

Los Altos is one of the worst cities in terms of new home constructions. Less regulations, please!

It makes sense to require EV charging hook ups on new construction. Also, I would be in support of REACH codes on new constructions that allow the option to have gas appliances, but only if the new construction also required hook ups for electricity as well, that would allow for conversion to electricity at a future time when clean electricity becomes more abundant. Clean electricity still is not abundant nationwide, or even in California. According to the EPA, in 2019, 25% of the nation's carbon emissions were due to generation of electricity. I don't think it is appropriate just yet to encourage increased demand for electricity that cannot be met with clean electricity. This increased demand will result in increased burning of fossil fuel to meet the increased demand for electricity. The electricity generation plants are generally located in or near lower economic neighborhoods, which means lower income people will have to suffer more, just so that the incessant and increasing consumption of electricity of people in more affluent areas (such as Los Altos) can be met. The emphasis on "electrification" gives the false impression that people can use electricity with impunity--and all they want--and gives them a false sense of doing the right thing. People need to reduce their consumption of ALL forms of energy in general, to the extent that they can, and practice conservation habits. I'm bothered by the hypocrisy that I see among many affluent people in this area who feel sanctimonious because they can afford to buy EVs and electrify their houses, and yet live in HUGE, energy guzzling house, take numerous commercial airline flights per year for non-essential reasons, and are uber consumers of newly manufactured products--which contribute greatly to their carbon foot print. I feel that the city and the environmental commission should try to raise awareness of the fact that it has been shown (through scientific studies) that people in affluent areas are energy hogs and leave a disproportionately large carbon footprint in comparison to less affluent people. Electrifying their houses and driving EVs is a drop in the bucket compared to other areas of consumption. It has been estimated that one round trip flight from New York to Paris emits the same amount of carbon as two years of eating meat, or 8 months of driving a car. There have been ads on TV lately encouraging people to fly to Paris to do their shopping! I read that the US is the only developed country that does not impose a carbon tax on airlines. It has been noted, based on an Oxfam study done five years ago, that ".,.,it is estimated that the world's richest 1% probably emit 30 times more than the poorest 50% of the planet". This is very relevant to Los Altos, Los Altos Hills and other Bay Area Cities which are the home to many "one percenters." We have not replaced our car with an EV, because we are retired and rarely drive a car. My husband is still able to do most of our errands on a bike--but not everyone is in a position to do this. Purchasing a new EV would on balance require far more fossil fuel and resources (such as Lithium, which is a disaster from an environmental standpoint) than continuing to drive an older car (occasionally) that gets good gas mileage and has low emissions. Also, electricity is very expensive. Not everyone can afford the tens of thousands of dollars it costs to get solar panels, nor is it cost effective for everyone. We had a solar expert come and do an analysis, and due to the fact that we have a lot of trees surrounding our house, we probably would be dead by the time solar would generate enough electricity to pay for itself. Also, we did not like the idea that was floated recently that people should have to electrify before selling their house! In particular, this does not make sense for older houses. In our neighborhood, there was a very nice house on Berry that was sold within the last couple of years. The original owners had done upgrades, such as replacing every window with energy efficient windows, probably at great cost. Well, just recently (I think this week), the new owners had the house bulldozed and razed to the ground! All this did was use up resources that then were destroyed! Does that make sense? Also, solar has some downsides which have not been addressed yet. For example, the panels can be a disaster for the environment when they end up in the landfill due to the fact that it is not cost effective to recycle the materials. The government may need to step up to the plate and subsidize

recycling or we could be looking at a mess when they start to reach the end of their life, or get damaged prematurely. Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback.

Government should not tell me what kind of stove I must have.

The commission's lack of coordination with those entities responsible for the already stressed grid is concerning. Our concern is if we run ahead of the capacity of the grid - it will lead to more than "periodic" power shut-offs.

All rules should consider unintended consequences and balance all energy sources. If everything is electric and there is no electricity ... even with some solar ... there will be issues. Options are key! Thank you for reaching out to the public on this critically important issue. Costs of going all electric are going down and becoming less expensive than gas. The urgency of climate change and reality that we're behind the curve individually and collectively in addressing it makes the case for Los Altos to be taking a more aggressive position than the State. And by doing so we will have an exceptionally healthy, thriving, and livable community to show for this in 20 years. You can bet on it!

China is opening as many coal plants each year as are still running in the US. Any tiny decrease in CO2 emission here is swamped by their output. America is for freedom, let people have a choice.

I am against mandating regulations. This is too much intrusion in people's lives. Responsible, environmentally conscious people can make the changes themselves

We have now lived in 4 neighborhoods in Los Altos and in 2 of those 4 we had to close our windows almost every night due to smoke coming from chimneys. It's 2022. We can do better than that kind of air pollution.

Currently, our electric infrastructure can't handle a significant increase in demand, as a result of eliminating gas appliances. Only a few years ago, we had rolling blackouts...and yet, these laws will make that issue worse? Doesn't make sense... Also, the VERY small amount of damage done by these gases, on a global scale, cannot be measured...literally. Why is a small city like Los Altos, wasting time on this issue, when other LOCAL issues are more important. We are NOT going to have ANY global impact on the problem, by passing these restrictive laws. California, will pass laws at some point...which will be restrictive enough....likely far more restrictive than most states....but that's not good enough for Los Altos? What a joke!!! If the City fills strongly, educate residents on the "advantage" of electric and let the local, intelligent citizens make their own decisions. Just because a person is on a committee, board, or council, does not make them smarter than the community at large. We can, and should, have the right to make our own decisions on this issue. 100% against wasting more time and money on this ridiculous topic, at the local level.

Ride a bike more often.

The reach codes cause us to use out of state Coal, and natural gas instead of clean natural gas. To make clean power CCA's wash the power in paperwork. Unfortunately the Coal is still polluting the environment. They are bad for the environment, bad for rate payers. We pay 3 times the national average for unreliable power. An electric car is really a "Coal Car" Don't make our ranges "Coal Ranges". Look up efficiency of electric ranges its about 4 watts to get 1 watt of work. MUCH more

greenhouse gases!! About 70% of the grid is fossil fuels. DO NOT PUSH THEM PLEASE! Bad for the environment!

I do not support aggressive steps that are promoted by a few and not supported by the community at large. The political divides in our community are exacerbated by a minority pushing their viewpoints into the homes of others. While I support taking action to address the environment I believe that we need to stay in alignment of what the community wants and avoid the temptation to think a few "know what's best" and force their agenda on others.

