

**FW: Climate Action Plan 2nd Set of Comments from J. Silva**

Climate &lt;Climate@montgomerycountymd.gov&gt;

Fri 2/26/2021 2:12 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]**From:** Jeff Silva [REDACTED]**Sent:** Friday, February 26, 2021 1:23 PM**To:** Climate <Climate@montgomerycountymd.gov>**Subject:** Climate Action Plan 2nd Set of Comments from J. Silva**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Sirs:

All in all, I agree with all the climate actions listed in Montgomery County (MC) solutions to the problems resulting from MC's GHG poisons production. It's just 40 years too late. But, we are all in this together so I studied much of MC's CAP because it is far better than what Maryland has to offer.

Figure 18: Montgomery County 2018 GHG inventory using a horizontal bar chart substantiates the last sentence on Pg. 56 that, "most of the County's 2018 emissions in annual metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year) come from residential and commercial building energy use (50%) and community transportation (42%)." Well said, those facts need to be mentioned repeatedly.

**1st what is missing from the CAP is a forecast, in dollars, of the harm those GHG poisons will inflict on MC, from each of the climate hazards listed on Pg. 33 by 2100 using RCP 8.5 conditions. And those losses need to be presented in a value that includes the cost of inflation estimated to occur by the same year.** Businessmen don't relate to anything that does not have a dollar value. That subgroup's pervasive economic influence over their employees and state officials will stop MC's climate actions before preparations are performed across the county to implement any non-government change of behavior designed to mitigate and adapt to Climate Change. Cost estimates should include costs of disruption to businesses and all people from the loss of that facility's function, such as a road being closed while a strip mall is flooded. MC adaptation cost estimates need to be totaled and distributed among MC's residents to counter the businessmen's condemnation of MC's climate actions based on short-term costs. If the loss of business activities caused by RCP 8.5 conditions in 2100 were given a dollar value, MC residents would have a powerful argument to support MC's CAP.

**The 2<sup>nd</sup> value missing from the CAP is linking the lives lost from the same four climate hazards mentioned on Pg. 33 that those hazards have claimed in other municipalities, such as extreme precipitation in Houston or Ellicott City, MD, wildfire events in California, loss of power from a brittle, centralized utility network as happened in Texas.** Without either estimates of lives lost, assets damaged and economic costs occurring during the events and recovery activities of both residents and businesses as provided by the County, the voter will only have cost estimates from businesses resisting the changes required to mitigate and adapt to Climate Change. Costs of resettling Climate Change refugees need to be estimated and published too.

I predict that MC will only be able to implement CAP's intra-government actions, because there isn't the estimated losses of dollars and lives resulting from 2100 RCP 8.5 conditions available and distributed among the County residents to counter the cost argument.

MC's own government CAP actions starting on Pg. 181 are unflinching and necessary. I agree with all of them.

Montgomery County CAP Public Engagement, Partnerships, and Education Climate Actions P-1 through P-20 are futile without the County cost estimates of 2100 RCP 8.5 conditions damaging property, damaging and interrupting businesses, taking lives and causing people to migrate. All the good intentions that are the basis of risk management will be crushed by the Chamber of Commerce mobilizing to stop and eliminate MC's CAP because the public does not have the dollar cost that the County will pay and loss of revenue resulting from forecasted 2100 RCP 8.5 events. Those cost estimates are crucial to countering the argument that MC climate actions cost too much. Those cost estimates would be useful for convincing Maryland state officials to cooperate with MC implementing the overwhelming number to above the county jurisdiction actions described in its CAP for the county to be successful. But Maryland hasn't bothered to estimate the costs it will suffer from year 2100 damage caused by Climate Change losses of assets, decrease of revenue and civil destruction from migration due to lack of drinking water and food. That is because the governor's office is occupied by someone who's political party says government is the problem and Climate Science is wrong.

The What Can I Do section is good because it provides guidance for useful individual action. It needs to include the instruction to seek the recommendations from credible climate mitigation and nature preservation groups that have endorsed candidates for public offices during all elections. If all our current office holders had endorsements from those advocacy groups we would not be staring at our extinction.

Below are responses to MC CAP <https://aecomviz.com/CAP360/> website alerts sent to Maryland MCCC members.

From Susan Casey -MDE-; Climate Change Program Communications Manager; Feb 8, 2021

Office of Communications

Maryland Department of the Environment

To Jeff Silva, two messages---

Hello, Jeff. Thank you for your thoughtful email filled with Montgomery County resources. We will review everything. Right now we are scrambling to finish the GGRA Plan to submit to the governor and General Assembly. I'll share with others.

Jeff, I just took a quick look at some of the links your provided. I can tell you the state doesn't have the resources (\$\$\$\$) to pull off such a sophisticated site. I have "visitor" site. I haven't tried it on my cell phone yet, but that is the bigger test.

Susan

I have sent the link to MC's CAP to all my friends and acquaintances. Thanks again for your excellent CAP. It makes me proud to be a resident of Montgomery County.

Jeff Silva