



From: [Glenn Rogers](#)
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: All Electric New Construction
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 9:13:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Commissioners,

I am a San Francisco resident living in District 7. I do support the idea of mandating all new construction to be exclusively electric. There are numerous reasons for this. I shall list the reasons below:

* I am concerned about a conflagration should there be another earthquake and fire. Having no gas lines would limit this problem.

* In all areas of the distribution of gas there is some amount of gas lost into the environment. If we do not stop this, it will lead to catastrophic events.

* Gas use in the home is bad for your health. Fumes from pilot lights alone in houses with poor ventilation is a health hazard.

These are just a few of the reasons gas should be eliminated and we should go all electric. Please, consider my opinion.

Thanks,

Glenn Rogers, RLA
Landscape Architect
License 3223
Website: alderlandscapearchitecture.com
Email: alderlandscape@comcast.net
Facebook:
<https://www.facebook.com/alderlandscape>
Cell: [REDACTED]

From: [Rebecca Barker](#)
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: mvespa@earthjustice.org; [Sheehan, Charles \(ENV\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); patrick.o.riordan@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] matt.gough@sierraclub.org
Subject: Comment Letter for July 28 Commission on the Environment Meeting
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 4:49:53 PM
Attachments: [ATT00001.png](#)
[BE Ordinance Letter of Support from Earthjustice, SC, SFCEC, and Allies.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Attached please find a letter from Earthjustice, Sierra Club, SF Climate Emergency Coalition, and many more allied organizations in support of the building electrification ordinance (Board of Supervisors File No. 200701) listed as agenda item #7 for the Commission on the Environment's July 28 meeting. Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Rebecca Barker

Rebecca Barker
She/her/hers
Associate Attorney
Clean Energy Program
50 California Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Phone: 415.217.2056
rbarker@earthjustice.org



The information contained in this email message may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this email message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete the message and any attachments.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: Comments on Board of Supervisors File 200701
Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 5:51:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the SF Commission on the Environment, in advance of the meeting on Tuesday:

As a resident of San Francisco who's quite concerned about both air pollution and climate change, I'm very much in favor of the proposed all-electric requirements for new construction in File 200701. With renewable energy becoming cheaper and cheaper, an increasing part of the costs of living are natural gas fees. By requiring electrification in new construction, we're taking steps towards a cheaper, healthier, and more environmentally friendly future that will hopefully be a template for cities across the nation.

I would also like to ask the commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board:

- **Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022.** We know that restaurants are really struggling now, but existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
- **Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction.** Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the coming decade is poor planning and a cost that will fall on the users of those buildings, as well as those surrounding the construction.
- **Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas.** Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
- **Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest.** We've seen in the past that DBI has been abused to favor those with private connections, and we should not allow a repeat in the future when the stakes now include our health and our contribution to the climate crisis.
- **Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare."** Omitting electric readiness on construction designed to, say, combat the housing crisis

During a time of many crises—a terrifying phrase all on its own—we must not forget to plan for the future as well as the present, and I'm very glad the Commission on the

Environment continues to push things forward in this regard.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jordan Rose

District 8 resident

From: [Rebecca Barker](#)
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: mvespa@earthjustice.org; [Sheehan, Charles \(ENV\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); patrick.o.riordan@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#); dktahara@gmail.com; c@n-a-s-o.com; matt.gough@sierraclub.org
Subject: Comment Letter for July 28 Commission on the Environment Meeting
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 4:49:53 PM
Attachments: [ATT00001.png](#)
[BE Ordinance Letter of Support from Earthjustice, SC, SFCEC, and Allies.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Attached please find a letter from Earthjustice, Sierra Club, SF Climate Emergency Coalition, and many more allied organizations in support of the building electrification ordinance (Board of Supervisors File No. 200701) listed as agenda item #7 for the Commission on the Environment's July 28 meeting. Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Rebecca Barker

Rebecca Barker
She/her/hers
Associate Attorney
Clean Energy Program
50 California Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Phone: 415.217.2056
rbarker@earthjustice.org



The information contained in this email message may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this email message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete the message and any attachments.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: Comments on Board of Supervisors File 200701
Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 5:51:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the SF Commission on the Environment, in advance of the meeting on Tuesday:

As a resident of San Francisco who's quite concerned about both air pollution and climate change, **I'm very much in favor of the proposed all-electric requirements for new construction in File 200701.** With renewable energy becoming cheaper and cheaper, an increasing part of the costs of living are natural gas fees. By requiring electrification in new construction, we're taking steps towards a cheaper, healthier, and more environmentally friendly future that will hopefully be a template for cities across the nation.

