

Douglas Dolleman

1 □ "It's not enough to meet Washington's climate goals."
Washington's Climate Commitment Act (CCA) revenue is hundreds of millions per year, so \$136M is "a drop in the bucket."

Climate impacts (wildfires, drought, flooding) are accelerating faster than the state's investments.

The budget delays or underfunds major clean-energy infrastructure, especially grid modernization and community resilience hubs.

2 □ "The money is too scattered and lacks accountability."
Fiscal watchdog groups argue the funding is spread across too many small programs, making it hard to measure results.

Funds are divided into dozens of grants with no unified performance metrics.

Commerce's clean-energy programs have limited public reporting on outcomes.

Some grants go to pilot projects that "sound good" but don't scale.

3 "Clean-energy spending is driving up costs for families."
Carbon-auction costs are passed to consumers through fuel prices.

Clean-energy grants benefit agencies and nonprofits more than households.

The state should focus on cost-of-living relief, not climate programs.