

<b>DOCKETED</b>	
<b>Docket Number:</b>	18-IEPR-09
<b>Project Title:</b>	Decarbonizing Buildings
<b>TN #:</b>	223946
<b>Document Title:</b>	Gene Wunderlich Comments Keep diverse energy options alive!
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Gene Wunderlich
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	6/26/2018 1:30:17 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	6/26/2018

*Comment Received From: Gene Wunderlich  
Submitted On: 6/26/2018  
Docket Number: 18-IEPR-09*

## **Keep diverse energy options alive!**

Proponents of this measure have made it abundantly clear that the purpose is to promote a transition from natural gas end-uses in buildings to electric heat pump technology. Additionally, your own regulators, who will be in charge of creating and implementing this strategy, have also made it known that their preference is to electrify all end-uses. Clearly, a specific technology and energy type will be given preference. However, combustion in buildings accounts for just 10% of the state's annual greenhouse gas emissions, far less than many other sectors. Why would the state create an expensive and unstudied mandate to chase such a small fraction of emissions?

Californians can already choose their preferred appliances—the reason natural gas is used in over 80% of homes and businesses is due to market forces. People choose natural gas because it is cheaper, more efficient, and superior for certain uses like cooking, and we believe Californians should have the right to choose the energy and appliances they use in their homes and businesses. We believe there are better, more cost-effective ways to clean our air and protect the environment.

Bearing in mind that the vast majority of Californians currently use natural gas as their preferred energy source for cooking and space and water heating, going all-electric could increase annual utility bills almost \$900 more than in mixed-fuel homes. Most families cannot afford to shoulder this undue and onerous financial burden. As our state is currently facing historic levels of homelessness and poverty, policies that would drastically increase the cost of building compliance and monthly utility bills, which negatively impact housing affordability, are misguided and regressive. Having lived in an Electric Medallion home in Arizona, I can assure you that all-electric homes will inevitably result in higher costs to consumers.

But it isn't just in the home where additional costs will be incurred. Similarly, businesses forced into all-electric commercial buildings would be faced with higher energy costs that they would likely pass through to consumers. The costs of goods and services will rise as a result, increasing the cost of living even further. These are policies that Californians simply cannot afford.

I encourage you to keep an open mind as you are considering this issue and leave affordable and diverse energy options on the table for all Californians. The goal of Zero-emission structures, while noble, is largely unattainable and the cost-to-benefit ratio is too high a burden for already over-regulated Californians.

Thank you for your consideration.