I would also like to ask the commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board:

- **Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022.** We know that restaurants are really struggling now, but existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
- **Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction.** Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the coming decade is poor planning and a cost that will fall on the users of those buildings, as well as those surrounding the construction.
- **Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas.** Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
- **Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest.** We've seen in the past that DBI has been abused to favor those with private connections, and we should not allow a repeat in the future when the stakes now include our health and our contribution to the climate crisis.
- **Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare."** Omitting electric readiness on construction designed to, say, combat the housing crisis

During a time of many crises—a terrifying phrase all on its own—we must not forget to plan for the future as well as the present, and I'm very glad the Commission on the

Environment continues to push things forward in this regard.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jordan Rose

District 8 resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: File 200701
Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 2:48:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As a resident of San Francisco District 2, I want to express my strong support for prohibiting gas in new construction. We have the chance to let San Francisco once again lead the way in tackling pollution that is changing our climate and destroying our children's futures.

We know that air pollution from natural gas use increases asthma, lung cancer, and deaths from most respiratory diseases. Electrification reduces GHG emissions from homes by 30 - 60% as compared with mixed-fuel buildings -- a savings that will increase as the energy grid gets cleaner.

I also urge the elimination of the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. I know that restaurants are really struggling now, but existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric

Thank you so much.

Gail MacGowan

...I believe that prohibiting the expansion of natural gas in our buildings is important because *<pick a relevant reason, or make up your own>*:

- Children growing up in homes with gas stoves are significantly more likely to have asthma than those growing up in homes with electric stoves.
- Air pollution from natural gas use increases asthma, lung cancer, deaths from most respiratory diseases including a marked increase in risks from COVID-19.
- Electrification reduces GHG emissions from homes by 30 - 60% as compared with mixed-fuel buildings--and this savings will only rise as the CA and SF energy grid gets cleaner
- On average in the United States, a natural gas or oil pipeline catches fire every four days, results in an injury every five days, explodes every 11

days, and leads to a fatality every 26 days

- Efficient electric heat pumps result in lower utility bills than gas for space and water heating and provide air conditioning as a bonus amenity!
- Induction stoves are fun and easy to cook with, unlike old electric resistance ones
- All-electric homes are already the norm in affordable housing developments, since they are cheaper to build and maintain than buildings with natural gas

I would also like to ask the commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we *<pick one, or all, or none>* :

- Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. I know that restaurants are really struggling now, but existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
- Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
- Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
- Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
- Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare." The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

2. EMAIL COMMENTS

If you cannot call in during the meeting and want to ensure that your comment on any item on the agenda is received by the Commission in advance of the meeting, please send an email (subject line should include "File 200701") to diedre.tanenberg@sfgov.org by **5pm Monday**, July 27th or call (415) 255-5870.

In the body of the email, include:

- that you are a San Francisco resident and which district you live in
- that you support the ordinance mandating new construction be all-electric, and why it's important to you. The more personal, the better!
- that you would like to see it improved (see above for talking points)

Thank you!

From: [Delforge, Pierre](#)
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); [Patrick.O'Riordan@sfgov.org](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#); [Comerford, Cyndy \(ENV\)](#); [Hooper, Barry \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: NRDC comments in support of Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 5:22:04 PM
Attachments: [NRDC Letter of Support for SF Building Electrification Ordinance 7.27.2020.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mr. Secretary and Commission Members,

Please find attached NRDC's letter of support for Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance.

We commend Supervisor Mandelman and City staff for coordinating a comprehensive and inclusive stakeholder process, leading to a strong ordinance. We urge adoption at tomorrow's Commission Meeting.

