



The Campaign for Fossil Free Buildings in Silicon Valley

350 Silicon Valley, Acterra, Bay Area for Clean Environment, Carbon Free Silicon Valley, Carbon Free Palo Alto, Carbon Free Mountain View, Citizens' Climate Lobby San Mateo County, Citizens Environmental Council of Burlingame, Clean Coalition, Climate Reality Project: Santa Clara County, Coltura, Cool Block, Earthy B, emeraldECO, Fossil Free Mid-Peninsula, GreenTown Los Altos, Kitchens of Life, Menlo Spark, Menlo Together, Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley, Pacifica Climate Committee, Peninsula Interfaith Climate Action, Project Green Home, Redwood Energy, SIDCO Homes, San Carlos Green, San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter, Bay Area for Clean Environment, Securethefuture2100, Sustainable San Mateo County, Sustainable Silicon Valley, Sunnyvale Cool, Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action, and Silicon Valley Youth Climate Strike.

November 16, 2020

San José City Council
200 E. Santa Clara St.
San José, CA 95113

Via email: sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov, dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov, raul.peralez@sanjoseca.gov, lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov, sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov, maya.esparza@sanjoseca.gov, charles.jones@sanjoseca.gov, sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov, magdalena.carrasco@sanjoseca.gov, pam.foley@sanjoseca.gov, johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov

RE: Strong Support for Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance (as outlined in FILE: 20-1445 for consideration on November 17, 2020)

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Council Members,

On behalf of the Campaign for Fossil Free Buildings in Silicon Valley ([FFBSV](#)), this letter expresses our strong support for the proposed *Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance*, - **as proposed by staff without further amendments** - extending the gas prohibition adopted last year for new homes, ADUs, small apartments, and municipal buildings to other sectors. Although we are in unprecedented times with a pandemic and economic downturn, city building electrification regulations are critically needed to address the magnitude of the climate, air quality, health, and safety impacts of current fossil gas use in our homes and buildings.

FFBSV includes the 33 organizations listed above, working together to support an accelerated phase out of fossil fuels in buildings. A rapid transition away from fossil fuel use is critical to avoid the very worst and irreversible impacts of climate change. Preventing the use of fossil fuels, including natural gas, in new construction will create more affordable, cleaner, healthier, and more resilient housing and buildings for communities throughout San Jose.

The resilience of all-electric new construction is paramount as we face longer and more destructive wildfire seasons and increasing Public Safety Power Shutdowns. Not only are new gas appliances inoperable during grid outages (*for instance, pilot lights are now prohibited for new appliances by the state for safety reasons*), gas service also takes far longer to restore than electricity after an emergency outage. Further, as far as any concerns about grid reliability, the memo from city staff on this item correctly notes that grid impacts from the electrification of *new construction* will be marginal.

It has come to our attention that Bloom Energy has requested an exemption from the proposed Gas Prohibition. Bloom products are fuel cell-based electricity generators that use natural gas as the fuel source. They require gas infrastructure connections and continuous operation (with the associated CO₂ and methane emissions) just like conventional gas combustion devices. The Staff supplemental memorandum indicates that the purpose of the exemption is "in the event of an electric grid outage," but fuel cells are not economic to run only during a power outage and therefore run 24/7/365. It also states that "Natural Gas-fed fuel cell systems typically have a higher carbon pounds of CO₂ per megawatt-hour generated footprint than the same amount of natural gas-generated electricity provided by PG&E." **We are therefore strongly opposed to any exemptions allowing significant continuous fossil gas use in place of cleaner SJCE (or PG&E) electricity in new construction.** Any blanket exemption in this vein would severely undermine the intent of the proposed gas prohibition. The late attempt of a fossil fuel company to tamper with this policy is inappropriate.

Building Electrification is an Urgent Climate Action

This year we have experienced another devastating wildfire season, and yet the depth of the climate crisis is even worse than commonly understood, demanding urgent action. In 2018, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) concluded that ***we must dramatically reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by 2030 through rapid, far-reaching, and unprecedented measures.***ⁱ Since that report was issued, we have seen greater impacts from climate change than anticipated.ⁱⁱ Current trends for carbon emissions and lack of action show that we are headed to *twice* the rate of warming that the Paris Climate Accord sought to contain.

San Jose joins at least 20 other cities that have adopted all-electric requirements for new construction that avoid new fossil gas use because there are many benefits to community health, safety, and a stable climate future, including:

- **Economic:** All-electric homes are less expensive to build (saving roughly \$3,000 or more for each new apartment unit, for example). In all of the buildings analyzed by the 2019 Nonresidential New Construction Reach Code Cost Effectiveness Study, all-electric versions cost less to construct than their mixed-fuel counterparts. **All-Electric buildings are also more efficient.** For example, according to the California Energy Commission, a modern high efficiency heat pump electric water heater (available now at major retailers) costs roughly one third less on utility bills to operate than the most efficient gas water heater.ⁱⁱⁱ In addition, all-electric buildings include air conditioning combined with heating, resulting in less equipment, reduced maintenance costs and greater climate resilience.

