

From: mcgavin_ted@comcast.net
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 01/17/2023 City Council Meeting: Agenda Item 7-B (Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan)
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 5:52:47 PM

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog, and Councilmembers Vella, Herrera Spencer, and Jensen:

I have been an Alameda resident since 1977 and make a point of voting in every election.

I disagree with the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan because I think it is inequitable and is poorly thought-out:

- It is inequitable because it mandates electrification, rather than making it optional. I think it is reasonable for the City to assist building owners (homeowners, landlords, and businesses) that wish to decarbonize, but it is totally unfair to saddle everyone else with these electrification expenses. If the Council wants to totally electrify Alameda, it should put it to a vote!
- Requiring electrification prior to sale fails for economic reasons. Many homebuyers like me WANT the access to natural gas for cost, cooking, and backup generator use. If the City implements this plan, many homebuyers will look for homes outside of Alameda.
- Natural gas is much cheaper than electricity for most household and business uses. Some say that eventually electricity will be cheaper than natural gas. That is their opinion, and hope. Hope is not a strategy.
- The implementation of this Plan would greatly expand the demand on the current AMP and California electrical grids. The recurring blackouts prove that these grids are not able to support CURRENT demands, much less the greatly-expanded demands generated by this Plan.

Too much change, too costly, and too fast. Help those who want to electrify, but let the PEOPLE of Alameda make their own energy choices, please do not mandate this poorly thought-out change.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ted McGavin

mcgavin_ted@comcast.net

From: [Danielle Mieler](#)
To: apetrich@earthlink.net; [Manager Manager](#); [CityCouncil-List](#); [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Andrew Thomas](#); [Jennifer Ott](#); [Nicolas Procos](#)
Subject: RE: Item 7-B, January 17, 2023 Alameda City Council Agenda
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 4:24:00 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Dear Ms. Petrich,

Thank you for sharing your concerns and questions regarding the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. Please see staff responses to you questions below.

Best,

Danielle

Danielle Mieler | Sustainability and Resilience Manager
Direct: 510.747.4713
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Suite 300, Alameda, CA 94501



Begin forwarded message:

From: Alexandra Petrich <apetrich@earthlink.net>
Date: January 17, 2023 at 3:07:23 PM EST
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>, Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>, Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>, Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>, City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: **[EXTERNAL] Item 7-B, January 17, 2023 Alameda City Council Agenda**

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice-Mayor Daysog, and Councilmembers Vella, Spencer, and Jensen:

I am writing in opposition to the adoption of the "Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan," which is attached as Exhibit 1 to Item 7-B on the January 17, 2023, City Council Meeting.

I fully support incentives and rebates that encourage voluntary conversion of residences from gas to electricity. However, I have strong objections to the "Plan" submitted to the Council by the Planning Department or Planning Board (not clear which). The "Plan" is deficient in numerous ways, a few of which are listed below.

First, the "Plan" is so inartfully drafted that it is impossible to tell whether the planners

envision mandating this conversion from gas to electricity. It appears to me, however, that the intent is for the City to require all residential buildings to be converted from gas to electricity. Before voting on whether or not to approve this "Plan," the Council owes it to the residents and tax-payers of Alameda to clarify whether or not this proposal will be mandatory.

Response: The Decarb Plan does not require the conversion from gas to electricity. However, staff does believe that requirements may be necessary in the future. As described in the Council adopted Climate Action and Resiliency Plan, to decarbonize Alameda's building stock, there will need to be incentives, funding programs, and requirements.

The Decarb Plan is a "road map." There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan. The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda's building stock. Each step is initiated with public outreach and discussion. Each step will end with a City Council decision. The council will approve the next step only if the Council is comfortable with the next step. Endorsing the Decarb Plan does not prevent or "tie the hands" of this Council or any future Council or predetermine what a future City Council action must or will be on any future regulation.

Second, the City's communication with the residents of Alameda has been woefully inadequate. The "Electrification Workshop" that was supposedly held to communicate the City's intentions was not publicized, and the City failed to seek meaningful public participation. This proposal is the first I have heard of it, and I can say the same for all of my neighbors.

Response: Development of the plan relied heavily on community involvement and support. To date, multiple forms of community engagement have been used to provide education, and incorporate community knowledge and feedback into the draft Plan. Outreach began last March with a series of seven tailored workshops, conducted a community survey and a multi-family building owner survey, developed flyers in English, Spanish, and Chinese, tabled at farmers' markets, created a website and FAQ, sent email newsletters and social media posts, conducted outreach at the libraries, the draft plan was available for public review and presented to Public Utilities Board and Planning Board.

Third, the "Plan" is entirely silent with regard to any provision for the expansion of the existing electrical grid. More and more frequently, Alameda County experiences rolling blackouts when there is a high demand for electricity; thus, the more that demand increases, the more there will be lack of access to electricity. In addition, the rising numbers of electric vehicles will place even more demand on the electrical grid, and there continues to be an increased demand from the new housing being built, with mandated use of only electric appliances.

Response: Each year AMP prepares a forecast of the peak demand and energy requirements (load forecast) for the next 10 years. The load forecasts include assumptions about future population growth as well as electric vehicle and building electrification and energy efficiency upgrades. AMP has sufficient supplies for the near term and actively purchases additional supplies to meet long term growth.

Fourth, the "Plan" is entirely silent with regard to any provision for compensation to property owners for costs incurred in the conversion from gas to electricity -- apart from the mention of current rebates, which offer partial but nowhere near full compensation. In particular, to the extent that the "Plan" contemplates compelling owners of residences to fully convert from gas to electricity before they can sell their homes, it places an unfair and undue financial burden on the owners, many of whom are elderly.

Response: The plan does not require upgrading a building to 100% electric before being sold. The plan includes a description various time of sale requirements that could be considered in the future by the City Council. Any potential future requirements, such as a point of sale requirement, will require research, evaluation and include opportunities for public comment and participation throughout their development, as well as City Council and/or Public Utility Board approval for implementation. When staff considers requirements we absolutely will need to consider implications and financial support for those who need it. Electrification will only be successful if it is affordable and practical. That is why staff is proposing a phased, incremental approach that includes careful consideration of costs and challenges at each step of the process.

Fifth, the "Plan" is entirely silent with regard to the increased cost using electricity instead of gas. While this might possibly change in the future, it currently costs more to, for example, heat a home with electricity than with gas. Compelling this conversion from electricity to gas will place an increased financial burden on low- and moderate-income residents, as well as on seniors who are living on fixed incomes.

Response: All our research indicates that electrification will, for most buildings, result in higher electric bills and lower gas bills. Overall, cost effectiveness studies conducted for Alameda show that in 2022, with full home electrification, average utility bills in Alameda may increase slightly in the early years. However, with gas rates increasing much faster than electric rates, customers are projected to save money overall over a 30-year period. Additional utility savings can be realized through weather and energy efficiency measures and the additional of solar panels. Heat pump water heaters, heat pump space heaters/coolers and induction stoves have higher efficiency ratings than similar gas-fired appliances and AMP's rates are approximately 36% lower compared to PG&E electric rates. Much of the upfront costs of these installations can be covered with already available [rebates and incentives](#) from AMP, BayREN and other state and local programs. Again, staff must consider all of these issues in developing any future requirements to ensure they do not create undue burden on low income families,

seniors, renters and mom and pop landlords.

I urge you to vote "No" on the request that the Council adopt this proposal.

Very truly yours,
Alexandra Petrich

From: [Danielle Mieler](#)
To: [Jennifer Ott](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Nicolas Procos](#)
Cc: [CityCouncil-List](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: RE: Item 7B on agenda
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 4:05:41 PM

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey,

Thank you for sharing your concerns and questions regarding the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. The Decarb Plan establishes an 8-year series of steps for City Council consideration. There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan. Staff fully agrees that the impact to tenants in terms of cost and disruption must be considered in the implementation of the plan and any future program or requirement. Equity principles were drafted in this plan to ensure that such consideration is made front and center in any future proposal and that there will be ample opportunities for the community to provide input throughout implementation. The Decarb Plan is a “road map.” The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda’s building stock. The Decarb Plan lays out a roadmap for future public decision making about what the next steps should be. Each step is initiated with public outreach and discussion. Each step will end with a City Council decision. The council will approve the next step only if the Council is comfortable with the next step.

Best,
Danielle

Danielle Mieler | Sustainability and Resilience Manager
Direct: 510.747.4713
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Suite 300, Alameda, CA 94501

-----Original Message-----

From: Don Lindsey <donlindsey@jps.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 2:37 PM
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7B on agenda

Honorable Mayor and Council members:

We are opposed to all of Item 78 which is on your agenda tonight. Requiring owners to change to all electric may be the most onerous requirement that you could consider. Putting a burden like this on property owners will cause undo harm, especially with the city requirement to relocate tenants during any work done in their unit. Much of the housing in Alameda is old and conversion would mean tearing out walls and with today's costs, may be prohibitive for most folks. Please do not vote for this. Thank you for your consideration.
Don and Suzanne Lindsey

Sent from my iPad

From: [Catherine Egelhoff](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Ruth Abbe](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council item 7b
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 3:58:14 PM

Dear City Council members,

As Alameda residents , we strongly support the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. The reasons are many. The plan is a good start to helping us do what we can to decrease our carbon footprint. It does so in a fair manner. It is achievable.

Sincerely,
Catherine Egelhoff
Randall Block

From: [Ruth Abbe](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Agenda Item 7-B – Adoption of Resolution Adopting the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 3:50:33 PM
Attachments: [clip_image001.png](#)
[CASA letter of support for Equitable Decarbonization Plan.pdf](#)
[We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Please see our letter attached (and copied below) in Support for Agenda Item 7-B – Adoption of Resolution Adopting the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan.

Dear Members of the City Council:

Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda (CASA) was formed in 2008 to help the City of Alameda implement its Local Action Plan for Climate Protection (adopted in 2008) and its Climate Action and Resiliency Plan (adopted in 2019).

The Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan provides a road map for reducing carbon emissions from Alameda's building stock. It identifies potential new policies, programs, and incentives to help Alamedans transition from natural gas to electric appliances. Natural gas used in buildings accounts for 27 percent of Alameda's citywide greenhouse gas emissions. Transitioning away from using natural gas in buildings will also positively impact the health and safety of Alameda residents.