Best regards,

PIERRE DELFORGE

Senior Scientist – Building Decarbonization

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

111 SUTTER ST., 21ST FLOOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

T 415.875.6139 | PDelforge@NRDC.org

BLOG: [HTTPS://WWW.NRDC.ORG/EXPERTS/PIERRE-DELFORGE](https://www.nrdc.org/experts/pierre-delforge)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: Prohibiting Expansion of Natural Gas in New Construction
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 11:53:37 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

My name is Annaliese Rosenthal and I am a resident of District 2. I strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. As a parent of a young child, it is so important to me that we take leadership in building a better future. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses.

I would also like to ask the commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

- Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. I know that restaurants are really struggling now, but existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
- Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
- Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. **It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.**
- Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
- Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare." The housing crisis is

real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for your consideration!

Annaliese

--

Annaliese Rosenthal

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 7:48:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Preston),

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Adrienne Gembala

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 1:04:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Haney),

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

elliot helman

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 4:18:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find

ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Sincerely,

Govind

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 9:17:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Ronen),

Hello,

I am an employee with the City & County of San Francisco and a union member in IFPTE Local 21 where I serve on the PAC. I am also a proud resident of San Francisco in District 9. I am writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. Please follow the recommendations to changes of the ordinance laid out in the letter by Earth Justice, SF Climate Emergency Coalition and other groups.

One specific reason why this ordinance should be as restrictive as possible: Any exemption to the ordinance will have a systemic effect that will have negative consequences on society. When new gas pipes are installed, they will become stranded assets in the future when we are moved to electrify everything to reach our climate goals. Removing these gas pipes before the end of their useful life will have a cost burden on those still remaining on the gas system who will be footed with the remaining maintenance and transmission costs for a system that has a shrink customer base. This is an equity concern, since those who cannot afford to electrify will be unable to be caught in the spiraling costs to electrify. Thus any exemptions to the code as long-term equity concerns.

Please follow the recommendations of the letter by SF Climate Emergency Coalition and Earth Justice.

Thank you,
Jonathan Kocher
IFPTE Local 21

Jonathan Kocher
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 12:20:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

As a San Francisco District 7 resident, I'm writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction.

The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. Our city should lead the state and the country in the right direction on this. Living in an earthquake zone, we should also welcome the large risk-reduction eliminating gas in our buildings provides.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility

of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Russell



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 10:44:10 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Mandelman),

I'm a resident of San Francisco. I write in strong support of the measure to prohibit gas in new construction. I live in a city landmark victorian residence and remodeling is expensive, yet I've managed to cut back most of my gas appliances. If I can do it, new construction, which is much easier to deal with, can do it.

The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public

welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Kimberlee Stryker

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 11:09:07 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Haney),

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the Sierra Club, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 8:02:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Commissioners:

I am a homeowner in District 11 in San Francisco. I strongly support the City's recognition that we are in the midst of a Climate Emergency, and I am happy to see that we have begun to remove gas from our buildings. It can't happen too soon. Gas is unhealthy for the planet, and for us. Like many other San Francisco residences, my home is powered by both gas and electricity, and I eagerly look forward to a City program that helps us retrofit our homes.

In the meantime, I fully support this first step: the ordinance that would prohibit gas in new construction. But drastically limit the loopholes. Gas is going away. If we put in gas now, we're going to have to take it out later; someone is going to have to pay for that.

In particular, I ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit

cost.

3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.

4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.

5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for your work on this very important issue.

Josephine Coffey



From: [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#)
To: [Rebecca Barker](#); [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: mvespa@earthjustice.org; [Sheehan, Charles \(ENV\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); patrick.o.riordan@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [REDACTED] c@n-a-s-o.com; matt.gough@sierraclub.org
Subject: RE: Comment Letter for July 28 Commission on the Environment Meeting
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 8:08:20 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello Ms. Barker,

I am in receipt of your email, and I'll forward it to the members of the Building Inspection Commission.

Thank You.