- **Public Safety:** Fossil gas is highly flammable. In the past ten years, 9,000 gas explosions in the U.S. have killed over 500 people, and gas leaks have displaced and sickened thousands of people.^{iv} Fossil Gas also caused half the fires after two major California earthquakes.^v
- **Public Health:** Gas stoves release smog-forming compounds such as nitrogen dioxide, unburnt hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide pollution that doubles risks for heart and lung disease and triples the use of asthma medications.^{vi} ***In fact, studies have shown that children living in homes using gas for cooking have a more than 40% higher risk of having asthma.***^{vii} Further, improperly vented gas appliances lead to carbon monoxide poisoning that results in thousands of emergency room visits and several hundred deaths every year.^{viii}
- **Climate:** All-electric buildings are a highly visible and practical step forward to address the climate crisis, by breaking the cycle of fossil fuel dependency in buildings. The proposed measure would reduce over 600,000 tons of CO2 emissions over the estimated 50-year lifecycle of the new buildings covered by this update, which will help San José reach its Climate Smart electrification and zero net energy building goals.
- **Construction Time Savings:** All-electric buildings are generally faster to design, permit, and build. The code is easier for building and planning staff to apply, and it is also easier for everyone to understand.
- **Resilience:** All-electric code today prevents a complex, costly and likely inevitable switch to electricity in the future, since gas prices are expected to rise sharply, and California is planning to eventually end gas distribution. PG&E has asked for a 24% gas rate increase and SoCalGas, a 42% increase, over the next couple years, and this is just the beginning. **Building all-electric now will help future-proof San Jose.**

The recent national election was the first to feature the climate crisis as a pivotal issue, making coordinated federal action on climate a new possibility.^{ix} However, achieving meaningful progress will not be easy or timely. Local climate action will continue to be key to community resilience and laying a strong foundation for broader action. Please continue San Jose's legacy of climate leadership with this updated prohibition on gas infrastructure for new construction. We urge you to adopt the policy as staff carefully crafted it, without any further exemptions. Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,

Monica Mallon, SV Youth Climate Action, San Jose team

Avi Subramanian, SVYCA, San Jose Team

Esther Duong, Co-lead, San Jose Youth Climate Action Team of SVYCA

Susan Butler-Graham, Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley

Karen Warner Nelson, Chair Climate Reality Project: Santa Clara County

Peter Pham, SV Youth Climate Action, San Jose resident

Michael Kutilek, Ph.D. Emeritus Professor, SJSU

Gary Latshaw, Chair of the Guadalupe Regional Group of the Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club

James Tuleya, Chairperson, Carbon Free Silicon Valley

Bruce Naegel, Sustainable Silicon Valley

Janelle London, Joint Venture Silicon Valley
Hoai-An Truong, Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley, Turnout4Transit
Abhimanyu Jayaraman, co-lead, state advocacy, Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action, HS student D1
Hoi Poon, co-founder, SVYCA; co-chair, environment committee, SVDC, D1 resident
Nicole Kemeny, 350 Silicon Valley
Robert M. Gould, MD, President, San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
Jeralyn Moran, Co-Chair, Unitarian Universalist Church of Palo Alto, Green Sanctuary
Sven Thesen, Founder, Project Green Home
Leane Eberhart, Architect
Raymond Larios, Advocate
Terry Nagel, Chair, Sustainable San Mateo County, and former Mayor, Burlingame
Lauren Weston, Executive Director, Acterra
Ellyn Dooley, Citizens' Climate Lobby San Mateo County
Gladwyn d'Souza, co-Chair, Conservation Committee, Loma Prieta Chapter Sierra Club
Suzanne Emerson, San Carlos Green
Constance Miller, GreenTown Los Altos
Diane Sweet, emeraldECO
Carol Cross, Fossil Free Mid-Peninsula
Suds Jain, 350 Silicon Valley City Teams co-leader, Acterra board member
Ruth Merino, Chair, San Jose Community Energy Advocates
Bruce Hodge, Carbon Free Palo Alto
Eva Markiewicz, Rewiring America Advocate
Spencer Ahrens, Facebook
Bruce Karney, Board Member of Carbon Free Silicon Valley
Daniel Tahara, San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition
Lauren Weston, Executive Director, Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet
Diana Moss, Teacher, Advisor The Harker School Green Team
Natasha Yen, Co-President, The Harker School Green Team
Debbie Mytels, Chair, Peninsula Interfaith Climate Action
Gary Ding, Public Relations Officer, The Harker School Green Team
Jared Johnson, Policy Fellow, Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet
Logan Spalding, Beneficial Electrification, Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet
Terry Nagel, Chair, Sustainable San Mateo County, and former Mayor, Burlingame
Mary Dateo, Board Member of Carbon Free Mountain View
Bret Andersen, Carbon Free Palo Alto
Carlos Davidson, Pacifica Climate Committee
Chloe Montgomery, Citizens' Climate Lobby San Mateo County
Rani Fischer, Peninsula Interfaith Climate Action, 350.org
Diane Bailey, Executive Director, Menlo Spark

Cc:

agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov

Rosalynn Hughey, Director, Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement, rosalyann.hughey@sanjoseca.gov

Kerrie Romanow, Director, Environmental Services, kerrie.romanow@sanjoseca.gov

Ken Davies, Deputy Director, ken.davies@sanjoseca.gov

Jim Ortbal, City Manager's Office jim.ortbal@sanjoseca.gov

[i] <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/> Also see: WRI blog for a roundup of the landmark reports of 2018 & a comparison of climate impacts in a 1.5 deg.C v. 2 deg.C world: <https://www.wri.org/blog/2018/12/2018-year-climate-extremes>

[ii] For example, the 2019-2020 Australian wildfire that destroyed over 10,000 buildings and killed at least 34 people, and a massive global bleaching event for coral reefs impacting hundreds of millions of low income people who rely on fisheries for their food or livelihoods.

See: A roundup on the latest global reports showing a worsened outlook than previously understood, including an estimated 3-5 degrees C of likely warming by the end of the century, [here](#):

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-LHZe9kFhLymXE7CaVZmgQTx8VEfbGKAVOSK_x4TcDo/edit?usp=sharing

[This WRI blog](#) discusses the state of international climate negotiations as of COP25 and what is required moving ahead:

<https://www.wri.org/blog/2019/12/cop25-what-we-needed-what-we-got-whats-next>

[This NYT OpEd](#) discusses why climate action is essential in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic and how to integrate a climate response into the economic recovery required: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/15/opinion/climate-change-covid-economy.html?smid=em-share>

[iii] Rider, Ken, Email correspondence, ken.rider@energy.ca.gov. March 2020.

