City shall adopt these revised procedures as required by law.

Subgoal E&S-2.3: Incorporate Climate Change considerations into city comprehensive and operational plans.

Policy E&S-2.3.1 Future amendments to the city comprehensive plan and operational plans will incorporate climate change considerations. This policy will be phased in coordination with existing schedules and planned updates and be fully implemented by 2011.
IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation requirements for the Energy & Sustainability Element are contained within the element itself, and are not reflected in the Implementation Element at this time. As the activities required under this Element are completed, additional specific implementation requirements will be added.

---
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