We have an electric car but use the existing plug for our dryer to charge.

Love the idea of requiring all-electric appliances of all types. Fully support the environmental commission's recommendations!

If restaurants are opened in new buildings, they should be allowed to have gas cooktops--induction cannot replace gas in all instances (e.g., high heat required for some Asian cuisines). Gas should still be permissible outdoors for BBQs in all homes (as part of new home construction, or landscape project in existing backyard)...still cleaner than charcoal + lighter fluid. Don't agree with EV infrastructure requirement--fuel cell cars provide another clean alternative. I think contractors building homes to sell on the open market will add them as a selling feature and many people building/rebuilding will install them on own. So, in most instances they'll go in anyway, but it shouldn't be a requirement. I agree there should be no requirement for appliance replacement in existing homes to switch to electric if they're currently gas. We actually just did this in our own home, and it is a VERY expensive and time consuming undertaking. Also, in older homes, making the conversion often requires a panel upgrade. Finding licensed electricians is extremely difficult, so making such conversion a requirement would pretty much create an unworkable situation for many homeowners. It would be great to see Los Altos support training programs for electricians, installers, etc., to help provide good jobs and maybe slow down ever rising costs for contracting with electricians and other technicians.

As we've seen in recent years the electric grid is not reliable enough, so for now we absolutely need gas as backup

Thank you for the work on behalf of all those of us who live in Los Altos.

Very complicated and noble, but will be offset by adding more immigrants to our State, as Sacramento is intent on doing.

Most the the grid electricity is generated by LNG. Until that moves to solar, hydro, wind or nuclear, electricity isn't very green. And people are leery of reliance on a single source of energy. They prefer to diversify with LNG.

All new construction and remodels should require electricity only. In addition, there must be a ten year phase out where ALL gas appliances, including furnaces and stoves must be electric. The gas phase out is critical, else residents will retain aging, inefficient furnaces, etc. rather than replace.

I am concerned about climate change. At this time REACH codes are mostly NIMBYism. Well off Los Altos moves our pollution out of town. When 90% of power comes from renewables then REACH codes make sense. Until then the efficiencies of power plants and power loss in transmission will mean producing more CO2 than we currently do. It is estimated that California will need more than 20 years to reach >90% electric power from renewable resources. During that time Los Altos under REACH codes will be responsible for large amounts of excess CO2 produced at power plants elsewhere. It is still all the same planet.

We have a 240v outlet for charging, not a dedicated charger. I also support limiting the amount of property that can be paved over. Plants capture carbon and we need to have more not less.

If we don't do something to save the planet, who will?

Oh my goodness. I read the introduction at the top several times and I'm still not completely sure what I voted for in #4. That was really confusing. It'd be nice if there were a summary under each of the four options so I don't have to scroll up to keep checking for the description. Also it'd be helpful if they were listed in order of rules restrictiveness (least to most restrictive or vice versa).

The pg&e infrastructure can not support a switch to most large gas items being switched to electric.

Too restrictive unless there is a cap on electricity rates which have gone up substantially. Unless the city can figure out ways to help homeowners with the expected higher pG&E bills, it seems unfair to assert such burdens on homeowners.

Why is the city so convinced that its limited staff has better knowledge than the state, the market and their citizens of the many trade offs involved in choosing optimal equipment ?

Making people go all electric if you do more than 50% is not right. New construction, sure, but not remodels.

Follow the state

I prefer to cook by gas; allotter appliances ok for electric inc. oven

How is all this electricity going to be generated? Stored? Paid for?

City Council has no business determining what available & legal energy sources we have to use. If 90 percent of residents were in favor, then fine. That is not the case here. Not even close.

Really - Nothing better to do with your time?

It's ludicrous to ban any gas appliances in new homes, remodels and present construction. WHERE does the electricity come from to power these devices? THE vast majority is from Natural Gas fired Utilities. We should be building nuclear plants NOW! Lawrence Livermore Lab is making progress on fusion power. That is eventually the answer to solving the environmental crises we're in.

If the City wants to remove the equivalent of 40-85 gas vehicles from the road, simply offer electrical vehicle tax subsidies to the first 40-85 to apply to the City of Los Altos. Why embroil the entire City of Los Altos in a politicized building permit campaign?

What is the plan for recycling the carcinogenic materials (Selenium, Cadmium Telluride, Gallium Arsenide, & Lead) which are contained in solar cells when the cells reach their end of life? If these cells are sent to land fill they contaminate the soil and ground water. No solar cell supplier has been able to develop a successful recycling program after 15 years of efforts. If the electricity needed for electric appliances does not come from solar or wind it must come from coal and gas fired power plants and the benefit of switching to electric appliances is lost.

Our electric infrastructure will not support going all electric. Natural gas is plentiful. Let us use it.

Electricity only format assumes we have an adequate supply of electricity. 94% of all power generation is carbon base. Alternative green sources are in their infant stages and are not reliable (every wind/solar "farm" has a carbon backup power source). This winter energy costs are expected to increase 100/400% on the East Coast. In Calif we have the highest energy costs of any state and now the local/state government wants to ban the most affordable source of energy for its citizenry. Also I noted that some LA council members are involved in Green companies, not a good optics for impartiality. Bottom line, until green is reliable (no energy when the sun isn't shining or the wind isn't blowing) and affordable then stay with a clean carbon source (natural gas is abundant and affordable and is the primary reason the USA met its CO2 carbon emissions under the Paris Accords (had we kept our membership). If you want to impact the environment focus on China and India, 2 countries that are INCREASING their carbon footprint without suffering any consequence. Summary: natural gas is a reliable and affordable source of energy that should be available to any homeowner.

One size does not fit all. Diversity. We all can help with climate change and should be able to adapt our own diet of cutbacks/comprises to reach mutually agreed upon goals.

80% of the existing houses in Los Altos do not have a large enough electrical service to support the all electric home. They have a 200 amp service and you need a 300 amp service for the all electric home. The power grid in Los Altos would need a 30 to 50% increase in capacity to support the all electric home and car charger. The Cost For this is way beyond the resources in Los Altos

The commission should offer rebates and other incentives to residence in order to transition to more sustainable energy uses.

Environmental Commission should provide provisions (including both incentives and fees) to support installation of EV home chargers, solar and water recapture system.) Solar, charging, water recapture (for garden reuse) should be required for all NEW multi-unit home, office, ADU or mixed use construction.

Think the revised recommendation is excellent.