Natural gas produces the byproduct of nitrogen dioxide, an air pollutant that can reduce lung function, cause inflammation of airways, increase asthma attacks, and exacerbate other respiratory issues, according to the American Lung Association. A growing body of medical literature has established a link between cooking with gas and childhood asthma, including one meta-analysis from 2013 finding that children living in homes with gas stoves face a 42% increased risk of asthma symptoms and a 24% increased risk of an asthma diagnosis in their lifetimes.

The Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan provides a modest, measured, approach to ensure that Alameda renters, homeowners, and property owners can all benefit from Alameda Municipal Power's (AMP) 100% carbon-free power.

We strongly encourage the City Council to adopt the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan, which is an essential, and good first step, on the road to a more sustainable (and healthy) future.

Sincerely,



Ruth Abbe, Steering Committee

Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda

415-235-1356



January 17, 2023

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Vice Mayor Tony Daysog
Councilmember Tracy Jensen
Councilmember Trish Herrera Spencer
Councilmember Malia Vella

RE: Support for Agenda Item 7-B – Adoption of Resolution Adopting the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan

Dear Members of the City Council:

Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda (CASA) was formed in 2008 to help the City of Alameda implement its Local Action Plan for Climate Protection (adopted in 2008) and its Climate Action and Resiliency Plan (adopted in 2019).

The Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan provides a road map for reducing carbon emissions from Alameda's building stock. It identifies potential new policies, programs, and incentives to help Alamedans transition from natural gas to electric appliances. Natural gas used in buildings accounts for 27 percent of Alameda's citywide greenhouse gas emissions. Transitioning away from using natural gas in buildings will also positively impact the health and safety of Alameda residents.

Natural gas produces the byproduct of nitrogen dioxide, an air pollutant that can reduce lung function, cause inflammation of airways, increase asthma attacks, and exacerbate other respiratory issues, according to the American Lung Association. A growing body of medical literature has established a link between cooking with gas and childhood asthma, including one meta-analysis from 2013 finding that children living in homes with gas stoves face a 42% increased risk of asthma symptoms and a 24% increased risk of an asthma diagnosis in their lifetimes.

The Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan provides a modest, measured, approach to ensure that Alameda renters, homeowners, and property owners can all benefit from Alameda Municipal Power's (AMP) 100% carbon-free power.

We strongly encourage the City Council to adopt the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan, which is an essential, and good first step, on the road to a more sustainable (and healthy) future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth Abbe".

Ruth Abbe, Steering Committee
Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda
415-235-1356

From: [Laria Pippen](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Building Decarb Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 3:49:55 PM

Hello,

I am a 20+ year resident of Alameda, and am writing to express my support for the Building Decarbonization Plan. The health and survival of ecology depends on taking steps such as those laid out in this plan.

Respectfully,

Laria Pippen, RN, MSL
3030 Fernside

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Danielle Mieler](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#); [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#); [announcements@alamedacitizenstaskforce.org](#)
Cc: [Jennifer Ott](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Nicolas Procos](#)
Subject: RE: City Council Meeting on 01/17/2023-Agenda Item 7B/Decarbonization
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 3:24:22 PM

Dear Ms. Cozad,

Thank you for sharing your concerns and questions regarding the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. Please see staff responses to your questions below.

Best,
Danielle

Danielle Mieler | Sustainability and Resilience Manager
Direct: 510.747.4713
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Suite 300, Alameda, CA 94501

-----Original Message-----

From: pcozad [<mailto:pcozad@mac.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 7:04 AM
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>; announcements@alamedacitizenstaskforce.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting on 01/17/2023-Agenda Item 7B/Decarbonization

Question to the City Council Members:

1) Why wasn't this agenda item sent to the community via email from alameda@public.govdelivery.com? I heard about this meeting two nights ago from a friend and have expressed interest in the past by attending 2 electrification workshops

Response: Notification about this meeting was sent to the community on Jan 10 through the Environment, Sustainability and Climate Action mailing list as well as to all participants of the building electrification workshops.

2) 2030 is too soon when education, policies, funding, and incentives are not in place today (Federal Reduction Act is not expected to be ready until late 2023).

Response: The Decarb Plan establishes an 8-year series of steps for City Council consideration. The Decarb Plan is not expecting or proposing that all of Alameda's building stock will be electrified in 8 years. It will take significantly longer than 8 years to decarbonize Alameda's building stock. The Decarb Plan is a "road map." There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan. The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda's building stock.

3) How will the City gauge whether or not the community understands the scope of this proposed plan and its impact on them financially?

Response: The Plan includes recommendations for policies and programs that will help transition to electric appliances. Any policies considered in the implementation of this plan will require research, evaluation and include opportunities for public comment and participation throughout their development, as well as City Council and/or Public Utility Board approval for implementation.

Thank you, Penny Cozad

From: [Danielle Mieler](#)
To: [Manager Manager](#); [CityCouncil-List](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Cc: [Nicolas Procos](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Jennifer Ott](#)
Subject: RE: Concerns about 7-B Equitable Building Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 3:12:04 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Thank you for sharing your concerns and questions regarding the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. The Decarb Plan establishes an 8-year series of steps for City Council consideration. The Decarb Plan is not expecting or proposing that all of Alameda's building stock will be electrified in 8 years. It will take significantly longer than 8 years to decarbonize Alameda's building stock. There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan. The Decarb Plan is a "road map." The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda's building stock. The Council has already taken the first steps: 1) Prohibiting gas infrastructure in new buildings (with certain exceptions), and 2) Prohibiting replacement of existing gas appliances in "major remodels" where the existing building is being almost completely rebuilt (with certain exceptions). The Decarb Plan lays out a roadmap for future public decision making about what the next steps should be. Each step is initiated with public outreach and discussion. Each step will end with a City Council decision. The council will approve the next step only if the Council is comfortable with the next step. Endorsing the Decarb Plan does not prevent or "tie the hands" of this Council or any future Council or predetermine what a future City Council action must or will be on any future regulation.

Staff is sensitive to and aware of the costs and potential challenges of upgrading to electric appliances. The plan does not force residents to convert all of their existing gas appliances to electric. However, . significant rebates for electrification upgrades are available today. Please see <https://incentives.switchison.org/> for a list of existing rebates currently available in Alameda. In addition, the Inflation Reduction Act provides up to \$14,000 in rebates and tax credits for households to electrify appliances. See <https://www.rewiringamerica.org/app/ira-calculator> for household specific information.

Best,
Danielle

Danielle Mieler | Sustainability and Resilience Manager
Direct: 510.747.4713
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Suite 300, Alameda, CA 94501



From: Cameron Bateman (public) <public@cameronbateman.com>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2023 3:45 PM
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concerns about 7-B Equitable Building Ordinance

As a homeowner in Alameda I wish to register both concern and alarm about 7-B on the January 17 agenda. I admit I don't stay up to date on everything the city is doing but I feel there has been a suspicious level of quiet on this item. I also find the presentations on the ordinance deliberately vague so as to make it difficult for me to assess how this will affect me.

What seems clear is that, if implemented, this measure will ultimately incur tremendous costs on very tight deadlines to average homeowners and small landlords in Alameda who use gas appliances. The incentives offered don't even cover a significant percentage of the cost of the appliances to say nothing of the much larger labor costs that such changes will require.

At a time when both local and global factors have conspired to make materials, and especially labor, extortionately more expensive to build the deck or fence or kitchen reno that we actually want, this will put a huge pressure on homeowners who actually like their gas ranges and fireplaces to trash them and borrow heavily to purchase replacements.

As a homeowner and a voter, I urge council to at least take the time to consider this measure more deeply. We should at least spread the time line longer across the life of people's average ownership and use more incentives to help smooth the cost of compliance into what would have been natural renovation and upgrade. Also, unlike housing requirements, there does not appear to be any benefit to Alameda of being on the leading edge of this from a state or federal funding perspective. We should take our time on this issue.

I urge you to consider the needs of homeowners and small landlords in passing this and future related legislation.

Cameron Bateman
1822 Encinal Ave.

From: [Lauren Eisele](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Item 7B Equitable Building and Decarbonization plan.
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 2:55:51 PM

City Clerk

I support the adoption and approval of the 1/19/23 City of Alameda council Item 7B Equitable Building and Decarbonization plan.

Thank you.

Lauren Eisele
Resident

From: [Danielle Mieler](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Cc: [Andrew Thomas](#); [Jennifer Ott](#); [Nicolas Procos](#)
Subject: RE: Jan. 17 City Council Item 7B Resolution to Adopt the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 2:41:21 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Ms. Fletcher,

Thank you for sharing your concerns and questions regarding the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan as well as your support for electrification in Alameda. Please see staff responses below.

Regards,
Danielle

Danielle Mieler | Sustainability and Resilience Manager
Direct: 510.747.4713
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Suite 300, Alameda, CA 94501



From: Donna Fletcher <ohprimadonna@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2023 11:41 PM
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Jan. 17 City Council Item 7B Resolution to Adopt the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members Daysog, Jensen, Herrera-Spencer, and Vella.

While I support the City's commitment to decarbonize Alameda through 100% electrification, I wholeheartedly agree with Paul Beusterien's October 2 letter urging the Council to consider an *"alternative electrification plan that prioritizes increasing supply, starts with the most cost-effective measures, and doesn't threaten the housing of our most vulnerable population..."* (Paul provides several examples such as incentives for increasing home-charging access, electric panel upgrades, and optimizing solar.)

Following are my comments and concerns on the Plan as presented. I hope you will consider these *as you review adopting the Resolution, or making modifications to the Plan as suggested by Paul Beusterien.*

- **AMP Capacity.** Can you share analysis that AMP had done to determine its capacity to meet the demands of the all-electric Alameda? What steps does AMP need to take, if any, to meet future projected demands?
 - **Response:** Each year AMP prepares a forecast of the peak demand and energy

requirements (load forecast) for the next 10 years. The load forecasts include assumptions about future population growth as well as electric vehicle and building electrification and energy efficiency upgrades. AMP has sufficient supplies for the near term and actively purchases additional supplies to meet long term growth. For example, AMP staff will be presenting a new geothermal contract to the PUB in March 2023. Alameda has very few power outages and has a very reliable electric grid and restores power very quickly whenever there is a power disruption. There are occasionally power interruptions that are out of AMP's control. Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS) as a result of wildfire are highly unlikely to occur in Alameda and rotating outages which can occur on very hot days are typically of very short duration, less than one hour.

