

From: Meredith Caplan <merefrog@sonic.net>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 7:41 AM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: All Electric Reach Code

Dear City Council Members,

I hope you will pass the All Electric Reach Code. It is so important in helping our city become a zero emission city. Our family has already replaced our gas stove with an electric stove and are soon going to convert from a gas furnace to an electric one. Passing policy like this is so crucial to the health of our planet. With the fires we have been living with for the last few years this is crucial.

Thank you, Meredith Caplan, Santa Rosa Teacher

Manis, Dina

15.2

From: Mark Mortensen <mortensen33@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2019 1:40 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electric REACH code Tuesday agenda item 15.2

Dear Council members,

Thank you for your taking the initial step to approve the Electric REACH Code ordinance for new construction in Santa Rosa. Please vote 'yes' this upcoming Tuesday to enact this measure. This is one of a number of actions that will enable Santa Rosa to do its part to fight the climate crisis.

Respectfully,

Mark Mortensen
209 W. 8th Street
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
707-583-4546

Twitter: @MarkM33

Facebook: facebook.com/mark33mortensen

From: jho@sonic.net
Sent: Saturday, November 16, 2019 1:39 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic; CMOOffice
Cc: susan@susan-gorin.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Cost of free energy

“

The effort to increase the percentage of electricity generated by intermittent renewable sources like wind and solar inevitably brings about large increases in the actual price of electricity that must be paid by consumers. The price increases grow and accelerate as the percentage of electricity generated from the intermittent renewables increases toward 100 percent. These statements may seem counterintuitive, given that the cost of fuel for wind and solar generation is zero. However, simple modeling shows the reason for the seemingly counterintuitive outcome: the need for large and increasing amounts of costly backup and storage – things that are not needed at all in conventional fossil-fuel-based systems. And it is not only from modeling that we know that such cost increases would be inevitable. We also have actual and growing experience from those few jurisdictions that have attempted to generate more and more of their electricity from these renewables. This empirical experience proves the truth of the rising consumer price proposition.

In those jurisdictions that have succeeded in getting generation from renewables up to as high as about 30% of their total electricity supply, the result has been an approximate tripling in the price of electricity for their consumers. The few (basically experimental) jurisdictions that have gotten generation from renewables even higher than that have had even greater cost increases, for relatively minor increases in generation from renewables. As the percentage of electricity coming from renewables increases, the consumer price increases accelerate.

No jurisdiction – even an experimental one – has yet succeeded in getting the percentage of its electricity generated from the intermittent renewables up much past 50% on an annualized basis. To accomplish the feat of getting beyond 50% and on closer to 100%, the grid operator must cease relying on fossil fuel backup power for times of dark and calm, and move instead to some form of storage, most likely very large batteries. The cost of such batteries sufficient to power a jurisdiction of millions of people is enormous, and quickly comes to be the dominant cost of the system. Relatively simple calculations of the cost of batteries sufficient to get through a year for a modern industrialized area show that this cost would imply an increase in the price of electricity by a factor of some 15 or 20, or perhaps even more.”

Jack H Osborne

Sent from Windows Mail

From: jho@sonic.net
Sent: Saturday, November 16, 2019 1:03 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic; CMOOffice
Cc: susan@susan-gorin.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] and renewable is free?

<https://stopthesethings.com/2019/11/16/renewable-energy-regrets-intermittent-wind-solar-delivers-grid-chaos-for-californians/>

“

The only thing that's inevitable about the so-called 'transition' to wind and solar is rocketing prices and grid chaos. The inability to deliver electricity as and when it's needed, mean wind and solar have no commercial value – apart from the massive subsidies they attract.

Being commercially worthless is one thing, but dumping volumes of wind and solar into the grid one-minute, and watching their output completely collapse the next, comes with a staggering hidden cost.

To that end, Donn Dears unpacks the story behind California's duck curve.”