I believe that allowing/encouraging more housing units to be built in Los Altos will have a far greater (positive) impact on climate change than appliances. If including gas appliances gets more housing built faster, I would go with gas. Requiring people to commute to Los Altos to work is the worst thing the city is doing right now.

California is in an ongoing multi-year drought. Hydro-electric generation throughout the West is jeopardy as a result of drought. California has one nuclear power plant currently on-line and it's to be decommissioned within a couple of years. Most of California's smaller power plants are natural gas powered; therefore electricity in our homes is GAS powered. Cutting off natural gas simply stresses an already maxed-out California power grid!

We need balanced, common sense Green policies, not these draconian unbalanced (Over) Reach codes that defy common sense. To require people to switch from gas to electric when buying a new appliance is absurd and unjust. Also, the world is in an energy crises (see Europe). Natural gas will remain an important and indispensable source of energy for decades to come. Wind/solar only produces 2-3% of our energy.

Slow your roll. California, and Los Altos specifically, is not ready to go fully electric. This idea only empowers PG&E to play electricity access games with us. Residential solar and wind generators are not readily available for each Los Altos building. Until they are, gas service will still need to be an option. If the city is hell-bent on an all electric future, then it should subsidize solar and wind power generators and battery storage for Los Altos residents.

If you ban extending current gas lines in non-new construction, then you need to consider the effects of people buying outdoor propane heaters instead of extending a gas line for an outdoor space heater. Not sure which is worse-propane from a tank or a natural gas line.

These questions are stupid. For example, induction electric is great; non-induction is awful. Heat-pumps are 3x as efficient as resistance heating. If you use this survey, you're spreading misinformation.

There isn't a great electric alternative to gas grills. I'm guessing gas grills are used much less often than water heaters and in-home ranges. Therefore, I'd be ok with folks continuing to install gas grills outdoors. I think it's better than burning propane, right?

It is not rationale, nor feasible, for appliances, water heaters, gas furnaces to be all replaced to electric should the current appliances need to be replaced. This is undue hardship, expense for SO SO many. Consider also the issues recently with supply issues, installer/contractor issues, cost of electricity, PG&E rolling black outs and price fixed electric charges by time of day. With current inflation, etc. this is NOT the time to add \$\$\$\$ EXPENSES to households. We can each do our part for climate and environment according to what we CAN DO; not forced to do.

Use a carrot vs. a stick approach. For instance, while I have solar panels and EVs and would recommend them, I can encourage others and tell them about the benefits but they may or, may not go to that way for a variety of reasons. Carrot example: I find that Los Altos has overly high building permit fees for installing solar panels or adding to a current solar installation. To encourage solar installations, reduce Los Altos building permit fees for installations. Do similarly for any behavior you would like to encourage. Also, please do not place burdensome costs on current homeowners by requiring changes in housing infrastructure such as gas lines, regulations relating to preparations for sale, or any other regulations that increase costs for homeowners. Also, please be mindful that a wholesale move toward electricity could have expensive ripple effects for seniors and, in fact, any homeowner such as when current electrical panels might not be able to handle increased electrical

load without expensive upgrades. Or, for instance, a move to electric stoves may require replacing cookware sets, and removing perfectly functional appliances and hauling them to a landfill and thereby creating a different environmental problem. Finally, please consider that every house is different, so a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate. For example, an extremely efficient (well insulated) home with gas heat may have far less environmental impact than would ripping out and hauling to landfills the existing equipment, and replacing it with equipment that has to be manufactured along with the environmental impact of the associated manufacturing activities. In other words, please be fair and honest in complete cradle-to-grave assessments of environmental (and \$) impact of operation of existing infrastructure in a home versus any alternatives that might be proposed to rip out and replace them. To sum up, please do not force, nor be heavy-handed. One can readily observe that the residents of Los Altos are quickly moving toward electric cars and solar panels and whatever other measures they can take that they personally deem appropriate for themselves and for the environment. Let them proceed and help them with incentives rather than burdensome and expensive regulation/requirements. Thank you.

Stop pushing more restrictions on people. If electric appliances were more economical, you wouldn't need to pass ordinances to make people buy them. Free market principles work best. Take an Econ 101 course! And quit drinking the SVCE Koolaid!

Let California set the standard. The city's current stance is too restrictive. We need to supplement electric energy with alternate forms so we are not strictly reliant on electricity. I don't want rolling black outs and I want an alternate source of energy if I loose electricity for any other reason.

I've spoken with multiple pool contractors and none have used electric heating for pools. One even said it was illegal. I think he was referring to old style heaters. Also, this would effectively ban outdoor fire pits. Offer incentives and alternatives before you ban!

Our electric panel cannot support these changes. It doesn't appear the California electric GRID can support these changes either. Natural gas is much cheaper than electricity and more reliable. CA has no comprehensive plan to meet the needs of an all-electric future - it's foolhardy. Look at Germany's failures - they are reopening coal plants and saving nuclear which is clean energy. I think this push for reach codes has more to do with the corruption where the ex mayor got rid of PGE and put in a company to deliver "clean energy" to city of Los Altos for "reduced costs". (which incidentally increased costs and profit for her husband's company) Now they want to increase electricity usage, so that they can profit more. Every time temperatures go above 95F in Los Altos, we are asked to not use air conditioning because grid cannot handle increased load. Why put additional burden on the grid? We should use all sources, Electricity, Gas, Solar, wind, whatever, so that we do not become dependent on one source and hedge our bets. Get the corrupt people who are backed by realtor mafia OUT of city council.

If Los Altos reaches zero carbon emissions, it has no impact on global climate change. The US itself only accounts for 13% of CO2 emissions, so that even if the US had zero emissions, a few years' growth in China's and India's CO2 emissions would offset that savings. If you extrapolate that to Los Altos, which produces a miniscule portion of US emissions, making Reach codes stricter unfortunately has no demonstrable impact on the issue you're trying to solve for - residents shouldn't pay any taxes to support a policy can be proven beforehand that it will show no impact. It's a frustrating finding, but it's factual, and policy decisions must be based on facts.

This will not change anything about the environment. This is all cyclical.

Los Altos should get with the program. The temperature rise of the climate is changing rapidly for the worst. We need to do our part. Go electric as much as possible, as soon as possible.

Another way to increase the cost of owning a home and making it more dependent on our marginal electric grid system...