- **Incentives and Education vs. Mandates.** Any program plan we adopt should be built solidly on *effective education and incentives* rather than sweeping bureaucratic mandates. That is the only way to ensure its success. We are not there yet!
 - **Response:** Staff wholeheartedly agrees on the need for effective education and incentives as we work toward decarbonizing Alameda's buildings. However, staff does believe that future requirements will also be necessary in the future. As described in the Council adopted Climate Action and Resiliency Plan, to decarbonize Alameda's building stock, there will need to be incentives, funding programs, and requirements. The Decarb Plan itself does not create any requirements. The Decarb Plan is a "road map." There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan. The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda's building stock. The Council has already taken the first steps: 1) Prohibiting gas infrastructure in new buildings (with certain exceptions), and 2) Prohibiting replacement of existing gas appliances in "major remodels" where the existing building is being almost completely rebuilt (with certain exceptions). The Decarb Plan lays out a roadmap for future public decision making about what the next steps should be. Each step is initiated with public outreach and discussion. Each step will end with a City Council decision. The council will approve the next step only if the Council is comfortable with the next step. Endorsing the Decarb Plan does not prevent or "tie the hands" of this Council or any future Council or predetermine what a future City Council action must or will be on any future regulation.

- **Sequence of Education and Outreach.** The Plan identifies City-hosted outreach events and targeted stakeholder meetings in March, and April. Shouldn't the City seek input from key stakeholders *before* adopting the Resolution? Meaningful input from stakeholder groups will ensure successful implementation.
 - **Response:** A series of workshops were held beginning in March 2022 and various other forms of outreach were conducted throughout the development of the Decarbonization Plan. Further education and outreach are an important component of the implementation of the plan going forward and the plan lays out some of the kinds of outreach that will be conducted, including additional workshops.

- **Realistic Challenges.** One of the Equity Principles states that we need to be "realistic about the challenges we face in transitioning Alameda's buildings." Have we adequately identified and addressed these challenges? *If not, shouldn't this be done prior to adopting this resolution?*
 - **Response:** Staff believes that many of the challenges have been identified and are being addressed. The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda's building stock. Part of the development of each new proposal would include consideration of feasibility and challenges and solutions to address those challenges. Each step will include a public process and end with a Council decision about whether the proposal strikes the right balance for Alameda.

- **True Cost of Plan.** The City should provide a range of costs to property owners and renters based on various implementation scenarios. I'm concerned that the public doesn't have a complete understanding of the financial impact of the Plan.
 - **Response: Adoption of the Decarb Plan will not result in** new requirements for electrification at this time. As specific electrification requirements may be proposed, the costs and benefits will be analyzed by staff and shared with the public and City Council for their consideration.

- **Following Through on Equity Principles.** The Plan highlights "equity principles" that undergird the plan. *What policies and measures does the City need to ensure these principles are put into practice?*
 - **Response:** The equity principles were established in the plan with an understanding of the importance of ensuring that implementation of the decarbonization plan benefits Alameda residents and businesses and to be aware of the challenges we should address at each step of the way. Future policies developed in the implementation of the plan will be evaluated against each of these principles.

Thank you for your consideration!

Respectfully,
Donna Fletcher
112 Centre Court
Alameda

From: [Don Lindsey](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7B on agenda
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 2:36:59 PM

Honorable Mayor and Council members:

We are opposed to all of Item 78 which is on your agenda tonight.

Requiring owners to change to all electric may be the most onerous requirement that you could consider. Putting a burden like this on property owners will cause undo harm, especially with the city requirement to relocate tenants during any work done in their unit. Much of the housing in Alameda is old and conversion would mean tearing out walls and with todays costs, may be prohibitive for most folks. Please do not vote for this.

Thank you for your consideration.

Don and Suzanne Lindsey

Sent from my iPad

From: [Danielle Mieler](#)
To: [Jennifer Ott](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Manager Manager](#); [CityCouncil-List](#)
Cc: [Nicolas Procos](#); [Andrew Thomas](#)
Subject: RE: Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbonization-Conversion of Residences from Gas to electric Power
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 2:22:14 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Dear Mr. Sing, Thank you for sharing your concerns and questions regarding the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. Please see staff responses below.

Regards,
Danielle

Danielle Mieler | Sustainability and Resilience Manager
Direct: 510.747.4713
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Suite 300, Alameda, CA 94501



From: Edward Sing <singtam168@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 2:58 PM
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>; Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbonization-Conversion of Residences from Gas to electric Popwer

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear City Council Members -

I am writing in support of the comments on the subject agenda item by the Alameda Citizens Task Force (see below and attached file).

I believe everyone can agree that its a good idea and important to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that we produce. I also agree with the concept of all new housing in Alameda have totally electric appliances to support this goal. However, **I disagree that existing home and rental property owners be forced to convert all of their gas appliances to electric at this time until:**

Response: The plan does not force residents to convert all of their existing gas appliances to electric. The Decarb Plan is a “road map.” There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan. The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda’s building stock. The

Council has already taken the first steps: 1) Prohibiting gas infrastructure in new buildings (with certain exceptions), and 2) Prohibiting replacement of existing gas appliances in “major remodels” where the existing building is being almost completely rebuilt (with certain exceptions). The Decarb Plan lays out a roadmap for future public decision making about what the next steps should be. Each step is initiated with public outreach and discussion. Each step will end with a City Council decision. The council will approve the next step only if the Council is comfortable with the next step. Endorsing the Decarb Plan does not prevent or “tie the hands” of this Council or any future Council or predetermine what a future City Council action must or will be on any future regulation.

(1) It has been demonstrated that Alameda Municipal Power has sufficient resources to power an all electric Alameda. This would require a plan to phase in those additional resources to meet an all electric goal.

Response: Each year AMP prepares a forecast of the peak demand and energy requirements (load forecast) for the next 10 years. The load forecasts include assumptions about future population growth as well as electric vehicle and building electrification and energy efficiency upgrades. AMP has sufficient supplies for the near term and actively purchases additional supplies to meet long term growth. For example, AMP staff will be presenting a new geothermal contract to the PUB in March 2023. Alameda has very few power outages and has a very reliable electric grid and restores power very quickly whenever there is a power disruption. There are occasionally power interruptions that are out of AMP’s control. Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS) as a result of wildfire are highly unlikely to occur in Alameda and rotating outages which can occur on very hot days are typically of very short duration, less than one hour.

(2) Funding sources for rebates (local, state or federal) to assist home and rental property owners in conversion to all electric are identified. As noted by ACT, conversion of an existing property to all electric will probably require a costly upgrade of the electrical panel, wiring to the affected appliances as well as the new appliances themselves.

Response: Cost of upgrades is definitely an important consideration to weigh in the implementation of the plan. Significant rebates for electrification upgrades are available today. Please see <https://incentives.switchison.org/> for a list of existing rebates currently available in Alameda. In addition, the Inflation Reduction Act provides up to \$14,000 in rebates and tax credits for households to electrify appliances. See <https://www.rewiringamerica.org/app/ira-calculator> for household specific information.

(3) Funding sources for rebates should not be a "possibility" but clearly identified for specific use in electrification.

Response: Please see response to (2)

(4) Required costs for conversion by home and rental property owners are clearly

identified so these owners can plan ahead for these costs.

Response: Please see initial response above. The plan does not force residents to convert all of their existing gas appliances to electric.

(5) Given the very costly nature of these upgrades, the law be modified to allow rental property owners be allowed to pass the electrification costs (in whole or in part, immediate or phased) on to tenants who will be the benefactor of these upgrades.

Response: Please see initial response above. Adoption of the Equitable Decarbonization Plan will not result in a new law. There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan.

Thank you for your consideration of the above,

Ed Sing
Alameda Resident 26 years

From: Alameda Citizens Task Force

Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2023 10:04 AM

To: Marilyn Ezy Ashcraft <mezzashcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Tdaysog@alamedaca.gov <tdaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <mvella@alamedaca.gov>; Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>; tjensen@alamedaca.gov <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: manager@alamedaca.gov <manager@alamedaca.gov>; Clerk@alamedaca.gov <clerk@alamedaca.gov>; sustainability@alamedaca.gov <sustainability@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbinozation

ACT

Alameda Citizens Task Force

Vigilance, Truth, Civility

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog & Council Members Vella, Spencer and Jenkins:

ACT has reviewed the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (EBDP) attached as Exhibit 1 to Item 7-B on the Jan. 17 City Council Agenda. We support incentives and rebates provided by AMP and the City to promote the decarbonizing existing buildings by shifting from natural gas use towards all-electric buildings. However, we strongly oppose those parts of the EBDP that propose the **requirement** of replacing natural gas with electrification for the following reasons:

1. **The Ability of AMP to Meet the Increased Service Load:** Such a requirement would greatly accelerate the service load on our existing electrical grid. The EBDP describes AMP as being “confident in their capacity of to accommodate additional projected loads.” However, the very next

paragraph states, "California as whole is facing continued stress on the statewide electrical grid and the potential for rolling State-ordered blackouts is expected to continue for all California customers, including AMP customers, for the near future." (p. 26) This begs the question of whether AMP's confidence is based on only its current incentive/rebate program or the imposition of required transition to electrical service proposed by the EBDP. Even if AMP is confident of its ability to meet the full demands of conversion from gas to electricity, the fragile state of the grid argues strongly against forcing people to depend entirely on electric power

2. **Unreasonable Costs Imposed on Building Owners:** Many, if not most of the existing buildings will require upgrades to the electric service panels to bring them up to providing 200-amp service to each unit. In buildings where tenants pay their own electric bills, this will require upgrading "each" electric panel. Most buildings will require opening walls to install electric wiring where none presently exists. This will be disruptive to tenants and may require relocation during construction. The rebates planned to be offered to Alameda property owners will not cover the cost of the necessary upgrades, especially in buildings where the service panels have to be upgraded. In buildings where major appliances, furnace, hot water heater, clothes dryer, and cooking stove are gas, this will be a very expensive process. Upgrading these appliances as they reach the end of life means replacing them one at a time. This is totally unpractical as the electric panel and house wiring upgrades will have to be in place at the time each appliance reaches its end-of-life cycle. Replacing all appliances at one time will be very expensive and beyond the financial abilities of most mom-and-pop landlords.

3. **Impact of Requiring Electrification Prior to Sale:** One part of the EBDP would require that a building be upgraded to 100% electric before it can be sold. The cost of this upgrade would increase prices/rents in our already expensive housing market.