[iv] Joseph, George. "30 Years of Oil and Gas Pipeline Accidents, Mapped." Citylab. November 30, 2016

Sellers, F., Weintraub, K. and Wootson, C. (2018). "Thousands of residents still out of their homes after gas explosions trigger deadly chaos in Massachusetts." Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/thousands-of-residents-still-out-of-their-homes-after-gas-explosions-trigger-deadly-chaos-in-massachusetts/2018/09/14/802ff690-b830-11e8-94eb-3bd52dfe917b_story.html

[v] Los Angeles in 1994 and San Francisco in 1989, according to the California Seismic Safety Commission. (2002). "Improving Natural Gas Safety in Earthquakes." SSC-02-03

Taylor, Ann. "The Northridge Earthquake: 20 Years Ago Today." The Atlantic. January 17, 2014.

[vi] Jarvis et al. (1996) "Evaluation of asthma prescription measures and health system performance based on emergency department utilization." <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8618483>

[vii] Lin, W., Brunekreef, B. & Gehring, U. Meta-analysis of the effects of indoor nitrogen dioxide and gas cooking on asthma and wheeze in children. Int. J. Epidemiol. 42, 1724–1737 (2013).

[viii] USDN, Methane Math, https://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/fliers/files/methane-math_natural-gas-report_final.pdf

[ix] Fact Sheet: Why 2020 Will Be Remembered As a Climate Election, <https://evergreenaction.medium.com/fact-sheet-why-2020-will-be-remembered-as-a-climate-election-4c2860820f19>

Fw: Public Comment on 6.3 20-1445 Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance

Gregory, Barbara

Tue 11/17/2020 7:44 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

📎 1 attachments (118 KB)

NRDC San Jose all-electric new buildings ordinance support letter.docx;

Thank You,

Barb Gregory



Analyst II

Office of the City Clerk

200 E Santa Clara St FL T-14

San Jose, C-A 95112

408-535-1272 Fax: 408-292-6207

e-mail: barbara.gregory@sanjoseca.gov

[How is our service? Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Walker, Olivia [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 7:07 PM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Public Comment on 6.3 20-1445 Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance

[External Email]

Hello!

I would like to submit the attached public comment letter in support of the updated natural gas infrastructure prohibition ordinance for tomorrow's council meeting. I've also included my comments below if you have any issues accessing the attachment. Thank you very much!

November 16, 2020

The Honorable Mayor Liccardo and City Councilmembers
San José City Council
200 E. Santa Clara St.
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: Support for the Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance

Dear Mayor Liccardo and City Councilmembers:

NRDC (Natural Resources Defense Council) is writing to support the proposed updates to the Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance to expand the current ordinance to cover virtually all new construction in San José with limited exceptions. This expansion will ensure the future of your city's building stock is cleaner, healthier, and more affordable for local residents and businesses.

Your approval of these updates will further San José's goals to address the environmental crisis through ambitious policy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will reinforce San José's reputation as a leader on climate action among U.S. cities.

NRDC is the implementing partner of the Bloomberg Philanthropies American Cities Climate Challenge. The City of San José was one of 25 cities to be awarded participation in the Climate Challenge due to its ambitious vision and commitment to execute upon carbon-reducing policies and programs, including taking aggressive action to remove natural gas from newly constructed homes and buildings.

Expanding the Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance to cover buildings of all types and sizes is a crucial step toward achieving the climate goals to which this Council has already committed. [Climate Smart San José](#), the City's ambitious climate action plan adopted by this Council in 2018, lays out the City's roadmap for reaching the targets set by the International Paris Agreement. Additionally, this Council signed onto a [Climate Emergency Resolution](#) in 2019 further emphasizing the urgent need for transformative climate action and laying out the specific steps for the City to pursue in the years to follow. Both Climate Smart San José and the Climate Emergency Resolution committed the city to prohibit natural gas in all new construction projects citywide, and this update presents this council with the opportunity to make good on those commitments.

Across the State of California, we have seen [nearly 40 other cities](#) approve codes that require or encourage transitioning from gas infrastructure to clean electricity. San José stands out as the largest city in the United States with a clean energy new construction code and will model the kind of ambitious leadership on climate action we need in our cities.

Making all of San José's new construction all-electric will present multiple benefits to the community:

- Improved indoor air quality by avoiding dangerous chemicals emitted by gas appliances, including carbon monoxide, formaldehyde, and nitrous oxide – chemicals tied to an increased likelihood of childhood asthma and poor respiratory health;
- Avoided GHG emissions, directly improving outdoor air quality, mitigating the urban heat island effect and reducing San José's contribution to the dangerous symptoms of climate change like wildfires and droughts; and
- Saving the San José community money in the long run as natural gas prices are projected to rapidly rise in the coming years. Requiring new construction to be fully electrified will shield developers and tenants alike from both higher gas bills and the costs of retrofitting existing buildings off of gas infrastructure down the line.

Furthermore, the California Statewide Codes and Standards Program has already found that with the appropriate design, fully electrified low-, mid-, and high-rise buildings are more cost-effective to build and operate than those with gas infrastructure. San José City staff and technical partners are already ensuring the development community has the necessary support to build all-electric in the most cost-effective way through public-facing educational resources and targeted technical assistance.

Expanding the gas infrastructure ban will make the city more resilient. Removing gas infrastructure from new construction projects minimizes the risks of explosion or fire caused by damage to gas piping due to a potential severe seismic event, a not uncommon occurrence in Californian cities.

We oppose the fourth exemption category added in a supplemental memo November 15 for “facilities with a distributed energy resource.” This eleventh-hour exemption for fuel cells—which will be powered by fracked gas for the foreseeable future—weakens the ordinance and is not needed. We urge you to keep San José’s climate leadership strong.