If houses are not ready for higher amp, it could take over a year and significant expenses to install an induction cook stove and another electric operated appliances, etc, especially in the area where electric wire is placed under ground. When we remodeled our kitchen 10 years ago, we were told that we need to have 200+ amp for our house to install an induction cook stove. To upgrade the amp, it would take a year to get approval and construction with PG and E, plus approximately over 40,000 dollars cost, plus additional 4,000 dollars upgrade on our electric box. Having a gas line to a new kitchen location in our house was only 1700 dollars. There was no brainer for us to go with a gas cooking stove. I had to give up having an induction cook stove. Trying to create a clean air environment is good, but why do some residents support some of our council members are pro-developer and keep approving more constructions for condos that bring more cars in our area? As the city approves more condos, this will bring more cars. Not all the new residents' own electric cars! Trying to control usage of individual house's gas cook stove that may be used 15 to 60 minutes a day or so is non sense micro management, comparing to polluting air with more gas engine cars in our town. Talking about health, having a gas cook stove that is used only 15 to 60 min per day is not as bad as eating unbalanced diet, eating bad prepared /processed non organic food and over eating without exercise or even taking recreational drugs for long term.

It is unwise to demand electrification until risks of rolling blackouts is eliminated.

The commission's "Background Statement" for this survey is egregiously biased, as is their intent — these "Overreach" codes will significantly increase energy costs for residents and businesses, ultimately create an electrical energy crisis, yet barely make a dent in the city's so-called "carbon footprint," all of which they clearly choose to ignore. Shame on this political power grab. But it won't stop here — the commission has made it clear their ultimate goal is to strip *all* residents and business of their right to make informed decisions about energy use (an intolerable liberty), and will sock expensive upgrades and conversions to those who can least afford financing their pipe dreams: specifically, seniors living on fixed income. Stop meddling in people's private lives and drop this self-serving, self-promoting initiative altogether.

Please continue to be the leader in our community by adopting and enforcing laws/policies that help protect our environment. We only have 1 chance to do this right - after that, we are all going to be faced with catastrophic global warming. We do our part, by walking/biking to most places, and conserving water to the best of our ability. Let Los Altos be an example to other.

electric pool heaters are not efficient compared to gas

Very concerned regarding the push to all electric without any guarantees of infrastructure to insure ability to provide electricity to all items being proposed to be ONLY electric. The #1 of supply chain management is NEVER SINGLE SOURCE, why are we considering single sourcing energy with no infrastructure in place to support it?

The recommendations are frankly tiny sacrifices. Please keep pushing. Thanks.

I am a little anxious about the ability to maintain daily activities in an all electric house, esp with power outages possibly becoming more of an issue with PG&E due to environmental factors. We will just need to learn to deal with it.

Our electrical grid is not even stable. It can't support all electrical everything. Gas is cheaper and more environmentally friendly in emission as electricity is still generated through burning fossil fuel. So what's the point?

Yes! Must do this.

I do not feel the government should enact rule and regulations that reach into my home, period. That choice is mine. Not the governments.

We have solar panels, but no electric vehicle - yet. We hope our next car can be electric, and will have a charger installed at home.

Since I don't trust any polls, surveys and the like, I shall withhold any extra comments, except to say that less government is better government, and to regulate in the name of "public good" is so far a failure!

I have serious doubts about whether the electrical grid can support even the current reach codes. I am very concerned that current reach codes will overpower them. Until we have proof that we can deal with that, I completely disagree with expanding the reach codes.

It is more efficient to make heat at the point of use with gas than it is to convert gas to electricity at the power plant, send it through transmission lines and then convert the electricity to heat locally. The additional cost, waste and CO2 released by all this is a result of clever lobbying by companies who benefit from so-called green tech policies and mandates. When their ideas are bad ones, they have to use the government's power of force to make their money. So here we are.

Given the drought situation and how it's negatively affecting dams, the dependence on hydroelectric power is a mistake. Our grids are taxes as it is and we need to have a way to defer some energy needs using natural gas. Being fully dependent on electricity for cooking and other energy needs is foolish given grid cannot support it. Solar also can't support nighttime needs. Don't go further beyond state mandates

Requiring that gas appliances that need to be replaced become electric is a terrible and impractical idea.

We will install charger when we buy an electric car (near term goal)

Climate change is our existential challenge!

We need to do this for our children and grandchildren. If we don't then we are being hypocrites.

Past time to step up!

We should require solar on all new construction

I will send them in a separate email

I don't want the city to prohibit gas furnaces or gas cooktops in any situation. The big culprit is excessive energy use and auto traffic. The city should focus on promoting solar and electric cars by adding charging stations and solar wherever possible.

Please adopt the strictest reach codes.

As an avid cook, I wholeheartedly DO NOT want the city to dictate what type of stove I can use. Purchasing a home without a gas stove, and no ability to add one, would be a deal breaker for me. We would not purchase a home in Los Altos with these limitations. It's tough to char spices, tortillas, and vegetables over an induction stove. Roasting marshmallows over a gas fire pit results in a grey coating with a chemical flavor. Building a fire in a non-approved fire pit is dangerous. Please do not limit Los Altos' cooking options.

I think the Environmental Commission has been thoughtful and prudent in its considered recommendation.

This is an existential issue for mankind.

I don't understand why anyone is even allowed to build fireplaces anymore. Wood or gas both pollute and we don't rely on them for heat.

I'll be happy to advocate for induction stove. I own one after having gas and electric. Induction is so much better. I'll be happy to explain why. We need restaurant to adopt it too.

This is one of those initiatives where I expect our politicians doing the right thing and not only what a vocal opposition would like to do. Please approve the new code!

Congratulations Los Altos!!!

Thank you for working on this! So important that we move this forward, but really appreciate the commission not forcing these changes on existing homes. (Although we're working on making these changes in our home, slowly but surely.)

Make solar electric system mandatory on all new buildings.

Thank you for your work on this. I support full electrification given our renewable energy agreements and continued solar-ification of buildings. It's the future; let's do our best for the sake of our kids and grandkids.

I have a 2017 Flat500e and charge it using a regular outlet since slower charging helps the battery last longer. Thank you for doing all you are to protect the environment.

This survey is confusing

It needs to be implemented! We owe it to our kids and grankids.

Go for it!!!

when our gas appliances and home Home heating need to be replaced, we are already wanting to make the changes.

I fully support this initiative as necessary to achieve our carbon footprint goals and to live a healthier life

I am very supportive of all measures the city is taking to mitigate climate change. Thank you for all you do!