4. **Cost of Gas vs. Electricity:** The plan assumes the electric bills to be paid by tenants or low-income property owners after the upgrades will be less than what they pay now for electric and gas combined. At present electricity is much more expensive than gas to heat water or to heat a unit during winter times. While it has been predicted that this will eventually reverse the relative costs. That is currently a prediction not a reality.

In summary, we believe that there is insufficient data to satisfy us that the grid can handle the increased service load created by requiring, rather than incentivizing, electrification and ample evidence that the costs imposed on both owners and tenants will be unreasonable and result in severe consequences to the affordability of living in Alameda.

Sincerely,

Alameda Citizens Task force Board of Directors

From: [Jennifer Ott](#)
To: announcements@alamedacitizenstaskforce.org
Cc: [CityCouncil-List](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Danielle Mieler](#); [Nicolas Procos](#)
Subject: RE: Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbinization
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 1:52:42 PM

Hello ACT Board of Directors:

Thank you for your email. Please find below staff's response to your email.

-
Alameda Citizens Task Force Comment: *"ACT has reviewed the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (EBDP) attached as Exhibit 1 to Item 7-B on the Jan. 17 City Council Agenda. We support incentives and rebates provided by AMP and the City to promote the decarbonizing existing buildings by shifting from natural gas use towards all-electric buildings. However, we strongly oppose those parts of the EBDP that propose the **requirement** of replacing natural gas with electrification for the following reasons:....."*

Response: Staff appreciates ACTs support for *"incentives and rebates provided by AMP and the City to promote the decarbonizing existing buildings by shifting from natural gas use towards all-electric buildings"*.

However, staff does believe that future requirements will also be necessary in the future. As described in the Council adopted Climate Action and Resiliency Plan, to decarbonize Alameda's building stock, there will need to be incentives, funding programs, and requirements.

The Decarb Plan ("EBDP") does not create any of these three things. The Decarb Plan is a "road map." There will be no new requirements for electrification that result from adoption of this plan. The plan establishes a process by which the City works with the community and council to incrementally create new programs, funding sources and requirements to slowly, step by step, incrementally reduce GHG emissions from Alameda's building stock. The Council has already taken the first steps: 1) Prohibiting gas infrastructure in new buildings (with certain exceptions), and 2) Prohibiting replacement of existing gas appliances in "major remodels" where the existing building is being almost completely rebuilt (with certain exceptions). The Decarb Plan lays out a roadmap for future public decision making about what the next steps should be. Each step is initiated with public outreach and discussion. Each step will end with a City Council decision. The council will approve the next step only if the Council is comfortable with the next step. Endorsing the Decarb Plan does not prevent or "tie the hands" of this Council or any future Council or predetermine what a future City Council action must or will be on any future regulation.

ACT Comment: *"**The Ability of AMP to Meet the Increased Service Load:** Such a requirement would greatly accelerate the service load on our existing electrical grid. The EBDP describes AMP as being "confident in their capacity of to accommodate additional projected loads." However, the very next paragraph states, "California as whole is facing continued stress on the statewide electrical grid and the potential for rolling State-ordered blackouts is expected to continue for all California customers, including AMP customers, for the near future." (p. 26) This begs the question of whether AMP's confidence is based on only its current incentive/rebate program or the imposition of required*

transition to electrical service proposed by the EBDP. Even if AMP is confident of its ability to meet the full demands of conversion from gas to electricity, the fragile state of the grid argues strongly against forcing people to depend entirely on electric power”

Response The Decarb Plan establishes an 8-year series of steps for City Council consideration. The Decarb Plan is not expecting or proposing that all of Alameda’s building stock will be electrified in 8 years. It will take significantly longer than 8 years to decarbonize Alameda’s building stock.

Each year AMP prepares a forecast of the peak demand and energy requirements (load forecast) for the next 10 years. The load forecasts include assumptions about future population growth as well as electric vehicle and building electrification and energy efficiency upgrades. AMP has sufficient supplies for the near term and actively purchases additional supplies to meet long term growth. For example, AMP staff will be presenting a new geothermal contract to the PUB in March 2023. Alameda has very few power outages and has a very reliable electric grid and restores power very quickly whenever there is a power disruption. There are occasionally power interruptions that are out of AMP’s control. Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS) as a result of wildfire are highly unlikely to occur in Alameda and rotating outages which can occur on very hot days are typically of very short duration, less than one hour.

ACT Comment: Unreasonable Costs Imposed on Building Owners:

“Many, if not most of the existing buildings will require upgrades to the electric service panels to bring them up to providing 200-amp service to each unit. In buildings where tenants pay their own electric bills, this will require upgrading “each” electric panel. Most buildings will require opening walls to install electric wiring where none presently exists. This will be disruptive to tenants and may require relocation during construction. The rebates planned to be offered to Alameda property owners will not cover the cost of the necessary upgrades, especially in buildings where the service panels have to be upgraded. In buildings where major appliances, furnace, hot water heater, clothes dryer, and cooking stove are gas, this will be a very expensive process. Upgrading these appliances as they reach the end of life means replacing them one at a time. This is totally unpractical as the electric panel and house wiring upgrades will have to be in place at the time each appliance reaches its end-of-life cycle. Replacing all appliances at one time will be very expensive and beyond the financial abilities of most mom-and-pop landlords.”

Response The Plan includes recommendations for policies and programs that will help transition to electric appliances, but does not propose removing existing appliances that have not reached the end of their useful life or are not part of another permitted renovation project. If such a policy were to be considered as part of the plan, it will require research, evaluation and include opportunities for public comment and participation throughout their development, as well as City Council and/or Public Utility Board approval for implementation.

In many cases a standard 100 Amp electric panel has sufficient capacity to power an all-electric home with an EV charger. To reduce demand on the panel, owners can choose energy efficient and heat pump appliances, insulate and air-seal the home, use circuit sharing plugs and shared circuit breakers, and analyze peak demand to see if you are close to the capacity of your panel. When a 200

Amp panel is needed or preferred, rebates and tax credits are available to support the cost. AMP provides a \$2,500 rebate to upgrade an electric panel when also electrifying one appliance. Panel upgrades are not needed until such time that the demand exceeds capacity of the panel. Any potential requirement for upgrades of certain appliances in the buildings would definitely need to include exception for buildings where upgrades are technically or practically infeasible.

ACT Comment: Impact of Requiring Electrification Prior to Sale: *One part of the EBDP would require that a building be upgraded to 100% electric before it can be sold. The cost of this upgrade would increase prices/rents in our already expensive housing market.*

Response The plan does not require upgrading a building to 100% electric before being sold. The plan includes a description various time of sale requirements that could be considered in the future by the City Council. Any potential future requirements, such as a point of sale requirement, will require research, evaluation and include opportunities for public comment and participation throughout their development, as well as City Council and/or Public Utility Board approval for implementation.

ACT Comment: Cost of Gas vs. Electricity: *The plan assumes the electric bills to be paid by tenants or low-income property owners after the upgrades will be less than what they pay now for electric and gas combined. At present electricity is much more expensive than heat water or to heat a unit during winter times. While it has been predicted that this will eventually reverse the relative costs. That is currently a prediction not a reality.*

Response: All our research indicates that electrification will, for most buildings, result in higher electric bills and lower gas bills. Overall, cost effectiveness studies conducted for Alameda show that in 2022, with full home electrification, average utility bills in Alameda may increase slightly in the early years. However, with gas rates increasing much faster than electric rates, customers are projected to save money overall over a 30-year period. Additional utility savings can be realized through weather and energy efficiency measures and the additional of solar panels. Heat pump water heaters, heat pump space heaters/coolers and induction stoves have higher efficiency ratings than similar gas-fired appliances and AMP's rates are approximately 36% lower compared to PG&E electric rates. Much of the upfront costs of these installations can be covered with already available [rebates and incentives](#) from AMP, BayREN and other state and local programs.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Ott
City Manager

From: [Karen Miller](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda item 7B
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 1:40:52 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[Electrification.pdf](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Hi Lara,

Can you please pass this along to the Council for tonight's meeting? Thank you!

Regards,

Karen Miller



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Madam Mayor and Council members,

My name is Karen Miller and I am a resident of Alameda. I am in support of the decarbonization plan but not in its mandatory implementation which is suggested in phase 3 which begins in only 3 years. We are very fortunate to have AMP generating all their power from renewables, but it is my understanding, that that power comes to us on PGE's transmission lines which are a part of the State's electrical grid.

I applaud the city's efforts, but in the State's decarbonization plan, written by experts, who know a lot more (not to be disrespectful) than staff, it states, and I quote "To support the transformation needed, we must build the clean energy production and distribution infrastructure for a carbon-neutral future. In almost all sectors, electrification will play an important role. That means that the grid will need to grow at unprecedented rates and ensure reliability, affordability, and resiliency through the next **two decades** and beyond. It also means we need to keep all options on the table, as it will take time to fully grow the electricity grid to be the backbone for a decarbonized economy."

With climate change we are experiencing more extreme weather both in the summer and the winter which lead to power outages. The electrical grid for the state is controlled by The Independent system operators and if the system gets overloaded they shut it down. Until the electrical grid is expanded, requiring electrification is irresponsible. Without power you have no heat in the winter and no fans in the summer. You have no ability to cook.

A phased approach, as was done with the water conserving measures, with only showerheads and faucets with flow restrictors and low flow toilets being available for sale, is a much more sensible, achievable and affordable approach. It took time but it worked. It is admirable that Alameda wants to take the lead in this endeavor but we cannot do it without the State's electrical grid expansion which will not happen in the plan's near term goals of 2024-2025, which is next year. Nor will it happen in the plan's long term goals of 2026-2030, which is only 3 years away.

Again, I applaud these efforts and all the work that staff did to put this plan together. We need to do what we can as a City to be active in achieving these goals but to make it mandatory without the expansion of the State's electrical grid is foolhardy and ill-advised.

From: [SANDY SULLIVAN](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Decarbonization Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 1:18:08 PM

To members of City Council:

Vote NO on this decarbonization plan that has many flaws. To name a few:

- This plan takes away individual freedom replacing it with a government political anti fossil fuel agenda. That's anti-American
- This plan lacks energy diversity, leaving Alameda residents vulnerable to unplanned emergencies.
- The housing and business stock is older. Major electrical upgrades will be required to change out furnaces, hot water heaters and stoves. There is no guarantee grants will be available., especially in this economy

This should be a consumer choice, not a government choice. Vote no

Sandy sullivan
49 Chatham Point
Alameda

From: ratto@att.net
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Alameda Building Decarbonization Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 12:57:31 PM

Dear City Council,

My name is Nick Ratto, and I am a lifelong Alameda resident.