- If you must include this exemption, we urge you to require that use of gas-powered fuel cells should be limited to operate only as backup power for no more than 200 hours (8 days) per year to cover PSPS and other outages. Operation beyond that more than that should require compliance with RPS requirements with stringent quality controls to ensure so-called "renewable" gas is what it claims to be.

NRDC urges this Council to take this necessary step toward making San José a more resilient, affordable and sustainable city for all its residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

OLIVIA WALKER

Research Associate, American Cities Climate Challenge

Healthy People & Thriving Communities Program

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL



OWALKER@NRDC.ORG

NRDC.ORG

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Support gas ban ordinance at 11.17.20 City Council Meeting, Item 6.3

Gregory, Barbara

Tue 11/17/2020 7:38 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

Thank You,

Barb Gregory



Analyst II

Office of the City Clerk

200 E Santa Clara St FL T-14

San Jose, C-A 95112

408-535-1272 Fax: 408-292-6207

e-mail: barbara.gregory@sanjoseca.gov

[How is our service? Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Claire B. [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 10:03 PM

To: Khamis, Johnny <johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Support gas ban ordinance at 11.17.20 City Council Meeting, Item 6.3

[External Email]

Dear Council Member Khamis:

As a resident of your district, and as a supporter of Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley, and 350 Silicon Valley, **I urge you to vote in favor of the [expanded gas ban ordinance](#)** at the city council meeting tomorrow, so that we can rein in the second-largest source of climate destabilizing emissions in our city: the burning of gas in buildings.

As you know, this Tuesday the San Jose City Council will vote on extending our city's existing "natural" gas ban to virtually all new buildings, including new high-rise apartment buildings. A key provision of this ordinance is requiring that builders apply for an exemption, if needed, rather than automatically receiving

one. This will greatly reduce emissions and will be a major step forward for climate, for air quality, and for health and safety. The ordinance **will only affect new construction**, not existing buildings.

As you also know, 98% of San Jose residents currently receive their electricity from clean, renewable sources through San Jose Clean Energy. By banning the use of "natural" gas (which emits large quantities of methane, a potent greenhouse gas that accelerates climate change), **you will be ensuring that new buildings in San Jose can be emission-free**. We and our children will be using these buildings for decades to come, so this is a vital step if we are to reach our goal of net zero emissions by 2045 -- which we **MUST** do in order to avoid the most devastating, existential threats from climate change.

Thank you for taking this important step to end the climate crisis and preserve a livable climate for future generations.

Sincerely,

Claire Bleymaier

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: support gas ban ordinance at Nov 17 city council meeting, Item 6.3

Gregory, Barbara

Tue 11/17/2020 7:38 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

Thank You,

Barb Gregory



Analyst II

Office of the City Clerk

200 E Santa Clara St FL T-14

San Jose, C-A 95112

408-535-1272 Fax: 408-292-6207

e-mail: barbara.gregory@sanjoseca.gov

[How is our service? Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Lisa Feldberg [REDACTED] >

Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 10:19 PM

To: Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: support gas ban ordinance at Nov 17 city council meeting, Item 6.3

[External Email]

Dear Council Member Peralez:

As a registered voter in District 3 and as a supporter of Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley, **I urge you to vote in favor of the [expanded gas ban ordinance](#)** at the city council meeting tomorrow. Tuesday, November 17. It is so critical that we turn the tide on our climate crisis by helping to eliminate the second largest source of emission in our city, which is the burning of gas.

If the measure passes, it will extend the current city ban of "natural" gas to virtually all new buildings, including new high-rise apartment buildings. Rather than automatically granting waivers to the policy, it allows builders to apply for an exemption, which maintains the integrity of the measure. The ordinance also exempts existing buildings and homes, which would be difficult and costly to retrofit, including my residence built in 1937.

As you also know, 98% of San Jose residents (including myself) currently receive our electricity from clean, renewable sources through San Jose Clean Energy. By banning the use of "natural" gas (which emits large quantities of methane, a potent greenhouse gas that accelerates climate change), **you will be ensuring that new buildings in San Jose can be emission-free.** This is a critical step if we are to reach our goal of net zero emissions by 2045 -- which we MUST do in order to avoid the most devastating, existential threats from climate change.

Thank you for taking this important step to end the climate crisis and preserve a livable climate for current and future generations.

Sincerely,

Lisa B. Feldberg



This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

CITY COUNCIL: VOTE YES on the Expanded Gas Ban Ordinance

Moria Merriweather [REDACTED]

Tue 11/17/2020 9:35 AM

To: Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Diep, Lan <lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Khamis, Johnny <johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov>;
Cc: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>;

[External Email]

Dear City Decision-Makers:

Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Jones,
Council Members Jimenez, Peralez, Diep, Carrasco, Davis, Esparza, Arenas, Foley, and Khamis,

I'm a 35+ year resident of Council District 7. I'm deeply concerned living in balance with nature, and restoring natural systems — and I am really disturbed about climate change.

I'm wiring to urge you to **vote in favor of a strong Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance.**

Thank you for passing a strong reach code and historic gas ban last year — please move now forward on to approve the expanded gas ban ordinance to cover virtually all new buildings.

I've heard from my friends at Mothers Out Front that Bloom Energy has requested an exemption from the proposed Gas Prohibition in order to continue burning significant amounts of fracked, fossil gas in Bloom Box fuel cell generators. It is crucial that you not include any exemptions that will allow significant continuous fossil gas use in place of clean energy in new construction. A blanket exemption like this would severely undermine the intent of the proposed gas prohibition.

I urge you to reject the supplemental memo. The proposed exemption in item 4 goes in the wrong direction, increasing San Jose's emissions.

Knowing that all of you care about the environment and the future of all children, please pass the ordinance as originally proposed, rejecting the supplemental memo.