I am not able to convert to electric at all. This is a draconian control measure that will do less than 1 % help. There are over 20 nations that burn coal. There are many nations that have more gas and oil than we do. By depleting our oil reserves this administration sets us up to be overrun by the communist countries. Shame on you all

This sort of thing should be dealt with at the nationwide level rather than individual cities because large foreign countries such as China and India produce way so much more greenhouse gases than Los Altos every could.

if you care about youth or people of color at all, please take stronger action to reduce the city's emissions

Not familiar with the various reach codes and the 2022 building code to comment. I'm concerned that our electric infrastructure, already strained, will not be able to keep up with an electrification plan that is too aggressive.

This is government over reach. The California electrical grid needs to be way more improved for reach codes to make sense. Note that my comment is based on PGE feedback. Plus if these draconian Reach codes are agreed on by our uninformed, biased council, the city needs to agree on subsidies for low income and elderly to pay for the remodels required by the installation of heat pumps etc.

The 50% improvement rule is discriminatory and should apply to any addition over 750 sq ft, period.

I would support whatever you recommend.

Please plant more trees - especially fruit trees on the streets. Create low water bee/butterfly friendly gardens in public spaces (as default). Make the city carbon neutral. Give homes a property tax credit if they install solar (or charge them more if they do not, or both).

How about including a requirement to install solar panels with a storage battery for new construction?

New gas line extensions to outdoor appliances should be prohibited, but keep option for new indoor gas stoves.

REACH codes violate the laws of thermodynamics.

I live in nearby Mountain View. I like the idea of having an area-wide reach code since it would avoid confusion and also help builders to streamline procedures and purchasing.

I support having gas stoves and not electric

Los Altos is NOT ready to go all electric. That was a Jan Pepper pipe dream. We still need natural gas as option for some time to come.

bike

A community like Los Altos needs to be a leader on these crucial changes.

I think we should do absolutely all we can. We should be leaders in this area we are sooo fortunate and so rich compared to others in our state, our country and the world. Do the right thing. I have an electric car, solar panels and a heat pump with dual gas and electric function, and an induction cooktop. It's all good. The only thing that concerns me is the heat pump when it gets cold. Thanks for doing this. I assume people will still grill outdoors with charcoal?

I'm very concerned about climate change. We see so many effects now, which are increasing in number and severity - so I support climate solutions!

YIMBY. Currently using heat pump water and whole-home heaters, solar array, and EV, and enjoying the savings.

Need to give more incentives for solar/wind so people can afford the higher electric costs.

I live in Los Altos Hills.

Hope people make the right decisions

Natural gas is plentiful and should remain an option. Our electric grid is already over burdened and unreliable. And I have solar!

I support the Env. Comm. recommendations. Transitions can be uncomfortable and there is a tendency to drag things out to avoid change, but change is coming one way or another, so I support going all in.

Don't overreach into use cases that have limited impact. Eg prohibiting bbqs.

Where is all this electricity coming from? And what are we supposed to do *every time* PG&E cuts off our electricity?

I don't think it has to be an all or nothing requirement. I do think that before making requirements to be all electric there needs to be development of proper infrastructure to support it all.

I am On the fence about fireplaces but I feel strongly that forcing all-electric cooking is an overreach. You will drive out restaurants and home chefs who refuse to adapt to cooking with electric.

I strongly oppose the imposition of reach codes. I would not oppose it if the city were to offer tax breaks or rebates for people replacing gas appliances with electric. It has to be a voluntary decision by each resident, according to their preferences.

This is very misguided. Natural gas is a highly efficient clean fuel.

Our electric grid is not set-up to handle the increased demand of electric vehicles and all electric homes. Power outages happen too often and a full scale battery back-up is not environmentally prudent in each home.

My main concern about going all-electric is if there will be enough electricity if the drought gets so bad that electricity can no longer be generated from the dams. I am glad you are allowing the replacement of current appliances to remain gas if that is what is currently being used.

I think the use of leaf blowers and movers and wood fire places is more destructive than gas. I do not know the life cycle carbon foot print of electric vrs gas but I do know our electric grid is under stress

The time is now to address climate change!

It's a bitter pill, but if we don't do it in communities like Los Altos, we can't expect the rest of the US to do it!

Full reliance on monopolized, unreliable electricity from PG&E is not a reasonable solution. My main concern is not requiring indoor stoves to be gas. Cooking on gas stoves is so much better. Secondary is the fireplace and firepit.

Environmental Commission recommendations (excluding indoor and outdoor cooking) should be phased in to allow market to improve technology for water heaters, space heaters, pool/spa heaters, etc.

this feels excessively cumbersome to comply on top of already overly expansive building codes in Los Altos. I also don't see the point of making new construction even more expensive which will mean most homes will avoid remodeling - this will make their emissions even worse. I am quite opposed to this change!

I support electric requirements for "extra" appliances not vital to the home. I am the primary cook and have used and do not like electric stoves, at all. I don't have enough experience with electric water heaters but have heard anecdotally that they do not support large families with multiple showers running at same time. Heaters I cannot speak to and would need to learn more about. On top of which, the cost of those items is a huge deal.

It would be helpful to know what the estimated cost would be for electric v gas for the different appliances, remodels, etc otherwise answering questions in a vacuum

This is imperative, to survive!

Our Planet is in danger. I strongly support any measure that stop CO2 emissions. New houses and big restructuring need to be all electric. Also any change of appliances for existing house should be mandatory electric.

Grey water systems

If we go all-electric where will the increased demand come from? I changed from all-electric 25 years ago because authorities said gas was cheaper and more efficient. Now I'm told gas is bad and I need to switch back!

I do not support this REACH in any way. Additional implementation of electric appliances should be a choice of homeowners and builders, not a mandate by politicians.

The entire concept of Reach Codes is flawed (Broken!).

This survey is very misleading and a watered down inquiry about resident's wishes regarding Reach Codes. It does not cover what the Reach Codes 2.0 want to do, including forcing replacement of any broken gas appliances with electric to a high cost to the home owner as well as requiring homes for sale replace all gas appliances. Shame on whom ever designed this survey.

Thank you for all of the research you did, the time you devoted, and explaining everything so clearly. Much appreciated.

For god's sake, we killed this in the last survey. Why the hell do you want another survey. Don't you get the message. Your suggested policies do 0, zip, nothing for the environment and only push contractors to make money installing and maintaining all that crap.

Climate change should not be a concern of the Los Altos government. Focus on realistic issues. We have been told so many lies for years and please note that none of Al Gore's predictions ever came true, so leave us alone with more garbage science.

Everyone needs to do their share to help the planet and fight climate change before total disaster strikes!

I agree with EC recommendations. Additionally, provide financial incentives (rebates, etc.) to replace gas appliances with electric in existing homes and businesses.