Over the past few years, the urgency of addressing the climate crisis has become apparent to me. I fully support the work of CASA, and that includes Alameda building decarbonization.

We have less than a decade to significantly reduce carbon emissions, as well as significantly reducing the atmospheric CO2 and other greenhouse gases.

Quite simply, the science is now clear: there is not another moment to waste in this decarbonization effort.

Sincerely,

Nick

Nick Ratto

1108 Court St



From: [Alexandra Petrich](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Manager Manager](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-B, January 17, 2023 Alameda City Council Agenda
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 12:07:23 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice-Mayor Daysog, and Councilmembers Vella, Spencer, and Jensen:

I am writing in opposition to the adoption of the "Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan," which is attached as Exhibit 1 to Item 7-B on the January 17, 2023, City Council Meeting.

I fully support incentives and rebates that encourage voluntary conversion of residences from gas to electricity. However, I have strong objections to the "Plan" submitted to the Council by the Planning Department or Planning Board (not clear which). The "Plan" is deficient in numerous ways, a few of which are listed below.

First, the "Plan" is so inartfully drafted that it is impossible to tell whether the planners envision mandating this conversion from gas to electricity. It appears to me, however, that the intent is for the City to require all residential buildings to be converted from gas to electricity. Before voting on whether or not to approve this "Plan," the Council owes it to the residents and tax-payers of Alameda to clarify whether or not this proposal will be mandatory.

Second, the City's communication with the residents of Alameda has been woefully inadequate. The "Electrification Workshop" that was supposedly held to communicate the City's intentions was not publicized, and the City failed to seek meaningful public participation. This proposal is the first I have heard of it, and I can say the same for all of my neighbors.

Third, the "Plan" is entirely silent with regard to any provision for the expansion of the existing electrical grid. More and more frequently, Alameda County experiences rolling blackouts when there is a high demand for electricity; thus, the more that demand increases, the more there will be lack of access to electricity. In addition, the rising numbers of electric vehicles will place even more demand on the electrical grid, and there continues to be an increased demand from the new housing being built, with mandated use of only electric appliances.

Fourth, the "Plan" is entirely silent with regard to any provision for compensation to property owners for costs incurred in the conversion from gas to electricity -- apart from the mention of current rebates, which offer partial but nowhere near full compensation. In particular, to the extent that the "Plan" contemplates compelling owners of residences to fully convert from gas to electricity before they can sell their homes, it places an unfair and undue financial burden on the owners, many of whom are elderly.

Fifth, the "Plan" is entirely silent with regard to the increased cost using electricity instead of gas. While this might possibly change in the future, it currently costs more to, for example, heat a home with electricity than with gas. Compelling this conversion from electricity to gas will place an increased financial burden on low- and moderate-income residents, as well as on seniors who are living on fixed incomes.

I urge you to vote "No" on the request that the Council adopt this proposal.

Very truly yours,
Alexandra Petrich

From: [Dodi Kelleher](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#); [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (EBDP) -Item 7B Council Agenda for Jan. 17th
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 9:38:39 AM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

This letter is written in regards to the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (EBDP) resolution. While I agree with the objective, I have significant reservations about some of the means to meet the objective and the timeframe. I support that all new construction be electric and support the idea of offering substantial and broad incentives to convert gas to electric. However, imposing other mandates rather than promoting voluntary compliance at this time risks negative consequences and undue burden, especially for those with limited financial resources, and with older homes. I have reviewed the posted presentation, which included the current and 2023 incentives. It is not clear to me that these are adequate incentives, given current costs and the kind of housing stock that would need conversion. In addition, there is real practical difficulty in finding skilled electricians and other necessary contractors. Has the Council received any data that supports that the specific incentives and structure of payment are adequate and practical? Has AMP provided data that supports that the utility will be able to meet the demand of an all-electric Alameda and when that would occur?

I ask that this email be placed in the record.

Sincerely,
Dolores Kelleher

From: [Meredith Hoskin](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for 7-B Adoption of Resolution Adopting the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 8:44:27 AM

To Madam Mayor, City Councilmembers, and Alameda leaders,

I am writing to support the Resolution Adopting the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan.

As the owner of a 100-year old home in Alameda, I recognize electrifying our home will be a large, but necessary undertaking and investment. By adopting this resolution, you're showing us the city will help us navigate the complexities, and financial opportunities, and equip us with the resources - and time - to get this done. This plan does not suggest to me that I have to buy an electric water heater or induction stove tomorrow, but rather informs me of this need and its importance to our city's action for reducing carbon emissions.

Frankly, we have no other choice. As we've experienced firsthand the extreme weather in California over the past few weeks, we all need to do our part to slow down the climate crisis. Alameda, and this City Council, have demonstrated their commitment to addressing climate change. The U.S. and California governments have also demonstrated the importance with the preliminary funding and resources for this critical effort.

Adopt the resolution and set the path to help Alamedans prepare for the future actions we'll need to take.

Thank you,

Meredith Hoskin
Alameda Resident

From: [pcozad](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#); [announcements@alamedacitizenstaskforce.org](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting on 01/17/2023-Agenda Item 7B/Decarbonization
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 7:49:12 AM

Question to the City Council Members:

- 1) Why wasn't this agenda item sent to the community via email from alameda@public.govdelivery.com? I heard about this meeting two nights ago from a friend and have expressed interest in the past by attending 2 electrification workshops
- 2) 2030 is too soon when education, policies, funding, and incentives are not in place today (Federal Reduction Act is not expected to be ready until late 2023).
- 3) How will the City gauge whether or not the community understands the scope of this proposed plan and its impact on them financially?

Thank you, Penny Cozad

From: [Donna Fletcher](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Jan. 17 City Council Item 7B Resolution to Adopt the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan
Date: Monday, January 16, 2023 11:41:21 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members Daysog, Jensen, Herrera-Spencer, and Vella.

While I support the City's commitment to decarbonize Alameda through 100% electrification, I wholeheartedly agree with Paul Beusterien's October 2 letter urging the Council to consider an *"alternative electrification plan that prioritizes increasing supply, starts with the most cost-effective measures, and doesn't threaten the housing of our most vulnerable population..."* (Paul provides several examples such as incentives for increasing home-charging access, electric panel upgrades, and optimizing solar.)

Following are my comments and concerns on the Plan as presented. I hope you will consider these *as you review adopting the Resolution, or making modifications to the Plan as suggested by Paul Beusterien.*

- **AMP Capacity.** Can you share analysis that AMP had done to determine its capacity to meet the demands of the all-electric Alameda? What steps does AMP need to take, if any, to meet future projected demands?
- **Incentives and Education vs. Mandates.** Any program plan we adopt should be built solidly on *effective education and incentives* rather than sweeping bureaucratic mandates. That is the only way to ensure its success. We are not there yet!
- **Sequence of Education and Outreach.** The Plan identifies City-hosted outreach events and targeted stakeholder meetings in March, and April. Shouldn't the City seek input from key stakeholders *before* adopting the Resolution? Meaningful input from stakeholder groups will ensure successful implementation.
- **Realistic Challenges.** One of the Equity Principles states that we need to be "realistic about the challenges we face in transitioning Alameda's buildings." Have we adequately identified and addressed these challenges? *If not, shouldn't this be done prior to adopting this resolution?*
- **True Cost of Plan.** The City should provide a range of costs to property owners and renters based on various implementation scenarios. I'm concerned that the public doesn't have a complete understanding of the financial impact of the Plan.
- **Following Through on Equity Principles.** The Plan highlights "equity principles" that undergird the plan. *What policies and measures does the City need to ensure these principles are put into practice?*

Thank you for your consideration!

Respectfully,
Donna Fletcher
112 Centre Court
Alameda

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Get methane gas out of our buildings
Date: Monday, January 16, 2023 10:14:09 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mari Matsumoto <ota-matsumoto@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Jan 12, 2023 1:02 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Get methane gas out of our buildings
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Dear Spencer,

I'm writing to you today because I believe our community must urgently pass a building electrification policy and phase fossil fuels out of our homes and businesses.

Buildings are responsible for 13% of greenhouse gas emissions in the US, and recent study from the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health found that gas stoves are responsible for 1 in 8 cases of childhood asthma – that's on par with secondhand smoke. Burning gas in homes also generates harmful emissions of formaldehyde, methane, nitrogen oxides, and other pollutants.

As your constituent, I'm urging you to do everything in your power to ensure new buildings in our community are all-electric and help phase gas and other fossil fuels out of existing buildings.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mari Matsumoto, Alameda

From: [Cameron Bateman \(public\)](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concerns about 7-B Equitable Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, January 16, 2023 3:44:51 PM

As a homeowner in Alameda I wish to register both concern and alarm about 7-B on the January 17 agenda. I admit I don't stay up to date on everything the city is doing but I feel there has been a suspicious level of quiet on this item. I also find the presentations on the ordinance deliberately vague so as to make it difficult for me to assess how this will affect me.

What seems clear is that, if implemented, this measure will ultimately incur tremendous costs on very tight deadlines to average homeowners and small landlords in Alameda who use gas appliances. The incentives offered don't even cover a significant percentage of the cost of the appliances to say nothing of the much larger labor costs that such changes will require.

At a time when both local and global factors have conspired to make materials, and especially labor, extortionately more expensive to build the deck or fence or kitchen reno that we actually want, this will put a huge pressure on homeowners who actually like their gas ranges and fireplaces to trash them and borrow heavily to purchase replacements.

As a homeowner and a voter, I urge council to at least take the time to consider this measure more deeply. We should at least spread the time line longer across the life of people's average ownership and use more incentives to help smooth the cost of compliance into what would have been natural renovation and upgrade. Also, unlike housing requirements, there does not appear to be any benefit to Alameda of being on the leading edge of this from a state or federal funding perspective. We should take our time on this issue.

I urge you to consider the needs of homeowners and small landlords in passing this and future related legislation.

Cameron Bateman
1822 Encinal Ave.