”

1. As more and more renewables are added to the grid the amount of electricity supplied during the daylight hours is increasingly from renewables, primarily from solar in this depiction.
2. Baseload power must be quickly reduced as the sun rises to allow renewables to supply the grid.
3. When the sun sets, these same baseload power plants must suddenly ramp up to meet the demand in the evening. The sudden ramping up of the power plants damages the power plants, except hydro, and various components of the grid from thermal expansions and contractions.
4. Renewables are intermittent, the sun may go behind a cloud or the wind may stop blowing, so the baseload power plants must be cycled up and down to meet the variations in load. Power plants are less efficient when they are cycled in this manner which can cause an increase in air pollution, such as NOx.”

I guess that you don't agree with this stuff, as you want to go all electric LOL

Jack H. Osborne.

Sent from Windows Mail

From: Pete Gang <pete@commonsensedesign.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 16, 2019 11:47 AM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] All Electric Reach Code

Dear Council members,

I am writing to express sincere gratitude for your willingness to take a small, but critically important step in addressing our climate emergency by voting to move forward the All-Electric Reach Code Ordinance.

I urge you to vote "yes" on Tuesday, November 19th in order to finalize this important measure.

When Santa Rosa sneezes, the rest of the County catches a cold.

With respect and gratitude,

Pete Gang, Architect, LEED-AP BD+C

Manis, Dina

15.2

From: Adam Horn <ahorn@nalobby.net>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 3:14 PM
To: Manis, Dina
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 15.2, Opposition to All-Electric Reach Code
Attachments: Opposition to All-Electric Reach Code, Agenda Item 15.2.pdf

Please find attached a letter from the California Pool and Spa Association (CPSA) opposing the upcoming All-Electric Reach Code (Agenda Item #15.2) to be heard at the upcoming City Council meeting on November 19, 2019.

Adam Horn
Legislative Coordinator
915 L Street, Suite 1100
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-447-5053
916-516-2400 (c)
ahorn@nalobby.net

E-MAIL NOTICE

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, use, disclosure or distribution by persons or entities other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.


NORWOOD
ASSOCIATES

To reply to our E-mail Administrator directly, please call (916) 447-5053 and delete this email.


Government Relations

November 15, 2019

City Clerk Dina Manis
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 10
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

NORWOOD
ASSOCIATES

Government Relations

RE: Opposition to All-Electric Reach Code, Agenda Item 15.2

Dear Acting City Clerk Dina Manis:

I am submitting these comments in Opposition to Item Number 15.2 on the Agenda for the Santa Rosa City Council meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 19th, 2019.

My name is John A. Norwood. I am the Chief of Government Relations for the California Pool & Spa Association (CPSA). CPSA is a statewide trade association that represents all segments of the swimming pool and hot tub industry in California. This includes manufacturers of equipment to operate swimming pools, hot tubs, ancillary equipment, testing and safety products, outdoor kitchens and recreation areas, swimming pool and spa builders, subcontractors, and the swimming pool maintenance and service industry.

The swimming pool and hot tub industry is an exceptional contributor to the California economy. In 2014, PK Data, Inc. opined that the swimming pool & spa industry contributed roughly \$5 billion annually to the California economy. This number did not include costs associated with the pool remodeling industry or the hot tub industry. In fact, California is the biggest market in the world for swimming pools and hot tubs. Moreover, the industry provides good-paying jobs in communities throughout California, supports numerous individuals and firms that are in the construction subcontracting business, and employs tens of thousands of people in the pool and hot tub maintenance and service business. Swimming pool contractors purchase their construction materials, i.e., steel, cement, tile, sand, lumber, electrical, plumbing, and drainage materials locally, thus supporting other local businesses. The economic effect of this industry is multiplied by the demand for pool/hot tub chemicals, toys, backyard furniture, barbeques, outdoor kitchens, fire pits, fireplaces, and lighting desired by both commercial and residential owners of swimming pools and hot tubs.

The "California Dream," so to speak, is still a home in the suburbs with a big backyard and a swimming pool. This fact is supported by the last five years of record-breaking pool construction since the nation emerged from the 2009 economic meltdown. This trend is destined to continue as in numerous areas of the state, 50% of new home buyers are millennials, many of which desire a home with a backyard swimming pool, hot tub, or exercise pool.