We should defer to applicable State or federal requirements. The carbon footprint for Los Altos is tiny and certainly does not warrant additional local controls. Can you imagine the mess if every City has their own set of requirements? J

Electric rates in CA are astronomical/unaffordable and unreliable.

I FULLY SUPPORT THE LAR SURVEY RESULTS. THE BEST WAY TO MOVE TOWARDS AN ELECTRIC WORLD IS WITH INCENTIVES LIKE BIDEN JUST DID WITH THE IRA BILL. FORCING PEOPLE TO CONVERT WILL NEVER WORK AND IS NOT ENFORCEABLE FOR EXISTING HOMES. PLEASE CEASE AND DESIST.

There will be the right time for all electric, but that is not now. We simply do not have enough sources of available, reliable energy sources that are not generated by fossil fuels or nuclear . People will experience power outages, restrictions and higher costs if all electric requirements are implemented in the next 5 or 10 years. It may take longer.

Natural gas is a clean source of energy. Globally, it's actually cleaner than electricity that is produced by coal. We are nowhere close to having the infrastructure needed to eliminate fossil fuels. Los Altos needs to stick with the current state codes and not adopt any reach codes.

The electric grid is already stressed in California, don't make it worse. Electric power is made from natural gas in California, so the reach codes will do nothing to change the amount of natural gas used. Reach codes will increase the carbon footprint of appliances by requiring the replacement of perfectly good appliances which HAVE ALREADY BEEN PRODUCED by new appliances which will have to be reduced. Don't let electric power installers and appliance producers influence our city council to adopt this ridiculous plan. Electric cars may not use gasoline, but their carbon footprint due to shipping components is huge, the battery lifespan is far lower than that of a properly maintained gasoline powered car, and the components of electric car batteries are extremely toxic to the workers who make them. Look at the environmental cost of the entire production chain before making these feel good laws.

The city needs to shut down the Environmental Commission and focus on the things most important to Los Altos Residents such as law enforcement, balanced budget. Don't place unnecessary financial burden on residents. And do not subsidize such waste, as it is derived from additional taxes. I want to make my own decisions and I don't want someone else to tell me which appliances I can buy.

The proposed Reach codes are not an effective tradeoff between combatting climate change and imposing onerous restrictions on new and existing residents.

I do not support codes that apply to only some residents. If these codes are important enough that the council needs to mandate them for new construction then they are important enough to impose them on existing homeowners.

I think these over-reach codes accomplish nothing, because >80% of electrical power in the US is produced using natural gas (the cleanest fossil fuel available). So requiring complete electrification of houses just shifts the use of natural gas from the houses to the electrical power plant.

I'm a bit confused but hope this helps.

While I strongly support the goals of Los Altos' enhanced reach codes, I do not agree with disallowing installation of lines for gas grills. There are currently no viable electric grill alternatives. If homeowners cannot use utility natural gas, they will buy propane tanks. That not only defeats the goal, it wastes more resources to transport metal tanks of propane.

There is no reason to go beyond what the State of California requires. Our state is one of the top, if not the top, state in the US regarding climate change. That's good enough for me. We should preserve as much freedom as possible for individual choice regarding our home appliances.

I strongly support the Environmental Commission's very sensible reach code recommendations. California does not have sufficient reliable electricity to justify increased dependence on it. Reliance on wind and solar energy is politically driven by people who are not concerned about the cost of so-called green energy (very expensive) or the fact that power from these sources is intermittent.

Although improvements need to be made, in my opinion, there are inadequate electrical appliances: hot water water heaters (instant electrical ones do not meet title 24) elec fireplaces are awful, and

until appliances improve to levels that actually work 'in real life,' requiring all electrical in any of the situations noted above does not make sense. Also - many homes don't have adequate electrical service to handle unexpected added electrical load. It seems better to work toward meeting the CA State Building Code, and working at the state level to change the codes for more energy efficiency.

We are not ready to go all electrical. PG&E will just take advantage of this and make residents' lives more painful than they are now.

I will sue the city for violation of our rights if they try to implement this nonsense

Stay out of our lives!!!

I don't know anything about pool heaters and can't comment on gas vs electric for them. Would the new reach codes require solar panels and battery backup to keep the home owner's costs down?

What does running a heat pump for a dryer cost?

The government incentivized solar with tax breaks instead of requiring it. That program was and is a big success. The same should be done with household batteries to reduce the strain on the grid and on our environment. Do that before you make the problem worse by requiring conversion to electric appliances. (Check out what the Island of Maui is doing to maximize renewable electric sources.)

I do not support Reach Codes requiring home electrification.

All of us should do our individual and combined best to meet the emerging crisis.

What is needed are incentives for responsible residents instead of reach codes for both new and existing homes. Forcing homeowners to convert gas appliances instead of repairing is unfair due to excessive costs for new wiring or higher capacity service panel. Because it is so expensive it is also going to be ignored if you dare require these changes. And, until we get a battery storage for the grid we will be 95% dependent on natural gas whenever the sun does not shine enough.

This all electric proposal is way, way, way too much over-reach by city council. Follow the money.... who is getting paid on the city council to propose and push this? NO to all-electric!!! Stop this nonsense! Listen to the people, not the special interest groups.

Require new buildings to be constructed using all-electric machinery or manual labor, no fossil fueled vehicles or equipment.

We need diversity in energy supplies. Electric grid is unreliable and easy fail in summer heat and winter storms. We should learn the lesson from Europe, especially Germany on relying on single source of energy. Remember, diversity is strength.

I don't believe Los Altos has the authority, legal or moral, to require any of these things. Let people be! Besides, do you want people to move here or not? I would not move here if there were this kind of restriction.

Live simple and use minimum natural resources are the real ways to cope with climate changes which happen periodically.

Why do new houses need fireplaces and firepits anyway?

Climate change demands that we cut emissions as much as possible as soon as possible. Newly constructed buildings and major remodels should be all electric with no exception. Gas lines to homes are outdated.

I like my gas stove, bbq & firepit

I strongly support the new recommendations. Such code and regulation changes are precisely the kinds of changes we all need and would benefit from. Climate change cannot be solved with individual behavior change.

A natural gas cook too is essential to gourmet cooking.

There are vast economic incentives provided by the Federal government. Each homeowner needs to always make the best decision. This would be a vast overreach by the Los Altos City Council to go into people's homes and require certain appliances be limited on choices. I would expect any City Council member in favor of dictatorial overreach to not be elected in future elections, and possibly recalled. I feel the all-electric building push is ahead of its time. Our electric supply infrastructure is not ready and unstable. Get the infrastructure ready and people will naturally migrate to it.