Sonya Harris
Commission Secretary

From: Rebecca Barker <rbarker@earthjustice.org>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 4:50 PM
To: Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV) <diedre.tanenberg@sfgov.org>
Cc: mvespa@earthjustice.org; [Sheehan, Charles \(ENV\) <charles.sheehan@sfgov.org>](mailto:Charles.Sheehan@sfgov.org); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>](mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>](mailto:Lee.Hepner@sfgov.org); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>](mailto:Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>](mailto:Suhagey.Sandoval@sfgov.org); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>](mailto:Dean.Preston@sfgov.org); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\) <jen.snyder@sfgov.org>](mailto:Jen.Snyder@sfgov.org); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>](mailto:Kyle.Smeallie@sfgov.org); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>](mailto:Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>](mailto:Jacob.Bintliff@sfgov.org); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>](mailto:MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\) <deborah.rafael@sfgov.org>](mailto:Deborah.Raphael@sfgov.org); patrick.o.riordan@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org); [Major, Erica \(BOS\) <erica.major@sfgov.org>](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org); [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\) <sonya.harris@sfgov.org>](mailto:sonya.harris@sfgov.org); [REDACTED] [REDACTED] matt.gough@sierraclub.org
Subject: Comment Letter for July 28 Commission on the Environment Meeting

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Attached please find a letter from Earthjustice, Sierra Club, SF Climate Emergency Coalition, and many more allied organizations in support of the building electrification ordinance (Board of Supervisors File No. 200701) listed as agenda item #7 for the Commission on the Environment's July 28 meeting. Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Rebecca Barker

Rebecca Barker

She/her/hers

Associate Attorney

Clean Energy Program

50 California Street, Suite 500

San Francisco, CA 94111

Phone: 415.217.2056

rbarker@earthjustice.org



The information contained in this email message may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this email message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete the message and any attachments.

From: [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#)
To: [Delforge, Pierre](#); [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); [Patrick.O'Riordan@sfgov.org](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Comerford, Cyndy \(ENV\)](#); [Hooper, Barry \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: RE: NRDC comments in support of Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 8:12:31 AM

Hello Mr. Delforge,

I am in receipt of your email, and will forward it to the members of the Building Inspection Commission.

Thank You.

Sonya Harris
Commission Secretary

From: Delforge, Pierre <pdelforge@nrdc.org>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 5:22 PM
To: Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV) <diedre.tanenberg@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Snyder, Jen (BOS) <jen.snyder@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Raphael, Deborah (ENV) <deborah.raaphael@sfgov.org>; Patrick.O'Riordan@sfgov.org <Patrick.O? ? ?Riordan@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Harris, Sonya (DBI) <sonya.harris@sfgov.org>; Comerford, Cyndy (ENV) <cyndy.comerford@sfgov.org>; Hooper, Barry (ENV) <barry.e.hooper@sfgov.org>
Subject: NRDC comments in support of Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mr. Secretary and Commission Members,

Please find attached NRDC's letter of support for Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance.

We commend Supervisor Mandelman and City staff for coordinating a comprehensive and inclusive stakeholder process, leading to a strong ordinance. We urge adoption at tomorrow's Commission

Meeting.

Best regards,

PIERRE DELFORGE

Senior Scientist – Building Decarbonization

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

111 SUTTER ST., 21ST FLOOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

T 415.875.6139 | PDELFORGE@NRDC.ORG

BLOG: [HTTPS://WWW.NRDC.ORG/EXPERTS/PIERRE-DELFORGE](https://www.nrdc.org/experts/pierre-delforge)

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [REDACTED]; [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 4:43:06 PM

Thanks for your email. I'm looping in Supervisor Mandelman who is the author of this legislation.
Aaron

From: Govind Wakhlu <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2020 4:17:51 PM
To: Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV) <diedre.tanenberg@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale

decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.

4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.

5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Sincerely,

Govind
155 Jackson St, San Francisco, CA - 94111

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Transition from fossil infrastructure! Re: BoS File 200701
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 10:49:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Safai),

Hi, I live in Ocean View with my husband. We have already electrified several of our appliances and are planning to do more. I also co-authored some of the studies showing the importance of a gas system transition at the state level. If we continue to allow new gas pipes now, it will mean more air pollution and financial burden on our most vulnerable communities for decades to come.

I strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to consider the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board. Any exceptions should be motivated by the public interest and should apply where continued gas fuel use is sustainable, and where non-piped fuel alternatives are infeasible.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Zack Subin

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 1:04:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Haney),

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

elliot helman

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 7:48:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Preston),

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Adrienne Gembala

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 8:02:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Commissioners:

I am a homeowner in District 11 in San Francisco. I strongly support the City's recognition that we are in the midst of a Climate Emergency, and I am happy to see that we have begun to remove gas from our buildings. It can't happen too soon. Gas is unhealthy for the planet, and for us. Like many other San Francisco residences, my home is powered by both gas and electricity, and I eagerly look forward to a City program that helps us retrofit our homes.

