

If current climate policies stagnate, we're likely to end up with global warming of around 3°C by 2100. Which is scary, tragic, and far from acceptable. But this is good news – but how? In the last decade we've seen enough progress that most scientists now think that we have likely avoided apocalyptic climate change. Although substantial risk remains, we can confidently say that humanity will survive. Civilization might have to change, but it will endure. Which begs the question: What's changed over the last ten years and is this good news?

The last decade has been an immense failure for climate policies around the world. Instead of passing comprehensive, binding bills that would meaningfully reduce emissions, we mostly did: nothing. A lost decade of breaking one alarming climate change record after another. This story is true and it's one reason that so many people are giving up. But it's not the whole picture. Despite the lack of climate policies and ongoing lobbying and misinformation from the fossil fuel industries, there was a lot of progress in shifting to renewable energy. Let's go back 20 years to see why today is so different.

Between 2000 and 2010, greenhouse gas emissions had grown by 24%, three times as much as the increase in the previous decade. Subsidies for fossil fuels, aimed at promoting economic growth, caused a colossal increase in fossil fuel consumption. For developing countries like China and India, coal was the cheapest fuel for growth, and rich countries showed little interest in changing their carbon-emitting ways. In 2010, many people expected these trends to continue. Instead of decreasing fossil fuel use, its consumption was expected to rise. The next decade turned out to be very different though.

First, coal burning in developing countries like India has slowed down or leveled off, like in China. And it's plummeted in rich countries like the UK and US. Since 2015, ¾ of planned coal plants have been canceled, and 44 countries have committed to stop building them. Ten years ago, that would have seemed like wishful thinking, but today we can say with confidence: Coal is dying. It's just not competitive anymore, because technologies we thought would remain expensive, rapidly became cheaper instead.

Renewable electricity has shown explosive progress. In a mere decade, wind energy got three times cheaper. Solar electricity is now ten times cheaper! Cheaper than coal or any other fossil-fuel burning power plant, despite the massive subsidies and global infrastructure propping up fossil fuels.

There is 25 times more solar and nearly 5 times more wind electricity produced today than 10 years ago, which is of course not nearly enough. One of the biggest obstacles is the variability of renewable power output. Renewables need a lot of energy storage to be a reliable power source, like expensive batteries. Amazingly, battery prices have decreased by 97% in the past 30 years, 60% in the last decade alone – which will serve all kinds of green technology like electric cars.

To be continued...

From: [Susan Cozzens](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Item from the Audience
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 2:54:53 PM

External Email Warning! Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Mayor Birney and City Council Members,

We are a consortium of community groups who, for the last year, have focused on alternatives to law enforcement for mental health crisis response. We have been closely following the proposals for the levy and write with our concerns.

The currently proposed levy does address important needs. Redmond is growing and needs expanded fire services. Redmond also needs non-police response to mental health crises. Lasting public safety means investing in community-based programs that ensure all have access to resources and support to thrive.

We ask that November's public safety levy enhance the city's mental health emergency response as has been clearly requested by residents. The need for this has been demonstrated multiple times in recent Redmond experience. As with other health crises, the vast majority of mental health emergencies do not require a police response. The City has been learning about other national approaches, such as Community Responders, and other cities in our area are also in the process of moving towards this model.

Nationally, communities have asked and expected police to do many jobs that do not require their specific training and authority. We want the increasing demand for public safety services brought on by population growth to be met with a shift of some services to non-commissioned, civilian staff. Adding non-police positions will reduce the burden on a police department already struggling to fill existing openings.

We ask that you revise the levy language to affirm that:

- 1) The new investment in a mental health response team, separate from the existing co-responder, must be organizationally housed outside the police department. (This is the way many neighboring cities are moving as well.)
- 2) Any new positions in the police department will be for non-commissioned, civilian staff that cannot be converted to commissioned officer positions for the duration of the levy funding.

Redmond's proposed community responder program could thrive as a component of the medical response of the fire department. This would better meet community needs than being part of the police department.

In summary, while we see that the resources in the levy could open important possibilities for a move towards comprehensive community safety, there are elements that prevent us from supporting it in its current form. We would be happy to participate in future conversations and share any additional information that would be helpful.

Given the many weighty decisions associated with the levy, we would understand if you decided to postpone the proposal and take more time to structure it in a way that benefits everyone in our community.

Sincerely,

Eastside For All

Indivisible Eastside

Indivisible Kirkland

Susan Cozzens, Sue Burrus, Jodi Newman, Eastside Quaker Meeting

From: [Matt Scudder](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Items from the Audience
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 3:08:25 PM

External Email Warning! Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

I wanted to comment in support of the proposed tenant protections. I am a resident of Redmond, and I believe in protecting the people who live here. These simple requirements should be enacted, and made permanent:

- Requiring 120 days written notice of rent increases for more than 3%, and 180 days for 10% or more.
- Limiting late fees to 1.5% of monthly rent
- Limiting move in fees to 1 month's rent & allowing for paying in installments

These are simple steps which I believe can be made to help protect the people of Redmond from unfair rent increases, and allow them to have the dignity of having options if they do happen. Finding a new place to live takes valuable time, and often the only reason people are forced to accept an unfair level of rent increase is because they don't have enough time to find a new place. Today, that's not even always an option, with market rates for rent far outpacing incomes, this has a much greater impact on those below the poverty line. Please make these basic changes into permanent requirements, and take another step towards a more equitable Redmond.

Thank you all for listening,
Matt Scudder