The goal of eliminating the use of natural gas in California, providing incentives for home builders to construct new housing tracts without natural gas lines or hookups, or otherwise phasing out the use of natural gas, will undermine the swimming pool and hot tub business in California, resulting in a significant economic blow to the state, as well as depriving millions of Californians of a backyard place for staycations that they so desire.

In the swimming pool and spa industry, pool heaters, fire pits, fireplaces, decorative fire features, pizza ovens, barbeques, outdoor ranges, and outdoor space heating all operate on natural gas. Together these elements produce spaces in backyards that provide families a place for recreation, exercise, entertainment, and relaxation. The pool and spa industry do utilize solar heating and electric heating where possible, especially for hot tubs, but there are no current alternatives to heating swimming pools in numerous commercial settings, in coastal and mountain residential areas of the state, or at night for homeowners. The same is true for outdoor kitchens and recreational areas relative to fire pits, fireplaces, outdoor space heating, and outdoor cooking equipment.

In addition to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, one of California's major goals in this proceeding is to improve energy and housing affordability. We do not believe the elimination of natural gas in California will accomplish either. Energy costs in California are extremely high as compared to other Western states. The cost of electricity from both traditional and renewable sources is significantly higher than natural gas and not as efficient. As such, even if there were practical alternatives to natural gas for the equipment installed by the swimming pool and hot tub industry, a change would result in a higher-priced and less efficient product, thus making it more difficult for homeowners, schools, recreational and commercial facilities to be able to afford it.

Swimming pools and hot tubs use only an estimated 4% of the natural gas demand in California. This industry should not be the target of these efforts and could be exempted from efforts to reduce the carbon footprint from the way we heat residential building and water systems. However, without natural gas hookups in new residential and commercial construction, citizens of this state that reside in these areas will be deprived of all the benefits associated with access to swimming pools and hot tubs.

For all of the above reasons, we would urge the town to reconsider action on this proposed ordinance.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. NORWOOD
Norwood Associates, LLC
916-447-5053


From: terri whetstone <sharpwhetstone@me.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 1:11 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New proposed ban on all electric new builds in Santa Rosa

We are writing you all to vote against your proposal to ban natural gas from all new build dwellings. We believe that this is not only short sighted in face of the expected continued PSPS (no cooking with gas, using gas fireplaces for heat, hot water, etc), but also from a financial position to ratepayers. This is absolutely government overreach. We also believe that the only 'in the best interest' this proposal would be for is PGE.

We as a community have been through enough power grabs and authoritarian moves the past few years from SRCC, which I will not enumerate on in this email (unless you request that I elaborate in a follow up response). I will stay with this one topic.

WE ARE COMPLETELY AGAINST YOU PASSING THIS RIDICULOUS FUTURE BUILDING REQUIREMENT FOR NEW BUILDINGS.

Terri & David Whetstone
602 Arrigoni Ct
95409

Sent from my iPad 

From: christine hoex <choex@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 9:38 AM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Electric Reach Code

To: citycouncil@srcity

Dear Santa Rosa City Members,

I'm writing to express my gratitude for your taking the initial step to approve the Electric REACH Code ordinance for new construction in Santa Rosa. Please vote 'yes' on Tuesday in order to finalize this measure that takes direct action against the climate crisis. On a personal note I was not able to stay late at last Tuesday's meeting to hear the public reading of the Electric REACH CODE. I do appreciate the long meeting times the city council puts in. My comment would have been to ask you once again to be leaders in the global emergency we face. Without leadership from the highest seats of power we depend upon you and leaders like you across the country. Please vote Yes on the Electric REACH code. Thank you for your service.

*Respectfully, Christine Hoex
For 350 Sonoma.org
330 Horn Ave Santa Rosa Ca.*

From: Stephen Hann <stephen@hannlaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 3:27 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Cc: Dawn; Mary Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gas ban

Dear Council Members,

Judging by the comments to the Press Democrat Facebook post regarding banning natural gas in new homes, your decision is wildly unpopular. This is an important issue to us, your constituents, and we would like to be able to vote on it.

It just doesn't feel right to have our choice taken away. Perhaps your function as a governing body would be better served if you started an information campaign urging new home builders to use electric instead of gas.

And it seems you relied on a PG&E study to validate your votes.