Reach codes are an over reach.. I will vote against any city council member supporting them.

None of the proposed stricter regulations will have any measurable effect on global warming. They are all symbolic efforts at best. I see no point to making people's lives somewhat miserable for symbolic measures. Nobody asked you to overhaul our society's energy infrastructure and systems just because some overly vocal folks think it might be a good idea. Please restrict your activities in this area. Do something really significant or do nothing at all. Keep your egos in check. Eliminate the Environmental Commission. They are a bunch of zealots that do not care about the residents or what they want.

Require electrical outlets accessible for gardeners at multiple points in the yard (front/back/sides) to use for landscape appliances, thus reducing the dirtiest pollution sources, ICE-based landscape tools, in Los Altos.

I will believe global warming is a problem when the rich people telling me it is a problem start acting like it is a problem.

Relying on a single source of energy (electric) from a bankrupt utility (PG&E) is a poor decision. I support initiatives to combat climate change, but PG&E burns natural gas to power the grid. There is little carbon savings. Instead, find ways to support solar and wind power on houses for near zero carbon electric power. Leave the gas appliances alone.

Let the public use their own discretion in moving toward all electric

The Proposed "Reach Codes" eliminate freedom of choice, claiming that choice must be sacrificed because we have a "climate crisis." This is no more than virtue signaling that will have no appreciable effect in addressing the so-called "crisis." The proposals appear oblivious to the fact that more electric appliances require more electricity. In California, already under extreme grid limitations, this

electricity will often come from natural gas, the supposed target of the Code. More and more scientists, who actually are knowledgeable about climate issues, are having the courage to speak openly about the public ignorance of the actual facts and decrying that complex issues have been hyped into apocalyptic terms by the media and politicians who have no real understanding of the actual data and science. A huge percentage of Los Altans have already made it clear that they oppose these Reach Code proposals. The Environmental Commission members, self-selected zealots, do not reflect the views of the community. They would be well-served to reign in their hubris, be open to the real facts, and listen to the community.

Private homes should be PRIVATE PROPERTY

Nothing but virtue signaling supported by an interested party, SVCE. These measures will do nothing to impact climate change. Reforming China and India is where you need to spend your energy. This is trivial and silly.

Woodland Vista Swim and Racquet Club, 1991 Deodara Drive, has a 75,000-gallon pool heated by 2 x 375,000 BTU gas heaters. Woodland Vista is the only private, commercial club with a swimming pool in Los Altos. Currently, there are no viable alternatives for gas heaters of this size. We heat the pool year-round. There are no heat pumps, that we can find, that would produce enough BTUs in the winter months to heat the pool. We currently heat the pool fully with solar for 7 months of the year, partially for 3 more and completely with gas heaters for the balance of the year. When the current heaters need to be replaced, we would like to be able to replace them with gas heaters. We would be glad to provide input to the committee regarding pools. Contact Jim Mutch, 650-961-8025. Thank you.

While I am concerned about the quality of our environment I am equally concerned about the quality of life-including freedom and choice. I hear (read about) all the dangers of using gas appliances and vehicles, but nothing about all the things necessary to supply the electric power-of which we do not seem to have a sufficient supply. Everything seems to be one sided- personal feelings and opinions, with maybe an 'authoritative' voice thrown in to provide 'proof' of your side. You are dealing with our homes, not just 'a house'.

Every city must do their part to address climate change, and that may mean taking tough decisions while wildfires rage ever closer and drought ever more intense. And that means taking as many steps to reduce fossil fuel infrastructure, even if that may feel a tad costly at the point of renovation/rebuild. But the recent federal news provides some financial assistance that can go a long way, especially if combined with other incentives. Perhaps in the future, there could be some more statistically-powerful polling done, rather than getting the usual supporters/opponents in this survey.

Restaurants should be allowed to continue to use gas stoves.

I haven't followed this very closely even though I am very concerned about the environment. Is it substantially more expensive to use electric vs. gas? Is it substantially more expensive to convert from gas to electric? It also seems like all new construction should be required to have an EV charger or easy ability to put one in.

The only time a property (house) should be forced to switch to all electric is when the house is totally torn down and rebuilt. I strongly disagree that Reach Codes Apply to buildings where 50% or more of framing or foundation of the building is modified. We should only apply it to full scrapes.

I do not support restrictions on natural gas, which is clean. Electrification I support, I have solar and an e-car, but mandates are an over reach and should be motivated by financial benefits. ALL residents should continue to have a choice to choose as I did. Los Altos are educated and wise to make good choices. TRUST YOUR CONSTITUENTS.

We need to ensure we have a reliable electric grid. We are already faced with power outages and requests to reduce electricity during certain hours - very hours we are cooking dinner and home and need appropriate heating and cooling. We can't continue to increase demand for electricity that outpaces the ability to provide reliable electricity. Instead of focusing on Los Altos building, is there anything you can do to focus on getting the state to take the needed action to address building a reliable grid with expanded energy supply?

I think the new recommended changes are good.

Newsome just approved keeping the nuclear plant in southern California open for another 10 years. He wants to make sure we have as many sources as possible to meet our energy needs. People of California are smart and should have choices on the kind of energy they want to use to heat their homes, get hot water and cook. I disagree that homes that have more than 50% of the foundation and framing be forced to use electric only.

2035 seems like a long way off, but it isn't. The time to act is now.

Older homeowners should not be subjected to any replacement restriction of broken gas appliances. Also there is no mention of natural gas or propane outside grills. Those should continue.

Make our homes more expensive and dependent on an unreliable electric grid... sounds like good government!

I support use of gas for cooking and for heat. Please keep in mind that the state of CA uses natural gas to create electricity and so the value to the environment is less impactful. Almost 47% of electricity is generated by natural gas in CA. We need to consider the data in the decisions that we make. <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2020-total-system-electric-generation/2018>. In addition, we have a real problem with the infrastructure and power grid and putting even more pressure may be counterproductive if the grid cannot support it. I don't want all my energy use dependent on electricity which is unstable not to mention expensive. I plan to get a hybrid car so that I can contribute to cleaner air on most of my trips but full electric puts my longer trips in jeopardy because of the infrastructure.

Why ask about space heater? Don't you mean furnace? Age is irrelevant. How are you ensuring only residents take the survey and that they only take it once? Asking for a no reach codes options is negative framing and is deceptive. California has reach codes. We would be following those, if we chose not to do our own version. I love that you are suggesting prohibiting gas to outdoor areas. This is a must do in my opinion.