In the meantime, I fully support this first step: the ordinance that would prohibit gas in new construction. But drastically limit the loopholes. Gas is going away. If we put in gas now, we're going to have to take it out later; someone is going to have to pay for that.

In particular, I ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit

cost.

3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.

4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.

5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for your work on this very important issue.

Josephine Coffey



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 11:09:07 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Haney),

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the Sierra Club, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 10:44:10 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Mandelman),

I'm a resident of San Francisco. I write in strong support of the measure to prohibit gas in new construction. I live in a city landmark victorian residence and remodeling is expensive, yet I've managed to cut back most of my gas appliances. If I can do it, new construction, which is much easier to deal with, can do it.

The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public

welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Kimberlee Stryker

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 12:20:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

As a San Francisco District 7 resident, I'm writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction.

The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. Our city should lead the state and the country in the right direction on this. Living in an earthquake zone, we should also welcome the large risk-reduction eliminating gas in our buildings provides.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility

of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Russell



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 9:17:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Ronen),

Hello,

I am an employee with the City & County of San Francisco and a union member in IFPTE Local 21 where I serve on the PAC. I am also a proud resident of San Francisco in District 9. I am writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. Please follow the recommendations to changes of the ordinance laid out in the letter by Earth Justice, SF Climate Emergency Coalition and other groups.

One specific reason why this ordinance should be as restrictive as possible: Any exemption to the ordinance will have a systemic effect that will have negative consequences on society. When new gas pipes are installed, they will become stranded assets in the future when we are moved to electrify everything to reach our climate goals. Removing these gas pipes before the end of their useful life will have a cost burden on those still remaining on the gas system who will be footed with the remaining maintenance and transmission costs for a system that has a shrink customer base. This is an equity concern, since those who cannot afford to electrify will be unable to be caught in the spiraling costs to electrify. Thus any exemptions to the code as long-term equity concerns.

Please follow the recommendations of the letter by SF Climate Emergency Coalition and Earth Justice.

Thank you,
Jonathan Kocher
IFPTE Local 21

Jonathan Kocher
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 4:18:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.
4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.
5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find

ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Sincerely,

Govind



From: [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#)
To: [Rebecca Barker](#); [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: mvespa@earthjustice.org; [Sheehan, Charles \(ENV\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); patrick.o.riordan@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [REDACTED] c@n-a-s-o.com; matt.gough@sierraclub.org
Subject: RE: Comment Letter for July 28 Commission on the Environment Meeting
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 8:08:20 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello Ms. Barker,

I am in receipt of your email, and I'll forward it to the members of the Building Inspection Commission.

Thank You.

Sonya Harris
Commission Secretary

From: Rebecca Barker <rbarker@earthjustice.org>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 4:50 PM
To: Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV) <diedre.tanenberg@sfgov.org>
Cc: mvespa@earthjustice.org; [Sheehan, Charles \(ENV\) <charles.sheehan@sfgov.org>](mailto:Charles.Sheehan@sfgov.org); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>](mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>](mailto:Lee.Hepner@sfgov.org); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>](mailto:Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>](mailto:Suhagey.Sandoval@sfgov.org); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>](mailto:Dean.Preston@sfgov.org); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\) <jen.snyder@sfgov.org>](mailto:Jen.Snyder@sfgov.org); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>](mailto:Kyle.Smeallie@sfgov.org); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>](mailto:Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>](mailto:Jacob.Bintliff@sfgov.org); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>](mailto:MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\) <deborah.rafael@sfgov.org>](mailto:Deborah.Raphael@sfgov.org); patrick.o.riordan@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org); [Major, Erica \(BOS\) <erica.major@sfgov.org>](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org); [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\) <sonya.harris@sfgov.org>](mailto:sonya.harris@sfgov.org); [REDACTED] [REDACTED] matt.gough@sierraclub.org
Subject: Comment Letter for July 28 Commission on the Environment Meeting

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Attached please find a letter from Earthjustice, Sierra Club, SF Climate Emergency Coalition, and many more allied organizations in support of the building electrification ordinance (Board of Supervisors File No. 200701) listed as agenda item #7 for the Commission on the Environment's July 28 meeting. Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Rebecca Barker

Rebecca Barker

She/her/hers

Associate Attorney

Clean Energy Program

50 California Street, Suite 500

San Francisco, CA 94111

Phone: 415.217.2056

rbarker@earthjustice.org



The information contained in this email message may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this email message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete the message and any attachments.

