

Finlayson, Ian (ENE)

From: Kyle Throssell <ktthross@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 August 2022 10:00 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.

I am writing to comment on the development and adoption of the stretch energy code <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/stretch-energy-code-development-2022>.

Section 4.2 of "2023 Stretch Energy Code Update and Municipal Opt-in Specialized Code" indicates the legal obligation set out by the state to achieve a net-zero economy by 2050. This is admirable and desirable -- a testament to the state legislature's foresight and commitment to their constituents.

A paramount motivation to net-zero emissions is the stability of our natural life sustaining ecosystems. It is the systems of nature which sustain us and make society possible. We should protect and support our life sustaining systems to the best of our ability and at every opportunity and we have that opportunity right now.

The new stretch energy recognizes the needs for better standards and I think can better represent the urgency of our situation. In particular there is a mixed-fuel path for residential homes. Retaining a mixed fuel path is unnecessary and allows for homes which will prevent MA from achieving net-zero emissions.

Houses built today with mixed fuels will still be in operation by the target date of 2050. By permitting further fossil fuel construction today we are increasing the burden and requirements on future home buyers, home owners and potentially forcing more radical action in the future. Not only will the carbon emissions from the new construction need to be offset, but the house will need to be refurbished, wasting resources. Permitting mixed fuels is continuing a dangerous tradition which we now have the opportunity to avoid.

If the stakeholders of today cannot be moved to remove the mixed-fuel path for buildings, there is a compromise. Allow municipalities to decide for themselves whether they want to require a standard for buildings. Cities which would like to adhere to a higher standard should have the opportunity without requiring that they also allow paths for mixed-fuels.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kyle Throssell