From: [pcozad](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting Jan. 17, 2023: Agenda Item 7-B Adoption of Resolution Adopting the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan.
Date: Monday, January 16, 2023 3:43:48 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files \(21.0 KB\).msg](#)
[Questions re Alameda Equitable Decarbonization.pdf](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear City Council Members, attached are questions concerning tomorrow night's agenda item and presentation concerning the Alameda Equitable Decarbonization Plan.

I did not get a notification about this issue for tomorrow's meeting and have attended two of the earlier workshops.

I am not in favor of the 2030 deadline and would recommend something along the lines of Berkeley's 2045 plan and phasing. This will certainly be a bitter pill for owners of homes built before 1960. I would be in favor of better communication to homeowners on this issue. To date the city seems to have relied on word of mouth and a website. The workshops I attended had fewer than a dozen people. Maybe having a bigger presence at street fairs and possibly a planned weekend event for just this issue that has food and entertainment.

Alameda needs to be more proactive in getting people to want to do upgrade. The proposal only makes vague references to future intensions. If the goal is 2030, the city is too late in getting the community on board.

Why is this issue not being submitted as a proposition for Alameda voters' decision?

Respectfully,

Penny Cozad

Questions re: Alameda Equitable Decarbonization

1]. Why is 2030 the deadline? Why not 2045 or 2055?

a]. What is the determining factor for making all of Alameda all electric when such a strict decision is not being made by other municipalities and will come at a great cost to homeowners and landlords of older buildings?

b]. What percentage of Alameda citizens attended the 7 Electrification 101/ Plan Brainstorm/ Draft Plan + Ordinance workshops?

•To date, have all the affected community members been identified or informed and educated?

c]. How will ending the use of natural gas result in lower energy "burden" overall by the Alameda community?

d]. What is the age of the building stock in the city?

•How many residences have no building insulation?

•How many residences do not have insulated windows?

•How many residences are without central heating?

•How many residences contain asbestos?

•How many Alameda residences were built with gas for heating, hot water and cooking?

•How many residences still have knob & tube wiring?

e]. What percentage of the city's residences will require electrical panel upgrades and new wiring?

2]. How is Alameda doing concerning the 2019 Climate Action Plan to reduce emissions 50% below 2005 levels by 2030?

3]. Why would landlords not be allowed to increase rent for required electrification expenditures?

4]. What was the response rate from the Alameda community so far to the city's electrification webpage? Is the community using this website?

5]. Isn't it possible that requiring cost upgrades during the permitting process may cause some homeowners to avoid remodel permits?

6]. Homeowners who purchased homes built prior to 1960 may avoid submitting a permit for new remodel or electrification work if their building would be subject to new scrutiny by city inspectors for work that was done prior to their ownership.

7]. Will there be realistic support to homeowners to understand the actual costs of upgrades that are site specific?

a]. Will electrical wiring or panel upgrade be needed for new electric stove, electric clothes dryer, heat pump, etc? And, what will that cost in real dollars?

b]. Is the building currently non-compliant and what will it cost to correct?

From: [Ashley Mullins](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 7B
Date: Monday, January 16, 2023 1:01:48 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I am writing to urge you to pass the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. This is the right decision for our city as we must address climate change at every level, and electrification of our city is an easy choice for combating climate change. The short-term costs associated with appliance and service conversions can be easily offset by state and federal incentives, and the long term gains will serve all Alamedans.

Thank you,
Ashley Mullins

From: [Edward Sing](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbonization-Conversion of Residences from Gas to electric Popwer
Date: Sunday, January 15, 2023 2:59:13 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[ACT CityCouncil January 17th Equitable Building2.pdf](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear City Council Members -

I am writing in support of the comments on the subject agenda item by the Alameda Citizens Task Force (see below and attached file).

I believe everyone can agree that its a good idea and important to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that we produce. I also agree with the concept of all new housing in Alameda have totally electric appliances to support this goal. However, **I disagree that existing home and rental property owners be forced to convert all of their gas appliances to electric at this time until:**

(1) It has been demonstrated that Alameda Municipal Power has sufficient resources to power an all electric Alameda. This would require a plan to phase in those additional resources to meet an all electric goal.

(2) Funding sources for rebates (local, state or federal) to assist home and rental property owners in conversion to all electric are identified. As noted by ACT, conversion of an existing property to all electric will probably require a costly upgrade of the electrical panel, wiring to the affected appliances as well as the new appliances themselves.

(3) Funding sources for rebates should not be a "possibility" but clearly identified for specific use in electrification.

(4) Required costs for conversion by home and rental property owners are clearly identified so these owners can plan ahead for these costs.

(5) Given the very costly nature of these upgrades, the law be modified to allow rental property owners be allowed to pass the electrification costs (in whole or in part, immediate or phased) on to tenants who will be the benefactor of these upgrades.

Thank you for your consideration of the above,

Ed Sing
Alameda Resident 26 years

From: Alameda Citizens Task Force

Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2023 10:04 AM

To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Tdaysog@alamedaca.gov <tdaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <mvella@alamedaca.gov>; Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>; tjensen@alamedaca.gov <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: manager@alamedaca.gov <manager@alamedaca.gov>; Clerk@alamedaca.gov <clerk@alamedaca.gov>; sustainability@alamedaca.gov <sustainability@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbinozation

ACT

Alameda Citizens Task Force

Vigilance, Truth, Civility

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog & Council Members Vella, Spencer and Jenkins:

ACT has reviewed the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (EBDP) attached as Exhibit 1 to Item 7-B on the Jan. 17 City Council Agenda. We support incentives and rebates provided by AMP and the City to promote the decarbonizing existing buildings by shifting from natural gas use towards all-electric buildings. However, we strongly oppose those parts of the EBDP that propose the **requirement** of replacing natural gas with electrification for the following reasons:

1. **The Ability of AMP to Meet the Increased Service Load**: Such a requirement would greatly accelerate the service load on our existing electrical grid. The EBDP describes AMP as being “confident in their capacity of to accommodate additional projected loads.” However, the very next paragraph states, “California as whole is facing continued stress on the statewide electrical grid and the potential for rolling State-ordered blackouts is expected to continue for all California customers, including AMP customers, for the near future.” (p. 26) This begs the question of whether AMP’s confidence is based on only its current incentive/rebate program or the imposition of required transition to electrical service proposed by the EBDP. Even if AMP is confident of its ability to meet the full demands of conversion from gas to electricity, the fragile state of the grid argues strongly against forcing people to depend entirely on electric power
2. **Unreasonable Costs Imposed on Building Owners**: Many, if not most of the existing buildings will require upgrades to the electric service panels to bring them up to providing 200-amp service to each unit. In buildings where tenants pay their own electric bills, this will require upgrading "each" electric panel. Most buildings will require opening walls to install electric wiring where none presently exists. This will be disruptive to tenants and may require relocation during construction. The rebates planned to be offered to Alameda property owners will not cover the cost of the necessary upgrades, especially in buildings where the service panels have to be upgraded. In buildings where major appliances, furnace, hot water heater, clothes dryer, and cooking stove are gas, this will be a very expensive process. Upgrading these appliances as they reach the end of life means replacing them one at a time. This is totally unpractical as the electric panel and house wiring upgrades will have to be in place at the time each appliance reaches its end-of-life cycle. Replacing all appliances at one time will be very expensive and beyond the financial abilities of most mom-and-

pop landlords.

3. **Impact of Requiring Electrification Prior to Sale**: One part of the EBDP would require that a building be upgraded to 100% electric before it can be sold. The cost of this upgrade would increase prices/rents in our already expensive housing market.

4. **Cost of Gas vs. Electricity**: The plan assumes the electric bills to be paid by tenants or low-income property owners after the upgrades will be less than what they pay now for electric and gas combined. At present electricity is much more expensive than gas to heat water or to heat a unit during winter times. While it has been predicted that this will eventually reverse the relative costs. That is currently a prediction not a reality.

In summary, we believe that there is insufficient data to satisfy us that the grid can handle the increased service load created by requiring, rather than incentivizing, electrification and ample evidence that the costs imposed on both owners and tenants will be unreasonable and result in severe consequences to the affordability of living in Alameda.

Sincerely,

Alameda Citizens Task force Board of Directors

Regarding January 17th, 2023 City Council Agenda Item 7-B Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan.

The Equitable Building Decarbonization (EBD) is a plan to replace all gas appliances in ALL Alameda buildings by 2030, just 7 years from now. Our reading of the EBD plan is that the requirements to upgrade Alameda properties will not be accomplished on a voluntary basis.

The City of Alameda has laid out a process for the replacement of gas appliances and has created a rebate schedule that is predicated on the ability of the City to obtain state and federal grant money to offer rebates to property owners for the necessary work required to upgrade Alameda's buildings to 100% electric. At present there is no guarantee that Alameda will be able to obtain the grants necessary to offer rebates to every property owner in Alameda.

There are also questions about Alameda Municipal Power's ability to provide the electricity required for a 100% electric Alameda.

At present all new construction in Alameda is required to be 100% electric. But the process of upgrading all existing buildings in Alameda will be a much more difficult process. Many, if not most of the buildings will require upgrades to their electric service panels to bring them up to providing 200 amp service to each unit. In buildings where tenants pay their own electric bills, this will require upgrading "each" electric panel. Most buildings will require opening walls to install electric wiring where none presently exists. This will be disruptive to tenants and may require relocation during construction.

The name of the plan is "Equitable Building Decarbonization". The plan assumes the electric bills to be paid by tenants or low income property owners after the upgrades will be less than what they pay now for electric and gas combined. At present electricity is much more expensive than gas to heat water or to heat a living unit during winter times. The plan assumes that over time gas prices will continue to rise above what will be required with the new "energy efficient" appliances. Heat exchange units for hot water and building heat may or may not be less expensive over time. A lot depends on the building configuration. Heat exchange systems do provide cooling for summer seasons.

The rebates planned to be offered to Alameda property owners will not cover the cost of the necessary upgrades, especially in buildings where the service panels have to be upgraded. In buildings where major appliances, furnace, hot water heater, clothes dryer, and cooking stove are gas, this upgrade will be a very expensive process. Upgrading these appliances as they reach end of life means replacing them one at a time. This is totally unpractical as the electric panel and house wiring upgrades will have to be in place at the time each appliance reaches it's end of life cycle. Replacing all appliances at one time will be very expensive and beyond the financial abilities of most mom and pop landlords.