Thank you for your time and attention in considering this with care

In support and solidarity for our shared sustainable future,
Moria Merriweather

"The opposite of division is not unity — it is collaboration" —Dar Williams (live concert in Hawthorne Barn, May 26, 2018)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



November 16, 2020

RE: Adopt Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance, Item 6.3; Reject the Supplemental Memo's recommendation #4 (allowing dirty fuel cells)

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Jones, and Council Members Jimenez, Peralez, Diep, Carrasco, Davis, Esparza, Arenas, Foley, and Khamis,

One year ago, you made history by unanimously passing one of the strongest reach codes and partial gas ban ordinances in the nation. Now it's time to take the next step and **expand the gas ban ordinance to cover virtually all new buildings, without unnecessary exemptions.**

Given the climate emergency, which you officially recognized last fall, we must act with bold urgency to reduce our city's greenhouse gas emissions, including those from our buildings, which are **the second largest source of those emissions.** Scientists warn that we have eight years or less to address the climate crisis if we're to have a hope of limiting warming to two degrees Celsius. Continuing to construct buildings that use fossil gas perpetuates the crisis. We must hold the line and insist that all new buildings be fully electric, allowing only rare, truly merited exemptions.

Therefore, we would like to express our five organizations' **strong support for the Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance** and our **strong opposition to the last-minute exemption proposed in the Supplemental Memo** released at 4pm the night before the vote.

By extending the gas ban ordinance to cover all types of buildings, you will reduce climate-destabilizing methane emissions which are a far more potent greenhouse gas than CO₂; improve air quality and health; increase safety; lower construction costs; promote equity; and protect residents from expected increases in the cost of fossil gas.

One of the most innovative and important parts of the proposed ordinance is the requirement to apply for an exemption rather than being granted one automatically, and **we urge you to hold the line on this vital requirement and reject the exemption #4 proposed in the Supplemental Memo.** If there is truly a need for gas, then an exception can be granted;

blanket exemptions should not be offered for fuel cells (which are usually powered by fracked gas), especially not without further analysis of how this will impact our ability to reach our climate smart goals. Don't allow any company, even if based in San Jose, to do an end run around the stakeholder engagement process and undermine our climate goals

Cities and counties throughout our region are recognizing how important going fossil-free is to community health, safety, and a stable climate future. San Jose has become a recognized leader in that endeavor, an example that other cities look to follow. Please Reach for the Future and vote to keep gas out of our new buildings, including dirty fuel cells. Our children will be living, studying, and working in these buildings and living with the increasingly brutal effects of the climate crisis for decades: we owe this to them.

Sincerely,

Jenny Green for Mothers Out Front - Silicon Valley Team
Felicia Gershberg & Miriam Martín for Together We Will - San José
Jamie Minden for the Silicon Valley Sunrise Movement
Amanda Bancroft for 350 San Jose
IdaRose Sylvester for Carbon Free Mountain View



November 17, 2020

RE: Item 6.3: Additional reasons to reject the Supplemental Memo's recommendation #4 (allowing dirty fuel cells)

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Jones, and Council Members Jimenez, Peralez, Diep, Carrasco, Davis, Esparza, Arenas, Foley, and Khamis,

As you know from our previous letter, we strongly support the Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance. If not watered down, this forward-thinking ordinance will go a long way toward meeting our climate-smart goals and preserving a livable climate for all children.

In this letter, we wish to elaborate on our **strong opposition to the Supplemental Memo's last-minute proposal to grant an unwarranted exemption that would allow for the use of fuel cells powered by liquified "natural" gas.**

In a nutshell, allowing this exemption would:

1. Violate the goals of the gas ban prohibition, allowing gas to be used in new buildings;
2. Harm the climate and make it harder to achieve our climate goals;
3. Allow an end-run around the open stakeholder engagement process by a company (Bloom Energy) engaging in stealthy, behind-the-scenes influence;
4. Set a bad example that would likely be emulated by other cities adopting gas bans, giving legitimacy to a technology that is not needed and perpetuating the use of gas;
5. Harm SJCE by pulling customers away, reducing its load.

To elaborate:

1. Since the fuel cells used in Bloom Boxes are currently powered by fracked gas, **the energy they supply is much dirtier than the energy provided by either SJCE or PG&E.** If this energy were only used on the few days each year when a power outage occurs, that would be acceptable. However, Bloom Boxes are not economically feasible if used only to provide back-up power. On the contrary, Bloom Boxes only make sense economically if used **24/7/365, providing baseload energy.** This is not acceptable and violates the goal of the gas ban prohibition: to ban gas! Fracked gas is fracked gas, whether it is burnt in a power plant, a building, or a fuel cell. Dirty energy should only be allowed, if

needed, to provide temporary, limited back-up power, not baseload energy.

- As you can see from the table below, a San Jose building using Bloom Energy is projected to produce, at a minimum, 2-3 times the carbon emissions than a building using PG&E or SJCE would produce. This difference will be even greater when SJCE's emissions profile is 100% carbon free.

Comparison of emissions for a hypothetical 90,000 sq. ft. office space located in San José

Energy Provider	PG&E*	SJCE*	Bloom Energy (low end of range)	Bloom Energy (high end of range)
Yearly CO2 Emissions (lbs of CO2)	417,150	382,118	893,734	1,096,436
Yearly emissions from back-up diesel power generation if there are 3 power outages/year (which is 3x times the 2018 number)	4,313	4,313	N.A.	N.A.
Yearly emissions from non-base load (if using Bloom Boxes for 65% of their power and SJCE for 35%)	N.A.	N.A.	133,741	133,741w
Total yearly emissions (lbs of CO2)	421,463	386,431	1,027,475	1,230,177
MT CO2 in 1 year	191	175	466	558
Over 5 year period*	955	875	2,330	2,790

*Emissions from SJCE and PG&E will be lower in the future, which is not reflected here.