The only winner here is PG&E and the optics are terrible for the Council

You might want to rethink this one. Everyone I've talked to today is upset about this and is against it.

Please put this issue on the ballot and let us decide what we want instead of governing by fiat.

Thank you for your attention to this email.

Best regards

Stephen E. Hann

Sent from my iPad

From: Stephen Hann <stephen@hannlaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 9:34 AM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Cc: Dawn; Mary Colbert
Subject: [EXTERNAL] All electric

Dear Council Members,

No natural gas in new homes. Who wins? Let's see, PG&E is in bankruptcy, is in desperate need of revenue, so what do you do, give them a huge financial win at the expense of your constituents.

I know it's a touchy feels warm fuzzy feeling you have right now, but we would be much better served if you addressed the public employee pension disaster and stayed the hell out of people's homes.

If any of you who voted for this ordinance received any financial donations from PG&E you should have recused yourselves from voting on this issue.

I am terribly disappointed in my Council.

Thank you

Stephen E Hann

Sent from my iPad

The closure follows other notable restaurant closings downtown this year after city and economic development officials made a priority to revitalize the area after the reunified Old Courthouse Square opened in 2017 to attract more businesses and residential living.

The earlier closings included Stout Brothers, Jade Room, Mercato, Tex Wasabi's and La Vera Pizza.

Nebesky has been a longtime critic of the city's parking meter policy.

Some of his diners have gotten tickets for not being diligent enough in monitoring their time

left on meters, a complaint that he has shared with other local business owners such as Natalie Cilurzo, co-owner of Russian River Brewing Co. nearby on Fourth Street. "People have anxiety when they come in," Nebesky said of the parking meters that he thinks should end daily at no later than 6 p.m. Local business owners have formed the Downtown Action Organization to help pay for supplemental staff to help beautify the area and guide visitors around. But Nebesky said more police officers are needed on patrol to provide an extra layer of security so people feel comfortable coming downtown.

"I'm done with these battles," he said. "I would rather do it somewhere else."

Peter Rumble, CEO of the Santa Rosa Metro Chamber, which is spearheading the downtown revitalization efforts, said Nebesky raised "some meaningful points" that also have been expressed by other city business owners. Rumble hopes these issues get City Council's attention. For example, he said the downtown used to have six city police officers on patrol but that number has been reduced to two officers.

Nonetheless, Rumble said he didn't think it's "unsafe to be downtown."

Thomas E. Schiff
1083 Vine Street, #430
Healdsburg, CA 95448
(714) 745-1360

From: Tom Schiff <schiff.tom@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 8:37 AM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ban on Gas

Banning gas usage. There are other pressing matters you can deal with.

See below.

DOWNTOWN SANTA ROSA » RESTAURANT CLOSURES

Gerard's to shut doors

Owner cites parking difficulties, area homelessness as reasons for ending

By **BILL SWINDELL**

THE PRESS DEMOCRAT

Chef Gerard Nebesky plans to close his Santa Rosa restaurant he opened last year, adding to the list of downtown restaurants that have gone out of business this year.

Nebesky, owner of Gerard's Paella y Tapas on Fourth Street, said customers have been turned off by area homelessness and parking hassles.

He opened the eatery in July 2018 to the anticipation of local foodies as a result of a past that included operating the Bohemian Cafe in Occidental and beating celebrity chef Bobby Flay on "a paella throwdown" in a cooking competition over the Spanish rice dish on his Food Network TV show.

Yet Nebesky said it was hard to keep attracting customers because of problems endemic to the downtown that included: metered parking that other than Sunday typically lasts until 8 p.m.; dimly lit areas around his restaurant that made his patrons feel unsafe; and a continuing homeless issue that reached its low point when a transient urinated in his dining room.

"It is such a battle downtown," said the 54-year-old Nebesky, who will continue operating his catering business. "I was literally pouring \$5,000 a week into it to keep it afloat."

The chef and his investors made the decision after area evacuations from the recent Kincade fire closed his restaurant for a few days.

The exact date of the closing has not been set as of Tuesday, he said.

