

Finlayson, Ian (ENE)

From: Ricki Pappo <ricki.pappo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 August 2022 10:33 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.

Thank you for your efforts to develop a building code that seeks to allow Massachusetts to meet our climate goals. I deeply appreciate that this is much improved over the initial straw code. with increased solar, EV charging and a true net zero definition. However, while the world is literally burning around us, this is the time to reach higher and further. It is to that end that I make the following comments.

First, I am discouraged that there is still a pathway for fossil fuels in the specialized stretch energy code. This is not necessary and is delaying the inevitable. By allowing homes to be built with fossil fuels, we are setting up these homeowners to have to retrofit these homes. If we honestly agree to have all buildings be net zero by 2050, and some municipalities have earlier deadlines, like Lexington, then in the next 28 years, we are saddling homeowners with fossil fuels with costs, potential problems to retrofit even if the wiring is there for the electrification of today, things change over time. New technology may be available and may not solve the problems that homeowners will face when they must retrofit. Please require that all communities that adopt the opt-in specialized stretch code have no pathway to build without fossil fuels. That is what I would call a real opt-in stretch code. Builders and HVAC installers can install heat pumps now. With the important incentives by MassSave it has been stated, by you, it can also be cheaper to build electric. **Please remove all fossil-fuel pathways.**

Second, I do not understand why electrification is only required for homes over 4,000 sq ft of living space or a home with a gross floor area of 5,500-6,000 sq feet, a large home. All electric homes are cleaner, safer, cheaper and healthier. Why do people who buy smaller homes have a higher likelihood of getting an unsafe, dirty, more expensive and unhealthy home? I raised my family in a 1,750 sq ft of living space and still live there. **Please remove the 4,000 sq foot threshold and allow every one seeking housing a clean electrified home.**

Third, you suggest that one can use fossil fuels if there is a solar ready area, but solar does not have to be installed if it is shaded. While I am not suggesting that people remove shading, I am suggesting that this clause does not make sense as you now have a home using fossil fuels that has no chance to offset the emissions on site? **If you eliminate the fossil-fuel pathway, you also eliminate this inconsistency.**

Lastly, the timing for implementation is too far away. While the climate crisis accelerates, we need to accelerate our implementation of clean energy solutions. While the climate crisis reaches toward tipping points, we must do EVERYTHING possible to bring it back from the edge by utilizing all tools available. Full electrification is possible and the transition off fossil fuels is imperative. You listened to us after the straw poll, and made substantive improvements. **Please listen again as we try and put out Earth's climate fire and construct clean buildings for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren.**

Respectfully,
Ricki Pappo
16 Blossomcrest Road
Lexington, MA 02421
781-254-2582

===
Ricki Pappo
781-254-2582
Chair, Lexington Climate Action Network (LexCAN)
Lexington Living Landscapes
Clean Heat Lexington Alliance
Sustainable Middlesex
Town Meeting, Pct. 2