Bloom Energy’s own estimates are even worse. According to their own technical highlights (ES5-FABAAN), their carbon emissions factor is 679-833 lbs/MWh when their fuel cells are powered by “natural” gas. **This is 3-4 times higher than PG&E’s emissions factor of 206 lbs/MWh.**

In 2019, San Jose’s use of fossil gas rose slightly. If new buildings are allowed to use Bloom Boxes, the City’s use of fossil gas would go up even more. **This is destabilizing to the climate and will make it harder for San José to achieve our climate smart goals. If Bloom wants to have its Bloom Boxes used in new San José buildings, it should be required to power its fuel cells with clean energy, not fracked gas.**

- It’s unfair and **contrary to transparency** to allow an end-run around the open stakeholder engagement process by a company (Bloom Energy) engaging in stealthy, behind-the-scenes influence. There was ample opportunity for Bloom to weigh in much earlier in the drafting of the ordinance, as other groups did. Dropping a Memo at 4pm

the day before the vote **does not provide adequate time for Councilmembers to analyze and assess the implications of the proposed exemption.**

4. If this exemption is allowed, it will **set a bad example** for other cities who look to San José to set the standard. **If San José wishes to keep its well-deserved reputation for climate-smart leadership, it must reject this attempt to weaken and undermine the gas ban ordinance**, in order to protect not just our ordinance, but those of other cities.
5. If new San José buildings are powered by Bloom Boxes, this will **pull away customers from SJCE**, at a time when its financial health is threatened by increasing PCIA charges. Why would we undermine our clean energy provider in order to allow dirty energy in our new buildings?

Bottom line: Council should reject the proposed exemption #4 in the Supplemental Memo.

The Memo is not needed at all, as the other 3 exemptions are already incorporated into the ordinance and there are other economically viable ways for consumers to obtain reliable back-up power on the few days per year when power outages occur.

If the Council wishes to consider an exemption for fuel cells in the future, it should direct staff to **conduct a detailed study to determine the consequences for our climate-smart goals**. Such a study should, at a minimum, answer the following questions:

- 1) In the future, how does Bloom Energy plan on sourcing hydrogen? What is the primary fuel source? Are promises of powering fuel cells with renewable fuels credible, affordable and scalable, or are they just a smokescreen to perpetuate the use of fossil gas? Are Bloom Boxes subject to the renewable portfolio standards?
- 2) What is the long-term greenhouse gas emissions forecast?
- 4) Has San Jose accounted for the emissions impact from a new power provider that uses fossil gas for electricity production?
- 5) How will this impact the City's goals under Climate Smart?
- 6) How will this impact SJCE?

Since these questions cannot be adequately answered today, the last-minute proposed exemption should not be granted. San Jose should not throw its climate goals under the bus in order to appease a company. Being based in San Jose should not exempt one from adhering to San Jose's regulations. Hiring a lobbyist who is a friend of the mayor should not earn a company special privileges. **We cannot afford to water down our essential climate policies.**

So let's hold the line and insist on the **strongest possible gas ban ordinance** so that San Jose can continue to provide the climate-smart leadership so essential to preserving a livable climate for all children. What could be more important?

Thank you for your consideration,
Linda Hutchins-Knowles for Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley

Blair Beekman. sj city council. November 17, 2020. Item 6.3

b. beekman

Tue 11/17/2020 11:30 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

[External Email]

Dear community of San Jose and city govt.

To politely connect, items 6.1 & 6.3,

Current natural gas reduction Ideas, of San Jose city govt., has created good examples, for a few years now.

It leaves San Jose, in a very good place, to help better address, the future of fracking, and fossil fuel use, into the late 2020's.

And can possibly, very much help, an upcoming, Biden/Harris administration, in how they can better address the issue.

Is there a way, people want to start to connect, this good work, of limiting the future of natural gas use, in San Jose, with the positive, good work, that is possible, with local community energy.

It may be time, to begin to organize, more clear, renewable ideas & goals, for San Jose, local community energy ideas.

Simple, decent conversations and dialogue, with friends, city staff, and city officials, can interestingly apply, an extraordinary amount, of good-minded pressure.

And begin, to better ask about nuclear power, and its economy, that is actually fueling, most local community energy programs, around the entire Bay Area, at this time.

This is a concept, that should be abhorrent, to the importance of renewable energy, and sustainable community democracy, at the heart, of local community energy ideas & plans.

It will be important to differentiate in the future, between, renewable energy, and clean energy, that relies on nuclear, to work towards carbon free goals.

Local community energy, in the Ca. Central coast and Sonoma counties, are learning how to opt out, of their nuclear energy packages.

Much as, Mayor Liccardo, is currently opting out of, natural gas use, for the future of San jose.

sincerely,
blair beekman

All Eyes on San Jose - Your Chance to Be a True Climate Hero

Diane Bailey

Tue 11/17/2020 12:02 PM

To: Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Diep, Lan <lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Khamis, Johnny <johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov>;

Cc: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Romanow, Kerrie <Kerrie.Romanow@sanjoseca.gov>; Davies, Ken <Ken.Davies@sanjoseca.gov>; Ortbal, Jim <Jim.Ortbal@sanjoseca.gov>;

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Council Members,

As we are able to put more thought into the supplemental memo late yesterday recommending a large fourth exemption to the updated gas prohibition, I wanted to share the following brief points:

- **The exemption would lock in large amounts of long term fossil gas use** that will be impossible to mitigate. Buildings that install fuel cells (that run on fracked gas) between now and the end of 2023 will continue to use them for years, possibly decades, after 2023, making it harder to wean the city off gas.
- **There are other, more cost-effective and less damaging ways to provide back-up power.** This could have been a part of the discussion, had the proposed exemption been raised during the long rule development process instead of at the 11th hour.
- **We are opposed to the proposed 4th exemption. However, if it is not removed, it must be defined for only true backup power** (e.g. no more than 200 hours per year). Any power generation that is not “back up” must comply with the state Renewable Portfolio Standard, with quality controls for renewable gas.