One part of the EBD plan would be any building would have to be upgraded to 100% electric before it could be sold.

As Alameda has a rent control plan where limited construction costs can be recovered in higher rents, the financial burden for landlords will be excessive and in many cases impossible to achieve even with the rebate plan.

All electric households will be healthier to live in. A recent study reports that children who live in homes with gas appliances have higher incidents of Asthma, so that will be big plus for the EBD plan.

"New Study Finds Gas Stoves a Key Cause of US Childhood Asthma"

*****[.motherjones.com/politics/2023/01/study-gas-stoves-cause-](https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2023/01/study-gas-stoves-cause-)

[mccarthy-sells-out-country-to-maga-lunatics-with-devils-deal&email_referrer=email_1780909&email_subject=judge-smacks-trump-down-in-250-million-lawsuit](https://www.mccarthy-sells-out-country-to-maga-lunatics-with-devils-deal&email_referrer=email_1780909&email_subject=judge-smacks-trump-down-in-250-million-lawsuit)

The City Council agenda is found at the following link:|

*****alameda.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=A&ID=1066764&GUID=4E85C669-80B2-4FC3-5447A7CBA8CE

The Planning Board recommendation attached to the agenda item can be read at the following link:

*****alameda.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11552885&GUID=EF9D805E-1108-8AA8-47E930D8731D

The City Council presentation slideshow can be seen at the following link. The slideshow includes the proposed rebates.

*****alameda.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11552890&GUID=7D553F43-8263-BB9C-F1DC6964F5B6

At the January 17th meeting the City Council will be voting to accept the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan ordinance. If you have concerns regarding this plan, please contact your City officials at the following email addresses before Tuesday January 17th afternoon.

Send emails to the City Council members at:

CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov

Include a cc email to:

clerk@alamedaca.gov

manager@alamedaca.gov

To speak on the agenda item at the City Council zoom meeting you must register at the following link before the meeting starts:

*****alamedaca.gov.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_waQjuTPhT8KJTRIFk90FeA

If links are not active, cut and paste links into your browser address line.

From: [Manager Manager](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Subject: Building electrification
Date: Saturday, January 14, 2023 10:55:01 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Nicholas Ratto <ratto@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2023 2:44 PM
To: Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Building electrification

Dear Brazil,

I'm writing to you today because I believe our community must urgently pass a building electrification policy and phase fossil fuels out of our homes and businesses.

Buildings are responsible for 13% of greenhouse gas emissions in the US, and recent study from the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health found that gas stoves are responsible for 1 in 8 cases of childhood asthma – that's on par with secondhand smoke. Burning gas in homes also generates harmful emissions of formaldehyde, methane, nitrogen oxides, and other pollutants.

As your constituent, I'm urging you to do everything in your power to ensure new buildings in our community are all-electric and help phase gas and other fossil fuels out of existing buildings.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Ratto, Alameda

From: [Claudia Viera](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concerns re: Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbonization-Conversion of Residences from Gas to electric Power
Date: Saturday, January 14, 2023 2:37:55 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog & Council Members Vella, Spencer and Jenkins:

I completely support the general proposal to begin to electrify older/all buildings in Alameda. However, the mandatory requirement to do so in 7 years is too difficult to achieve.

I own a small house with a gas fireplace, gas heater, gas dryer, gas stove and gas water heater. I am a fairly recent homeowner which means that I pay high property taxes compared to some of my neighbors, who have owned their homes for 20 or more years. While I am in favor of converting all of the above appliances to be electric – the key is the amount of TIME given to homeowners to do so.

ACT's email summary below outlines many of the issues which I believe are relevant. Mine is an old house which will require an electrical panel upgrade. It will require re-wiring parts of the house internally. Any electrical work will then require repairs to the walls and re-painting after the repairs. These are not simple, discrete fixes, which can be done easily. They require coordination of contractors and workers and materials/appliances.

Your proposal places the majority of these costs on me, the individual homeowner, in a short amount of time. Currently, I am more concerned with improving drainage (given recent flooding in many parts of Alameda) and with earthquake safety (improvements which cost a small fortune.) Thus, while I support your goal and I support giving as many rebates as possible, I do not see how many homeowners can do this so quickly.

Some thoughts on what you can do to assist homeowners to make these changes (in addition to rebates):

- a. Make the permitting for these changes easy, quick and inexpensive; streamline it to avoid delays that often occur,
- b. Figure out how to give **substantial** rebates, not just a few dollars for every hundred or thousand spent by the homeowner (perhaps consider lowering property taxes temporarily to encourage these upgrades),
- c. Make the timing reasonable (10+ years), and encourage changes over time,
- d. Allow for significant rent increases for landlords who must upgrade their property extensively & figure out how the City can help compensate homeowners and tenants temporarily during this renovation work,
- e. Wait on some of these requirements until the pandemic-induced delivery of supplies/supply-chain issues is fully resolved,
- f. Consider the big differences between professional, corporate landlords and individual (mom and pop) landlords, and perhaps have different incentives/criteria for each based on their resources,
- g. Incentivize, but do not require, houses to be made all-electric prior to sale for a period of

time.

I truly am on the side of working to prevent global warming as much as we can. From my limited understanding, heat pumps are the way to go, however, they cost a small fortune to install currently. I had looked into solar panels in about 2019 and was informed by AMP at the time that it was not cost effective if I did not have an electric bill greater than \$70/mth. It was also the case that AMP could not utilize all the energy produced during the daytime due to lack of battery storage, and extra solar power sent to the grid was a waste at that time. At that time, I did not have a high electric bill, nor the funds to go solar, so I did not move forward. Solar is still a huge monetary investment with a very slow return on investment over time. But it is the way of the future in California.

I appreciate the excellent ideas/goals. I hope that the City can figure out ways to incentivize everyone to move in a greener direction while also taking into account all the practical issues associated with these changes.

Best,
Claudia Viera

From: Alameda Citizens Task Force
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2023 10:04 AM
To: City Council

ACT has reviewed the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (EBDP) attached as Exhibit 1 to Item 7-B on the Jan. 17 City Council Agenda. We support incentives and rebates provided by AMP and the City to promote the decarbonizing existing buildings by shifting from natural gas use towards all-electric buildings. However, we strongly oppose those parts of the EBDP that propose the **requirement** of replacing natural gas with electrification for the following reasons:

1. **The Ability of AMP to Meet the Increased Service Load:** Such a requirement would greatly accelerate the service load on our existing electrical grid. The EBDP describes AMP as being “confident in their capacity of to accommodate additional projected loads.” However, the very next paragraph states, “California as whole is facing continued stress on the statewide electrical grid and the potential for rolling State-ordered blackouts is expected to continue for all California customers, including AMP customers, for the near future.” (p. 26) This begs the question of whether AMP’s confidence is based on only its current incentive/rebate program or the imposition of required transition to electrical service proposed by the EBDP. Even if AMP is confident of its ability to meet the full demands of conversion from gas to electricity, the fragile state of the grid argues strongly against forcing people to depend entirely on electric power
2. **Unreasonable Costs Imposed on Building Owners:** Many, if not most of the existing buildings will require upgrades to the electric service panels to bring them up to providing 200-amp service to each unit. In buildings where tenants pay their own electric bills, this will require upgrading "each" electric panel. Most buildings will require opening walls to install electric wiring where none presently exists. This will be disruptive to tenants and may require relocation during construction.

The rebates planned to be offered to Alameda property owners will not cover the cost of the necessary upgrades, especially in buildings where the service panels have to be upgraded. In buildings where major appliances, furnace, hot water heater, clothes dryer, and cooking stove are gas, this will be a very expensive process. Upgrading these appliances as they reach the end of life means replacing them one at a time. This is totally unpractical as the electric panel and house wiring upgrades will have to be in place at the time each appliance reaches its end-of-life cycle. Replacing all appliances at one time will be very expensive and beyond the financial abilities of most mom-and-pop landlords.

3. **Impact of Requiring Electrification Prior to Sale:** One part of the EBDP would require that a building be upgraded to 100% electric before it can be sold. The cost of this upgrade would increase prices/rents in our already expensive housing market.

4. **Cost of Gas vs. Electricity:** The plan assumes the electric bills to be paid by tenants or low-income property owners after the upgrades will be less than what they pay now for electric and gas combined. At present electricity is much more expensive than gas to heat water or to heat a unit during winter times. While it has been predicted that this will eventually reverse the relative costs. That is currently a prediction not a reality.

In summary, we believe that there is insufficient data to satisfy us that the grid can handle the increased service load created by requiring, rather than incentivizing, electrification and ample evidence that the costs imposed on both owners and tenants will be unreasonable and result in severe consequences to the affordability of living in Alameda.

Sincerely,

Alameda Citizens Task force Board of Directors

From: [Alameda Citizens Task Force](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [Manager Manager](#); [City Clerk](#); [Sustainability](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-B, Jan. 17 City Council Agenda-Decarbinization
Date: Saturday, January 14, 2023 10:04:29 AM

ACT

Alameda Citizens Task Force

Vigilance, Truth, Civility

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog & Council Members Vella, Spencer and Jenkins:

ACT has reviewed the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (EBDP) attached as Exhibit 1 to Item 7-B on the Jan. 17 City Council Agenda. We support incentives and rebates provided by AMP and the City to promote the decarbonizing existing buildings by shifting from natural gas use towards all-electric buildings. However, we strongly oppose those parts of the EBDP that propose the **requirement** of replacing natural gas with electrification for the following reasons:

1. **The Ability of AMP to Meet the Increased Service Load:** Such a requirement would greatly accelerate the service load on our existing electrical grid. The EBDP describes AMP as being “confident in their capacity of to accommodate additional projected loads.” However, the very next paragraph states, “California as whole is facing continued stress on the statewide electrical grid and the potential for rolling State-ordered blackouts is expected to continue for all California customers, including AMP customers, for the near future.” (p. 26) This begs the question of whether AMP’s confidence is based on only its current incentive/rebate program or the imposition of required transition to electrical service proposed by the EBDP. Even if AMP is confident of its ability to meet the full demands of conversion from gas to electricity, the fragile state of the grid argues strongly against forcing people to depend entirely on electric power
2. **Unreasonable Costs Imposed on Building Owners:** Many, if not most of the existing buildings will require upgrades to the electric service panels to bring them up to providing 200-amp service to each unit. In buildings where tenants pay their own electric bills, this will require upgrading "each" electric panel. Most buildings will require opening walls to install electric wiring where none presently exists. This will be disruptive to tenants and may require relocation during construction. The rebates planned to be offered to Alameda property owners will not cover the cost of the necessary upgrades, especially in buildings where the service panels have to be upgraded. In buildings where major appliances, furnace, hot water heater, clothes dryer, and cooking stove are gas, this will be a very expensive process. Upgrading these appliances as they reach the end of life means replacing them one at a time. This is totally unpractical as the electric panel and house wiring upgrades will have to be in place at the time each appliance reaches its end-of-life cycle. Replacing all appliances at one time will be very expensive and beyond the financial abilities of most mom-and-pop landlords.
3. **Impact of Requiring Electrification Prior to Sale:** One part of the EBDP would require that a

building be upgraded to 100% electric before it can be sold. The cost of this upgrade would increase prices/rents in our already expensive housing market.

