

Finlayson, Ian (ENE)

From: karen@grassrootsmessages.com
Sent: Monday, 25 July 2022 10:21 AM
To: STRETCHCODE (ENE)
Subject: Building Code Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is karen Arpino from Albany, NY. I am emailing you today to ask that you reconsider the stretch building code proposal. This proposal would reduce my choice for home heating and cooking options and increase my utility costs. All Massachusetts residents should have the option of a reliable gas hook-up in the case of power outage or emergency situations. This reliable source of energy is at jeopardy if the draft code proposal is adopted. Supply chains are currently having a hard time keeping up producing heat pumps. To make matters worse, large swaths of California will soon be mandated to install heat pumps further straining the demand. If cities go forward with the stretch or special opt-in code, builders and major renovators will be left with no, or exorbitantly expensive, options to heat their homes. The stretch code's reliability on electric heat pumps will make construction and homeownership more expensive. Incentivizing electric only houses will likely increase greenhouse gas emissions in the short term because our grid is not and cannot be supplied fully by renewable energy. Low carbon fuels like natural gas are more efficient when used in the home, rather than at a powerplant to where they are burned to inefficiently create electricity. To make up for the increase in demand electric utilities will have to burn natural gas or coal. Further, disincentivizing the proliferation of gas infrastructure, you forego any opportunity for your constituents to take advantage of the emerging technologies of renewable natural gas, and hydrogen blending. Cost to consumers must also be considered in the regulatory process. Natural gas is a less expensive fuel source than electricity. Information from the Federal Registry shows that per million BTU, natural gas is far cheaper than electricity (<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/03/07/2022-04765/energy-conservation-program-for-consumer-products-representative-average-unit-costs-of-energy>). This proposed code would be tantamount to a regressive tax on those in Massachusetts who can least afford it. Not only will the cost of energy for consumers increase; the cost for home builders will increase as well. Some of the reports that construction cost will decrease for an all electrics homes are based on assumptions, not real world-costs. The National Association of Home Builders recently released a report that says, especially in cold climate areas, it is significantly more expensive to build and operate an all electric home. Please reconsider this draft code proposal and preserve energy choice for me and all Bay Staters. Thank you for taking the time to read this. Sincerely, karen Arpino

Finlayson, Ian (ENE)

From: cwolfe1075@grassrootsmessages.com
Sent: Thursday, 21 July 2022 11:38 AM
To: STRETCHCODE (ENE)
Subject: Building Code Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Chris Wolfe from Manheim, PA. I am emailing you today to ask that you reconsider the stretch building code proposal. This proposal would reduce my choice for home heating and cooking options and increase my utility costs. All Massachusetts residents should have the option of a reliable gas hook-up in the case of power outage or emergency situations. This reliable source of energy is at jeopardy if the draft code proposal is adopted. Supply chains are currently having a hard time keeping up producing heat pumps. To make matters worse, large swaths of California will soon be mandated to install heat pumps further straining the demand. If cities go forward with the stretch or special opt-in code, builders and major renovators will be left with no, or exorbitantly expensive, options to heat their homes. The stretch code's reliability on electric heat pumps will make construction and homeownership more expensive. Incentivizing electric only houses will likely increase greenhouse gas emissions in the short term because our grid is not and cannot be supplied fully by renewable energy. Low carbon fuels like natural gas are more efficient when used in the home, rather than at a powerplant to where they are burned to inefficiently create electricity. To make up for the increase in demand electric utilities will have to burn natural gas or coal. Further, disincentivizing the proliferation of gas infrastructure, you forego any opportunity for your constituents to take advantage of the emerging technologies of renewable natural gas, and hydrogen blending. Cost to consumers must also be considered in the regulatory process. Natural gas is a less expensive fuel source than electricity. Information from the Federal Registry shows that per million BTU, natural gas is far cheaper than electricity (<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/03/07/2022-04765/energy-conservation-program-for-consumer-products-representative-average-unit-costs-of-energy>). This proposed code would be tantamount to a regressive tax on those in Massachusetts who can least afford it. Not only will the cost of energy for consumers increase; the cost for home builders will increase as well. Some of the reports that construction cost will decrease for an all electric homes are based on assumptions, not real world-costs. The National Association of Home Builders recently released a report that says, especially in cold climate areas, it is significantly more expensive to build and operate an all electric home. Please reconsider this draft code proposal and preserve energy choice for me and all Bay Staters. Thank you for taking the time to read this. Sincerely, Chris Wolfe