Please don't allow this major giveaway to fossil fuels. San Jose has been an incredible climate leader. I hope you will each be climate heroes today.

Sincerely,
Diane Bailey

From: Diane Bailey <[REDACTED]>
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 at 11:03 PM

To: "sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov" <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>, "dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov" <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>, "raul.peralez@sanjoseca.gov" <raul.peralez@sanjoseca.gov>, "lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov" <lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov>, "sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov" <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>, "maya.esparza@sanjoseca.gov" <maya.esparza@sanjoseca.gov>, "charles.jones@sanjoseca.gov" <charles.jones@sanjoseca.gov>, "sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov" <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>, "magdalena.carrasco@sanjoseca.gov" <magdalena.carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>, "pam.foley@sanjoseca.gov" <pam.foley@sanjoseca.gov>, "johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov" <johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: "agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov" <agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>, "rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov" <rosalynn.hughey@sanjoseca.gov>, "kerrie.romanow@sanjoseca.gov" <kerrie.romanow@sanjoseca.gov>, "ken.davies@sanjoseca.gov" <ken.davies@sanjoseca.gov>, "jim.ortbal@sanjoseca.gov" <jim.ortbal@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Strong Support for Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance WITHOUT exemption #4 for fracked gas fuel cells in the Supplemental Memo

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Council Members,

On behalf of the Campaign for Fossil Free Buildings in Silicon Valley ([FFBSV](#)), and the many undersigned, please accept this attached letter expressing our strong support for the proposed Updated Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance, - as initially proposed by staff without further amendments - extending the gas prohibition adopted last year for new homes, ADUs, small apartments, and municipal buildings to other sectors.

We oppose any exemptions allowing significant continuous fossil gas use in place of cleaner SJCE (or PG&E) electricity in new construction. Any blanket exemption in this vein would severely undermine the intent of the proposed gas prohibition. If Bloom Energy wants to install its Bloom Boxes in new San José buildings, it should be required to power its fuel cells with clean energy, not fracked gas.

Thank you for considering our attached comments.

Sincerely,
Diane Bailey

Diane Bailey | Executive Director

MENLO SPARK

Visit us: www.MenloSpark.org & www.FossilFreeBuildings.org

Find us on [Facebook](#)

Follow us on [Twitter](#)



Climate Neutral for a Healthy, Prosperous Menlo Park

EV, PV & Fossil Free: Guides for Electric Cars, solar & Fossil Free Homes at: <http://menlospark.org/what-we-do/>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



November 17, 2020

San José City Council
200 E. Santa Clara Street
San José, CA 95113

RE: 11.17.2020 Agenda Item 6.3: Support for Natural Gas Prohibition Ordinance

Dear San José City Councilmembers,

We are living in the middle of a mass extinction fueled by a climate crisis that threatens the existence of organized human life on earth. The IPCC calls for urgent and unprecedented changes to avoid the worst effects of climate change. Meanwhile, the current federal government is accelerating fossil fuel projects and shrinking our time to act. The future makeup of the Senate seems poised to be gridlocked on climate at best, and will likely continue to increase pollution.

In this political environment, cities and states must lead the way on climate action. Cities like San José should heed the call of the scientists and the youth by taking legislative action that not only rapidly reduces emissions within City limits, but also serves as a model that other cities, states and nations will follow.

The Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter is in full support of the Natural Gas Prohibition Ordinance created by City Staff and as described in the November 2d memorandum.

Methane gas is incompatible with climate action, public health, and economic prosperity. Methane gas is a significant emissions source and is 84 times more potent than CO₂. Gas use in buildings presents a significant public health hazard that can cause a variety of long term and potentially lethal health impacts. Gas rates will rise as gas infrastructure maintenance costs are split among a shrinking number of gas users, resulting in stranded assets. By avoiding the construction of new gas infrastructure, this ordinance is a common sense and cost-effective climate action that will result in community benefits for decades to come. All-electric buildings are cheaper to build, pollute less, and are much healthier to live in.

It is for the above reasons that we believe the City should NOT amend the ordinance to include the last-minute supplemental memorandum released on November 16th. This memorandum would allow for a blanket exemption for 'natural' fossil gas fuel cells. These fuel cells would require the expansion of gas pipelines into any property that uses them. By expanding the gas pipeline network, gas fuel cells go against the core intention of the gas prohibition ordinance and contradict the climate action and public health goals of the City of San José.

Please approve the Natural Gas Prohibition Ordinance as originally written and as described in the November 2 memorandum, without the modifications proposed in the November 16th memorandum.

Now is the time for leadership and decisive action. This ordinance is a common sense and necessary step in the struggle to protect life on Earth from the devastating effects of climate change.

Sincerely,



Dashiell Leeds, Conservation Assistant, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Desiree Grahn, San José Resident, District 10
Maggie Dong, Student, San José Youth Climate Action
Danica Kubota, Student, San José Youth Climate Action
Esther Duong, Student, San José Youth Climate Action

Re: Please vote YES for the 2020 new construction gas ban ordinance

Seema Jethani [REDACTED]

Tue 11/17/2020 1:53 PM

To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Diep, Lan <lan.diep@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Khamis, Johnny <johnny.khamis@sanjoseca.gov>;

Cc: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>;

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Jones, and Council Members Jimenez, Peralez, Diep, Carrasco, Davis, Esparza, Arenas, Foley, and Khamis,

As a member of Climate Reality: Santa Clara County, I ask you to vote in favor of the updated *Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance*.

I was so proud of San Jose when you passed the important reach code for All Electric/gas ban in 2019. This next phase of the ordinance is an incredibly important step to creating a safer and healthier world for us and our children. I urge you to stand by our community and on November 17th approve this gas ban ordinance update that will include almost all new building construction.