From: [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#)
To: [Delforge, Pierre](#); [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); [Patrick.O'Riordan@sfgov.org](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Comerford, Cyndy \(ENV\)](#); [Hooper, Barry \(ENV\)](#)
Subject: RE: NRDC comments in support of Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 8:12:31 AM

Hello Mr. Delforge,

I am in receipt of your email, and will forward it to the members of the Building Inspection Commission.

Thank You.

Sonya Harris
Commission Secretary

From: Delforge, Pierre <pdelforge@nrdc.org>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 5:22 PM
To: Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV) <diedre.tanenberg@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Snyder, Jen (BOS) <jen.snyder@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Raphael, Deborah (ENV) <deborah.rafael@sfgov.org>; Patrick.O'Riordan@sfgov.org <Patrick.O? ? ?Riordan@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Harris, Sonya (DBI) <sonya.harris@sfgov.org>; Comerford, Cyndy (ENV) <cyndy.comerford@sfgov.org>; Hooper, Barry (ENV) <barry.e.hooper@sfgov.org>
Subject: NRDC comments in support of Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mr. Secretary and Commission Members,

Please find attached NRDC's letter of support for Supervisor Mandelman's proposed building electrification ordinance.

We commend Supervisor Mandelman and City staff for coordinating a comprehensive and inclusive stakeholder process, leading to a strong ordinance. We urge adoption at tomorrow's Commission

Meeting.

Best regards,

PIERRE DELFORGE

Senior Scientist – Building Decarbonization

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

111 SUTTER ST., 21ST FLOOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

T 415.875.6139 | PDELFORGE@NRDC.ORG

BLOG: [HTTPS://WWW.NRDC.ORG/EXPERTS/PIERRE-DELFORGE](https://www.nrdc.org/experts/pierre-delforge)

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Govind Wakhlu](#); [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#)
Cc: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)
Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 4:43:06 PM

Thanks for your email. I'm looping in Supervisor Mandelman who is the author of this legislation.
Aaron

From: Govind Wakhlu <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2020 4:17:51 PM
To: Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV) <diedre.tanenberg@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I'm a resident of San Francisco writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.
3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale

decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.

4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.

5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Sincerely,

Govind
155 Jackson St, San Francisco, CA - 94111

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tanenberg, Diedre \(ENV\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Transition from fossil infrastructure! Re: BoS File 200701
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 10:49:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Safai),

Hi, I live in Ocean View with my husband. We have already electrified several of our appliances and are planning to do more. I also co-authored some of the studies showing the importance of a gas system transition at the state level. If we continue to allow new gas pipes now, it will mean more air pollution and financial burden on our most vulnerable communities for decades to come.

I strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco can lead the state and the country in building a better future.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to consider the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board. Any exceptions should be motivated by the public interest and should apply where continued gas fuel use is sustainable, and where non-piped fuel alternatives are infeasible.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Zack Subin

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



AIA
San Francisco



AIA
California

July 30, 2020

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Regarding: Support for All-Electric Building Code for New Construction

The American Institute of Architects San Francisco Chapter (AIA SF) and American Institute of Architects California (AIA CA) support your proposed ordinance requiring all-electric buildings for new construction.

Last year, AIA's national component adopted a policy supporting urgent climate action as a health, safety, and welfare issue and an exponential acceleration of the 'decarbonization' of buildings. Aligned with this resolution, AIA SF and AIA CA support required electrification of new construction as the most effective means to decarbonization. We believe that the move toward electrification is quickly moving 'mainstream' – as evidenced by the dozens of California cities which have approved electrification reach codes. We have supported these forward thinking codes now in place, and our members are currently working with dozens more cities across the state.