From: Allen Commeau <allencommeau@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2019 2:59 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Electric service for construction of new residential housing

Dear Council Members,

Regarding your recent majority vote to mandate electric service for all new residences constructed in Santa Rosa, I hope you have done your home work. My family owned a second home on the east coast for many years on Cape Cod and it's service was electric. The annual electric service cost was outrageous and it was not unusual to have an average monthly bill of \$400 to \$450 to just heat the house. One month we received a bill for just over \$700. And the electric rates were half of what PG&E is now charging. This was a home with all the up to date insulation requirements, was unoccupied in the winter months and the thermostat set at 50 degrees. Yes, climate change needs to be addressed but this is not the way to do it. Periodically, but rarely, I hear you mention the outrageous cost to live here in Santa Rosa. Has it ever occurred to you that you might be partly responsible for that? There does not seem to be a city department here that does not have to be subsidized by a special tax. Where does the general tax revenue go? For god's sake, do your home work before you decide to saddle the home owners with another of your "feel good" ideas. Thank you for your time, Allen Commeau

From: Michael Nagler <michaeln.nagler72@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 9:05 AM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] REACH

Dear Council members,

I'm writing to express my gratitude for your taking the initial step to approve the Electric REACH Code ordinance for new construction in Santa Rosa. Please vote 'yes' on Tuesday in order to finalize this measure that takes direct action against the climate crisis. We all want our city to look to the future, enjoy the benefits of the new technologies, and do our part to save the planet from the destructive effects of climate change.

Respectfully,

Michael Nagler

[The Metta Center for Nonviolence](#), Founder and President

[Nonviolence + Science = New Story](#)

[Daily Inspiration--and we need some!](#)

Find [The Nonviolence Handbook](#), as an audio-book [at this link!](#)

Nonviolence is the greatest force at the disposal of humanity. (Gandhi)

Bliss, Sandi

15.2

From: Carla Grady <carladgrad@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 9:44 AM
To: CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Tuesday vote on All-electric Reach Code

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to ask you to vote in favor/support of the all-electric code for new construction in Santa Rosa. To me, this is a no-brainer whose explanation goes without saying, but if you need some reasons, the following will mention only a few.

99% of the scientific community has stated publicly, with increasing alarm, that we can't even call what's happening now "global warming" or "climate change" anymore; it is full-on CLIMATE CRISIS. Search on that term and all the evidence will be laid out before you. The scientific community also contends that the timeframe for mitigating this problem, the window of opportunity to reverse the crisis, is much shorter than they ever imagined. While political bodies snail along and make plans to curb greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, Climate Crisis analysts say we have about 5 years to make enough changes to have an impact. This means we have to act NOW. You have the chance to make a big impact *immediately*. There is no good reason to *not* enact this code except the sting the oil & gas industry will feel as they lose some cash in the coming years. They should have thought of that long ago and diversified their portfolios into sustainable energy, just like the tobacco industry had to figure out how it was going to maintain profits once people realized that tobacco consumption was killing them.

Greenhouse gases come in a few forms, the most harmful being methane, which is a by-product of natural gas production. Add this to the fact that burning natural gas to create heat makes fossil fuel infrastructure triply harmful: neighborhoods are poisoned as natural gas extraction in CA happens in residential areas (where cancer rates soar way above national averages), methane hot spots surrounding these fracking sites add exponentially to the greenhouse gases fueling the Climate Crisis, then the burning of natural gas in households adds more greenhouse gases, fueling the Climate Crisis even more. It couldn't be more stupid if you designed it to be.

The argument that electric is too expensive compared to natural gas is unrealistic and has been defeated by long-range economic arguments too numerous to quote here. And with the advent of Sonoma Clean power and Evergreen in Sonoma County, local consumers have made it obvious that we prefer energy that is NOT produced from fossil fuels.

I have had 9 solar panels on my home for a decade and drive an electric vehicle. I am doing my part to reduce my personal carbon footprint as much as possible. PLEASE do YOUR PART as well: make it possible for new homes to be equipped with sustainable electric energy, not more fossil fuels.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. Carla Deicke Grady

--

If you're still using Google, why?