The facts are undeniable that eliminating natural gas significantly reduces climate-disrupting methane emissions, improves our indoor and outdoor air quality to support better health, increases safety, lowers construction costs, and leads to on-going energy cost reductions from more efficient heat pump and sustainable energy generation technology.

Our welfare rests in your hands and as a resident of San Jose I urge you to vote YES for the 2020 new construction gas ban ordinance update.

Thank you so much for your support,

Regards

Seema Jethani

On Fri, Nov 13, 2020 at 2:54 PM Seema Jethani <seema.jethani@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Laccardo

As a member of Climate Reality: Santa Clara County, I ask you to vote in favor of the updated *Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance*.

I was so proud of San Jose when you passed the important reach code for All Electric/gas ban in 2019. This next phase of the ordinance is an incredibly important step to creating a safer and healthier world for us and our children. I urge you to stand by our community and on November 17th approve this gas ban ordinance update that will include almost all new building construction.

The facts are undeniable that eliminating natural gas significantly reduces climate-disrupting methane emissions, improves our indoor and outdoor air quality to support better health, increases safety, lowers construction costs, and

leads to on-going energy cost reductions from more efficient heat pump and sustainable energy generation technology.

Our welfare rests in your hands and will be demonstrated by a YES vote for the 2020 new construction gas ban ordinance update.

Thank you so much for your support,

Regards
Seema Jethani

--
Regards
Seema Jethani

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Letter for Agenda Item # 6.3 Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance

Gregory, Barbara

Tue 11/17/2020 5:09 PM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

Thank You,

Barb Gregory



Analyst II

Office of the City Clerk

200 E Santa Clara St FL T-14

San Jose, C-A 95112

408-535-1272 Fax: 408-292-6207

e-mail: barbara.gregory@sanjoseca.gov

[How is our service? Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Sudhanshu Jain [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 10:24 AM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Letter for Agenda Item # 6.3 Natural Gas Infrastructure Prohibition Ordinance

[External Email]

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I'm pleased that San Jose is moving forward to an all electric requirement for new construction. I understand that Bloom Energy is asking for an exclusion from this requirement. I strongly oppose this exclusion unless they commit to matching the Carbon-Free Power Mix that is being provided by the GreenSource option from SVCE which is item 6.1 on your agenda. The presentation shows that the 2020 Greensource mix is 86% Carbon-Free and the proposed 2021 mix will be 92% Carbon-Free, an improvement of 6% in one year. The main purpose of the all-electric requirement is to reduce greenhouse gases and Bloom fails to do that.

Bloom Energy fuel cells are not cost effective if used as backup power. They must be used as baseload power, meaning they are always on and always emitting CO2. Bloom operates 100% on fossil natural gas compared to SVCE electricity which will have only 8% fossil natural gas and will get cleaner every year. Bloom Cells are NO MORE efficient than Combined Cycle natural gas power plants.

The City of Santa Clara rightfully claims that, if Bloom Cells wants to use Silicon Valley Power as their backup source, then the Bloom Cells must match the power mix of Santa Clara's grid. Otherwise the CO2 emissions of Bloom Cells will be MUCH higher than using SVP power. Note that the City of Santa Clara provides electricity with 99.99% reliability. There were only 4 loss of power instances in 10 years for customers with 60KV systems like data centers and large businesses.

Finally Bloom Boxes seem to be producing electricity at 16 cents per kilowatt hour. The latest report from Lazard on the unsubsidized cost of electricity indicates that new wind electricity is between 3 and 6 cents and solar is between 2 and 3 cents. Los Angeles just contracted for 400 megawatts of solar with 3 hours of battery storage at only 2 cents per kilowatt hour.

Given the goal of reducing CO2 emissions, Bloom Energy should not be given an exclusion unless they use renewable fuels that match the power mix of SJCE.

Thank you,

Suds Jain

Resident of Santa Clara

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Subject: Support gas ban ordinance at 11.17.20 City Council Meeting, Item 6.3

Gregory, Barbara

Tue 11/17/2020 5:10 PM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

Thank You,

Barb Gregory



Analyst II

Office of the City Clerk

200 E Santa Clara St FL T-14

San Jose, C-A 95112

408-535-1272 Fax: 408-292-6207

e-mail: barbara.gregory@sanjoseca.gov

[How is our service? Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Julie Allingham [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 9:58 AM

To: Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: Sam Liccardo <mayormail@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Subject: Support gas ban ordinance at 11.17.20 City Council Meeting, Item 6.3

[External Email]

Dear Council Member Arenas:

As a long-time resident of D8, and co-chair of San Jose Community Energy Advocates (SJCEA), **I'm reaching out to urge you to vote in favor of the [expanded gas ban ordinance](#)** at the city council meeting this Tuesday, November 17.

I know from our previous conversations, and your strong prior support for forming a CCA and establishing the original ban on natural gas in new residential buildings, that you fully understand the importance of reining in climate destabilizing emissions. This Tuesday's Council vote on extending our city's existing "natural" gas ban to virtually all new buildings, includes a critical provision requiring that builders apply for an exemption, if needed, rather than automatically receiving one. On this point I think it's **very important to the practical effectiveness of the ordinance, that you hold the line and reject**

recommendation 4 of the Supplemental Memo which would too easily allow continuously running, fracked-gas powered fuel cells, and could actually increase GHG emissions. Ensuring that our **new** buildings be powered by electricity, rather than gas or fuel cells, will greatly reduce emissions and will be a major step forward for climate, for air quality, and for health and safety in San Jose.

Thank you for your strong support for clean energy, and for your leadership ensuring that new buildings in San Jose can be emission-free.

Thank you for your continued service to District 8.

Sincerely,

Julie Allingham
D8, 5415 Silver Vista Way

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.