We believe that for virtually all residential and commercial buildings in San Francisco, the proposed electrification is cost effective for owners and occupants. Numerous studies have found that electrification is the lowest cost and least risk pathway to achieve the State's legislated climate goals by 2045. AIA SF and AIA CA believe that the necessary transition to this path should begin immediately. Failure to make this course correction early would result in a continuation of the installation of equipment and infrastructure that will quickly become obsolete and thus have to be replaced before its end of life, which would waste taxpayer money.

The health, safety, and equity issues of fuel combustion in buildings are also a serious concern. Indoor and outdoor air pollution disproportionately impact disadvantaged communities and communities of color, and California continues to lead the nation in air pollution and its health impacts. These structural inequities must be addressed with urgency. Fossil fuel combustion in buildings release seven times more nitrogen oxide emissions (NOX) pollution than do all of California's power plants, and UCLA research has demonstrated serious health impacts from combustion inside homes. A 2019 California Energy Commission report by Berkeley Economic Advising and Research found the "benefits of electrification significantly outweigh the costs" and "more dramatically, the public health benefits are greater...for disadvantaged communities and contribute to reducing inequality."

Supervisor Mandelman

Page 2

July 30, 2020

Fortunately, solutions are readily available. All-electric buildings of all types and sizes are being designed today by AIASF member architects across the state. They use efficient electric appliances that run on California's rapidly expanding clean renewable energy supply supplemented with solar. Rapid advances in energy storage and demand flexibility continually make our electric grid more efficient and affordable. Electrification will reduce carbon emissions and other pollutants, improve health outcomes, lower energy costs, help mitigate fire risk, and result in a more just and equitable San Francisco.

For these reasons, and on behalf of our Members, AIASF and AIA CA are pleased to support your proposed ordinance requiring all-electric buildings for new construction.

Please feel free to reach out to us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Adrienne Steichen, AIA
2020 President
AIA San Francisco



Debra Gerod, FAIA
2020 President
AIA California

Cc: Angus McCarthy, President, Building Inspection Commission
Patrick O'Riordan, Interim Director, Department of Building Inspection
Deborah Raphael, Director, Department of the Environment

Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV)

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 4:03 PM
To: Tanenberg, Diedre (ENV); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: Public Comment Re: BoS File 200701 (Item 7 of 7/28 COE Meeting)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Diedre Tanenberg (and Sup. Walton),

I'm a resident of San Francisco in District 10 writing to strongly support prohibiting gas in new construction. The methane leaks, air pollution, and explosion dangers of natural gas are no longer necessary for the functioning of our homes and businesses. San Francisco has consistently lead the state and the country in passing landmark environmental and human health protection laws. With the continued increase in renewable energy access and infrastructure, we do not need natural gas anymore.

In addition to recommending the ordinance, I would also like to ask the Commission to recommend the changes to the ordinance as laid out by Earthjustice, the Sierra Club, the San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition, and other local groups in their letter to the Commission and Board.

It is important to me that we:

1. Eliminate the blanket exemption for commercial kitchens delaying compliance until 2022. Existing restaurants are not helped by giving builders a pass on making future commercial kitchens all-electric.
2. Eliminate the feasibility exception to the electric-ready requirement and make fully electric-ready construction a baseline requirement for new construction. We know that the future is electric. Allowing any building to be built that will require massive retrofits in the near future is unacceptable. With full electric readiness, we minimize that retrofit cost.

3. Expand the ordinance's definition of "mixed-fuel buildings" to include laboratory, industrial, and decorative uses of gas. Gas shouldn't be allowed for upscale decorative uses. It's wrong to harm public health for private enjoyment.

4. Provide additional limitations and transparency in the exemption process to ensure any project found exempt for infeasibility is truly in the public interest. I'm concerned about the news of powerful and connected people being able to get favors from DBI. We need sunshine on the exemption process, and exemptions should only be given in the public interest.

5. Amend section 106A.1.17 to require that the Building Official find "sufficient evidence was submitted to substantiate the infeasibility of an All-Electric Building or Project design without regard to financial, floor-area, or amenity-related loss unless deemed to be in the public welfare. The housing crisis is real. And we need to find ways of fixing it without sacrificing our children's future. The space taken up by a transformer should not be an acceptable reason for an exemption.

Thank you for taking up this important issue and considering the health and safety of our residents and climate.

Megan Kalsman

████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████