



SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE SDC 2.0 OUTLINE

DOEE released the Sustainable DC 2.0 Outline for public comment from June 14 through July 15, 2018. The community weighed in during a series of listening sessions, via email, and using an online platform that allowed users to comment directly and publically in the document. After the comment period closed, DOEE reviewed and incorporated feedback into the DRAFT Sustainable DC 2.0 plan that was released to the public on August 30, 2018. The DRAFT Sustainable DC 2.0 plan is open for public comment through September 30, 2018.

While the majority of feedback received from the public came from individuals, DOEE also received comments from 10 groups, including environmental organizations, business groups, and federal and local government agencies. A total of 105 unique users registered and provided 488 comments.

Feedback from the listening sessions, emails, and online platform fell into a few broad thematic categories. Below is a snapshot of the most common themes that emerged.

- ***The timeline, intensity, or scope of an action is not ambitious enough:*** DOEE received approximately 70 comments asking that the plan strengthens actions, or a critique that an action was not sufficiently ambitious. For example, commenters in the Waste section urged expanding the bans on waste products (WS1.3) to other items, like single-use plastic bottles. Other comments focused on action timing: a comment on EN1.5, which aims to launch a behavioral campaign around individual energy consumption by 2023, urged the city to launch the campaign immediately.
- ***Clarify the language in the plan and/or clarify how and when actions will be tracked and completed; define sustainability or “green”; make SDC 2.0’s language accessible to residents:*** DOEE received over 60 requests for clarifications on how actions would be executed, monitored, or completed, or what an action’s timeline would be. An additional four comments requested clarification on baseline years, particularly in the Energy and Climate sections. Finally, at least five comments sought clarification on the definition of “sustainability” or “green” when these words appeared in action titles. DOEE also received a couple comments requesting that plan language be more accessible and resident-friendly.
- ***Biophilia-related comments:*** DOEE received many subject-specific comments on the topic of biophilic design. Biophilic design is the practice of incorporating nature into the places where we live, play, and work, to reduce stress and improve health. The comments on biophilic design urged DOEE to do a better job of connecting humans to nature throughout the plan.
- ***Processes and policies used by District Government should be user-friendly and aligned with established standards or best practices:*** DOEE received several comments urging that policies used by the government be user-friendly, and that any certifications, standards, etc. used by the government should align with pre-existing standards rather than having the District “reinvent the wheel” by developing its own standards. For example, for action EN1.3 (“Replace all street and public lighting with high efficiency fixtures that protect public health, reduce light pollution, and



don't harm wildlife.”), a contributor suggested that lighting requirements should follow guidelines from the International Dark Sky Association.

- ***Develop or expand educational or other programs to incentivize or support residential behavioral change:*** DOEE received 15 comments noting the importance of supporting behavior change initiatives in the Waste, Food, and Energy sections. For example, in the Waste section, contributors advocated for programs to help educate residents on recycling and composting in tandem with waste minimization. In the Food section, a contributor suggested engaging in educational campaigns regarding food date labels at the local level to help consumers distinguish between safety and quality when purchasing food.
- ***Incentivize shared or community use of resources:*** Many commentators observed the potential for communities or buildings to pool resources. In the Waste section, for example, a contributor suggested pooling trash, recycling, and compost receptacles amongst buildings. Similarly, contributors voiced support of neighborhood-scale energy systems for distributed generation and for heating/cooling.
- ***Highlight connections between different plan sections:*** Contributors were eager to understand the connections between different SDC topic areas and to have those connections be made more explicit in the plan. For example, a contributor to the Health section wanted transportation and air quality issues to be addressed in that section and a contributor in the Nature section urged that nature be incorporated more explicitly into the Built Environment section.