Switch to this search engine instead and help the planet:

<https://www.ecosia.org/?ref=icon-search&addon=chrome&addonversion=2.1.0>

xoxoxo Carla

Bliss, Sandi

15.2

From: Michael Nagler <michaeln.nagler72@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 9:05 AM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] REACH

Dear Council members,

I'm writing to express my gratitude for your taking the initial step to approve the Electric REACH Code ordinance for new construction in Santa Rosa. Please vote 'yes' on Tuesday in order to finalize this measure that takes direct action against the climate crisis. We all want our city to look to the future, enjoy the benefits of the new technologies, and do our part to save the planet from the destructive effects of climate change.

Respectfully,

Michael Nagler

[The Metta Center for Nonviolence](#), Founder and President

[Nonviolence + Science = New Story](#)

[Daily Inspiration--and we need some!](#)

Find [The Nonviolence Handbook](#), as an audio-book [at this link!](#)

Nonviolence is the greatest force at the disposal of humanity. (Gandhi)

Bliss, Sandi

From: Javier Tenorio <javier.tenorio2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 10:57 AM
To: CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ban of natural gas in homes

Dear Council Members,

I was shocked, as many of my friends were, to hear of the decision to ban natural gas in new homes beginning in 2020. I am not sure if I blatantly ignored the discussions leading up to this decision but to make a final decision without input from your constituents is irresponsible. It seems to me that you made a political statement in your decision rather than taking into consideration the needs and wants of your constituents. We as a city are currently not in a position to take the lead on climate change initiatives. We are, however, still a city struggling to get through surviving from wildfires and public safety power shut offs. As we recover, we should be given options, alternatives, to living our lives as close to normalcy as possible. By removing an option as to how we cook, how we heat our water, how we heat our house during a future power shut off is simply wrong and immoral.

Thinking of real life examples, I don't know what I would have done if during a public safety power shut off I was not able to cook for my family without power, not able to take a hot shower, and not able to heat my house during 30 degree nights without our natural gas fire place. Please put yourselves in our shoes and think of how life would be impacted without this alternative source of energy.

I really hope the City Council reverses its decision on this ban. It is too soon to take a stand against natural gas when so many of us rely on it heavily to get through the power shut offs.

Thank you for your time.

Javier Tenorio

Bliss, Sandi

From: jd@thetahealingintuitive.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 12:24 PM
To: CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] about no new construction with gas

11/18/19

To the Santa Rosa City Council:

It's come to my attention that you are ready to approve an ordinance that all new construction can no longer be built with gas fittings or usage. I find this NOT in the best interest of myself, my neighbors or the community.

As many have noted lately, when the lights went out in SR during the Kincade Fire, they were still able to use their gas stoves for cooking and heating. They also still had hot water from their gas water heaters. They might have been sitting in the dark, but they weren't cold!

When PG&E turns the electricity off, as it says it will continue to do, there will be nothing available unless there is a generator on new construction. That means no gas cooking stoves, no gas dryers, no gas anything. This is VERY expensive as electricity is double the price.

This no-new-gas ordinance is NOT required by the State of California, according to the SRCC staff report on this. Most people oppose this change--the members of local builders oppose it also.

If Santa Rosa enacts this ordinance, Sonoma County as a whole, won't be far behind! Getting rid of natural gas in new residential construction, is an experiment and a known 'agenda' that we don't need to support or conduct in Santa Rosa, or anywhere else. It is focused on creating 'smart grids' using smartmeters and 'smart cities' to control the population along with the 5G agenda where power base is in space. PG&E already bought into this technology. I'm wonder if you're aware of this.

So my voice says NO to all of this.

Sincerely,
Judy Dragon
Santa Rosa, CA.

PG&E diverted more than \$100 million in gas safety and operations money collected from customers over a 15-year period and spent it for other purposes, including profit for stockholders and bonuses for executives <https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/PG-E-diverted-safety-money-for-profit-bonuses-2500175.php>

PG&E Makes a Deal for Space-Based Power
<https://www.powermag.com/pgemakes-a-deal-for-space-based-power/>

A convicted federal felon, PG&E, donated more than four million dollars to influence California politics and the money was accepted by Governor Newsom, the vast majority of members of the state legislature, and both major political parties. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IA2TuDHbxvA&feature=youtu.be>