4. **Cost of Gas vs. Electricity:** The plan assumes the electric bills to be paid by tenants or low-income property owners after the upgrades will be less than what they pay now for electric and gas combined. At present electricity is much more expensive than gas to heat water or to heat a unit during winter times. While it has been predicted that this will eventually reverse the relative costs. That is currently a prediction not a reality.

In summary, we believe that there is insufficient data to satisfy us that the grid can handle the increased service load created by requiring, rather than incentivizing, electrification and ample evidence that the costs imposed on both owners and tenants will be unreasonable and result in severe consequences to the affordability of living in Alameda.

Sincerely,

Alameda Citizens Task force Board of Directors

From: [Dorothy Freeman](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Agenda Item 7-B Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan-20230117
Date: Friday, January 13, 2023 11:20:43 AM

January 17th, 2023 City Council Agenda Item 7-B Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan.

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog, and Councilmembers Spencer, Vella and Jensen;

The Equitable Building Decarbonization (EBD) plan is a necessary step in the decarbonization of our planet. While being a necessary direction for our City, it is also necessary to protect the financial viability of Alameda citizens in the process.

The EBD plan must be voluntary so property owners are not placed in such a severe financial situation that forces them to abandon or sell their properties in order to comply with the EBD requirements. Alameda is a city of older homes. This is the result of our past efforts to save these old homes and they are the charm of Alameda. Unfortunately, because Alameda has these older homes, replacing all the gas appliances with electricity, even with planned rebates, will be a huge financial burden on many property owners. Rental property owners will have to carry the majority of the financial burden of construction costs since only small amounts can be recovered in rental increases. Even with the small amounts that can be recovered by landlords, rents will be increased.

Many of the older homes are also the rental properties for lower income families. Building upgrades to install electrical wiring can disrupt their lives to the point that they may have to be displaced during construction. Where will they go?

Savings projected from the Equitable Building Decarbonization plan assumes that gas prices will continue to rise to a level that makes the conversion to all electric a savings on energy costs. At present electric is far more expensive than gas so this conversion will result in no savings and perhaps increased utility costs for an extended period of time.

The Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan is also predicated on receiving government grants to provide the rebate incentives necessary to assist property owners with the conversion to all electric. At present the State of California budget is in deficit. The controlling party in the House of Representatives has indicated their desire to cut funding for climate change issues. There is no guarantee that the required assistance will be forthcoming from the government.

The Equitable Building Decarbonization must be voluntary but includes as much education, financial incentives, and city assistance as possible to encourage Alameda property owners to upgrade their buildings. Our planet needs the change, but our citizens need the financial security of not being placed into unreasonable debt. Renters need to know they are secure in their space and will not have to relocate or be unreasonably disrupted by the conversion from gas to electric. With the combined efforts of the City government and the voluntary efforts of property owners, Alameda will be able to make a great step forward for decarbonization and protect our property owners from such a huge financial burden.

I urge you to vote to keep the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan voluntary.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Freeman

cc;

City Manager Jen Ott

City Clerk Lara Weisiger

From: [Brian Tobin](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Written comment for item 7b (equitable building decarbonization plan)
Date: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 11:16:43 AM

Thank you for allowing me to submit the following comment:

Please adopt this plan! As a coastal city we'll be among the first experiencing displacement due to rising seas, not to mention choking on wildfire smoke, bigger droughts, worse floods, etc. It's really the least we could do, and avoids investments in fossil infrastructure that will inevitably become stranded assets as our society confronts the realities of climate change.

BT

Brian Tobin
415.518.4918

From: [Ashley Mullins](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 7D
Date: Tuesday, October 4, 2022 4:19:47 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am writing to urge you to pass the Resolution Adopting the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan. This is the right decision for our city as we must address climate change at every level. Any short term costs associated with appliance and service conversions can be easily offset by state and federal incentives, and the long term gains will serve all Alamedans.

We must make decisions now to protect our future, and I urge you to take this action for the benefit of all.

Regards,
Ashley Mullins



October 4, 2022

Mayor Ashcraft and Members of the Alameda City Council:

The Bay East Association of REALTORS® commends the City of Alameda for taking a leadership role in addressing climate change. We, too, are supportive of policies that create and maintain a suitable living environment. The members of the Bay East Association of REALTORS® want to help the City of Alameda address the impact residential buildings have on the environment and we are generally supportive of the Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan (Plan). In fact, the Plan presents many opportunities for our members to partner with the City of Alameda in achieving your energy efficiency goals.

To make the Plan responsible to the community and effective we respectfully submit the following observations and recommendations and ask they be considered as the City of Alameda proceeds with adopting and implementing the Plan.

Among the many actions proposed and discussed in the Plan there are several that will have a direct impact on housing affordability and social equity issues in Alameda. These policies will mandate certain actions when a home is sold including conducting an energy audit and requiring the complete electrification of a home.

The Bay East Association of REALTORS® does not have an issue with energy audits or the electrification of homes. However, a mandate that these activities occur during the sale of a home is problematic for the following reasons:

1. Time-of-sale requirements are not an effective or efficient way to implement policies that aim to improve private properties. The residential real estate market is in flux and home sales have decreased significantly in Alameda during the last several months. A combination of historically high sales prices and increasing mortgage interest rates have driven home buyers out of the market. An implementation strategy that focuses only on units that are for sale misses most homes in Alameda. Additionally, some of the oldest and least energy-efficient properties rarely change hands and would never be subject to a time-of-sale energy audit or electrical system upgrade requirement.
2. Time-of-sale requirements complicate real estate transactions. The current market for resale homes in Alameda is fragile because of challenges related to securing purchase financing along with housing affordability issues. Another layer of regulation that could require expensive and costly upgrades is not what the real estate market needs now or in the foreseeable future.
3. Time-of-sale requirements would add a significant administrative burden and tax city staff resources. Ensuring compliance with time-of-sale requirements would be complex and time-consuming. Valuable staff resources should be invested in decarbonization programs that will have a greater benefit to as many Alameda residents as possible.
4. Time-of-sale requirements will complicate an equitable implementation of decarbonization activities. Any building decarbonization policies based on time-of-sale triggers will make homeownership less affordable and will have disproportionate impacts on low-income households and communities of color. Furthermore, given the relatively modest number of buildings that would be subject to a time-of-sale requirement, it is not the most expeditious or realistic approach to transitioning Alameda's buildings.
5. A time-of-sale requirement is the least effective method for updating residential properties and will not improve environmental health. In fact, such requirements could be a deterrent to property owners considering selling their home. It could make more economic sense to keep their home off the market rather than make expensive improvements. In that case,

environmental health has not been improved while a home for a potential new owner is kept off the market.

We recognize the time-of-sale requirements are only one of several implementation strategies presented in the plan. However, the approach has too many unintended negative consequences for it to even be considered. As you move forward implementing the Plan we urge you to not pursue time-of-sale requirements.

Eliminating time-of-sale requirements as an implementation strategy will not negatively impact the ability of the Plan to achieve its goals. More prudent and effective approaches to improving energy efficiency are contained in other recommendations in the Plan including financing programs, leveraging programs offered by other entities and by teaming with the REALTOR® community and our efforts to promote energy efficiency.

The Bay East Association of REALTORS® wants to be a partner with Alameda homeowners, homebuyers and the community at-large in promoting energy efficiency. Our comments are offered in the spirit of creating effective public policy based on a full understanding of the real estate market. Please let me know if you have any questions about these recommendations. You may call me at (925)730-4068 or via email at: Davids@bayeast.org.

Sincerely,

David Stark, Chief Public Affairs and Communications Officer
Bay East Association of REALTORS®

From: [Paul Beusterien](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Danielle Mieler](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Equitable Building Decarbonization Plan - Item 7-D - October 4 City Council Meeting Agenda
Date: Sunday, October 2, 2022 10:35:42 AM

Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers:

Electrification is an important climate mitigation initiative. Since Alameda has its own electric utility that has been 100% renewable since 2020, Alameda is in a great position to be a leader.

Given that there are already several trends increasing electrical demand, I think it's especially important that Alameda focuses on supply initiatives, especially as we continue to have rolling blackouts when demand surges.

Some of the trends that will continue to increase demand:

- Rapidly increasing affordability of electric vehicles
- Alameda's Housing Element specifying 5353 new housing units in the next eight years combined with the requirement they be all electric
- Corresponding retail structures and city infrastructure for new housing
- State and federal initiatives, like the Inflation Reduction Act

At this point in time, I suggest it's more important that we incentivize supply creation. City simplification of the solar permit process is a good first step, but we have a long way to go to take advantage of the abundant sunlight we have in Alameda. We should incentivize home solar as well as moving forward with the Doolittle Solar Facility. We should incentivize battery adoption to store more of that power for the challenging 4-9PM peak demand time.

Since Alameda's greenhouse gas emissions from transportation are significantly higher than from homes, increasing home-charging access, including incentivizing electric panel upgrades and car-charging infrastructure for homes and multi-family apartments, should be a priority over other housing electrifying investments.

City incentives for full-home electrifying of existing homes and apartments should **not** yet be a priority:

It can cost tens of thousands of dollars per dwelling

- It can displace renters, especially the most vulnerable
- Housing greenhouse gas emission is 27% versus 70% for transportation in Alameda
- We should address electricity availability and some of the other lower hanging fruit first

I urge the council to ask staff for an alternative electrification plan that prioritizes increasing supply, starts with the most cost-effective measures, and doesn't threaten the housing of our most vulnerable population.

Paul Beusterien