This survey does not ask anything about remodels or appliance replacements. I am not in support of requiring electric replacements for gas appliances (stove, water heater, furnace, dryer, etc.). City council can stand by our Reach Codes. Don't be afraid to move forward.

Electrification is critical to reducing our production of GHG. It is imperative that the City and community do all we can to protect our environment for ourselves and future generations.

Have concerns about the capacity and cost to generate the electricity the new reach codes (in all cities) will require

If businesses are included in Reach Codes, I would hope there will be an exception for businesses who show their business needs require gas infrastructure. (Restaurants and Labs, for example)

Greater opportunity to reduce climate change than adding burdensome requirements that are not looking at the basic reasons for reducing climate change. Electric power generation need to be changed to reduce pollution!

This is an incomplete survey and NOT well researched. what about NO reach codes. Tell China and Russia to stop their new over 400 new coal burning plants. This reach code will do NOTHING

New homes built with EV car charging capable. Apartments have 2-3 EVchargers per five units, for tenants. Heat a/c from same electric units with Auto temp sensor.

I live in a condominium in which there is no EV charger, and the schools are too far away for me, especially at my age. I would love for there to be more EV chargers available throughout LA, such as in the parking lots downtown and along the streets in the commercial areas of town. Thank you

The state should replace income and sales tax with carbon and water taxes. (PS: We just finished a house remodel-- no gas (even capped off), no fireplaces, 'all' heatpumps, solar.)

Please revert back to the California building code - no more reach codes! If a homeowner or a developer chooses to go all electric, great, but do not mandate it. Reach codes would have an infinitesimal effect on global warming beyond the gains already locked in with the state building code. With high electric costs and frequent grid outages due to fires or weather, gas needs to stay an option for cooking and for equity for those struggling to pay bills.

Why do you specify heat pumps as the only method of powering heaters, water heaters and dryers? Why doesn't this survey include switching from gas to electric in remodels or when replacing appliances in existing homes? Those are much bigger issues than new construction.

Stop this nonsense - these will have an absolutely negligible effect on climate change. It is simply virtue signaling, but if people want to build or convert their houses to all-electric, that is certainly their prerogative. But don't make it mandatory for everybody!

I support encouraging EV infrastructure and I urge the City to get rid of the Diesel engine constantly running in the Community Center parking lot for the Covid testing. It's horrid to have that pollution and noise, especially after the City's efforts to reduce idling engines!

What do we need an Environmental Commission for ? Stop trying to control people. If someone wants to go all electric, fine. Don't force the rest of us. FREEDOM OF CHOICE

I'm a young person who's very, very concerned about climate change. I'm an advocate for passing the strictest possible reach codes. Even though some older citizens may believe that the disadvantages of implementing reach codes far outweigh the benefits, I say that these "disadvantages" don't matter in

the face of a climate crisis that may render the world near unlivable in my lifetime. Reach codes are one step we can take to lessen Los Altos' impact on the environment!

I believe the reach code recommended for new construction is sensible.

I agree with the environmental commission recommendations for all-electric newly constructed buildings and additional electric vehicle infrastructure, but I believe we should also have this apply to existing buildings if the owners are open to this idea.

I urge the city to adopt the reach codes described above. We need to do all we can to mitigate climate change and care for the environment.

I think the code should also require replacement appliances (e. g., water heaters, furnaces, etc) to be electric.

Many cities with reach codes will be strengthening them this cycle. Removing exceptions will help standardize requirements in our area, and save cost and complexity in new construction.

Humans have the biggest impact on the Climate Change we have seen over the years. We need to do EVERYTHING we can to get as close to carbon neutral as we can. With the number of very large homes being built and rebuilt in Los Altos to move to clean energy. I would like to see programs encouraging residents to move to clean energy as their appliances need to be replaced. My household is doing this and I encourage the Environmental Commission to focus on this as well. Thank you.

Would appreciate guidance on which of our legacy gas appliances we should electrify first to reduce our CO2 exhaust most. I presume our 50-gallon water heater (2012) is the priority, but I'd like confirmation.

I want to support whatever it takes to do our part for our climate change disaster.

Please pass the strongest reach codes for new construction and existing buildings. The Bay Area must decarbonize its building stock to have hope for a livable world for our children and future generations, and to inspire other municipalities to take similar action. I am not a Los Altos residents but I live in a nearby city, and each Bay Area city's actions have an impact on its neighbors, most importantly by inspiring other cities to act. Please be a leader and put the climate, our children and future generations, above any fear you may have of angering a small constituency that will always be on the wrong side of history in obstructing progress on climate change through fear mongering and misinformation tactics. Thank you.

I appreciate Los Altos city leadership taking bold action on climate that will have immediate health benefits as well as help ensure we have a livable planet for generations to come.

The requirements being proposed by the Environmental Commission are actually very minor, particularly in comparison to cities like Menlo Park who are really leading on this effort to decarbonize our buildings. It would be, frankly, embarrassing if Los Altos couldn't even agree to these requirements, which will only affect new development and substantial remodeling projects.

Eventually, we are going to need to tackle all the national gas use in existing building buildings, but these rules are not even getting started on that problem. Let's just not dig the hole any deeper by prevent new gas appliances and infrastructure in new construction. This is also going to save people money in the long run because some day they are going to be forced to switch to electric (by the state, if not the city) and retrofitting that is going to be far more expensive than making smarter choices during construction. And with all of the new federal money from the "Inflation Reduction

Act" to subsidize the cost of electric appliances, it has suddenly become a lot more economical for people to make the smart choice, too. It should be an absolute no-brainer to approve the new reach codes.

Los Altos needs to step up to be part of the solution rather than lagging behind other cities and contributing to the worsening climate crisis. The Reach Codes proposed by the Environmental Commission are minimal at best and will affect few residents. The cost of the proposed codes are minuscule compared to the total cost of new construction or the 50% remodel. Additionally, there are financing models such as BlockPower, Pays and BeSmart, and new State and Federal laws will provide funding for climate adaptations for buildings. I also fear about the results of this survey. It is extremely difficult to get the attention of residents on issues like this. The people who care most about the future of the planet are parents of young children, and they are most likely so busy they do not know about the issue of Reach Codes or this survey. The survey results will be slanted towards the opponents - mostly older individuals who are on a distribution list of residents who want no change.

We also need to take actions that will expedite the electrification of existing buildings.