| DOCKETED | |
|------------------|--|
| Docket Number: | 18-IEPR-09 |
| Project Title: | Decarbonizing Buildings |
| TN #: | 223984 |
| Document Title: | Greater Palm Springs (CVB) Comments Oppose AB 3232 |
| Description: | N/A |
| Filer: | System |
| Organization: | Greater Palm Springs (CVB)/Scott White |
| Submitter Role: | Public |
| Submission Date: | 6/27/2018 3:27:35 PM |
| Docketed Date: | 6/27/2018 |

Comment Received From: Scott White

Submitted On: 6/27/2018 Docket Number: 18-IEPR-09

Oppose AB 3232

Letter attached.

Additional submitted attachment is included below.



June 18, 2018

Chairman Robert Weisenmiller, Ph.D. California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street - MS-29 Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Re: AB 3232 (Friedman) - OPPOSE

Dear Chairman Weisenmiller:

On behalf of the Tourism Industry in Greater Palm Springs (CVB), we would like to express our opposition to AB 3232 (Friedman), which sets statewide goals for "zero-emission" buildings by 2030-both new and existing construction.

Tourism generates over \$7 Billion for our economy and is growing at a record pace. We have dozens of new projects under construction and many more in the planning stages. We oppose AB 3232 due to the language concerning the elimination of natural gas for future projects.

While there are claims that the bill is "fuel-neutral", the proponents of the bill have made it abundantly clear that the purpose of this bill is to promote a transition from natural gas end-uses in buildings to electric heat pump technology. Additionally, state 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, the bill itself states that combustion in buildings accounts for just 10% of the state's annual greenhouse gas emissions, far less than many other sectores. Why would the state create an expensive and unstudied mandate to chase such a small fraction of emissions?

This bill is unnecessary. Californians can already choose their preferred appliances-the reason natural gas is used in over 80% of businesses is due to market forces. Hotels and restaurants choose natural gas because it is cheaper and more efficient, and we believe Californians should have the right to choose the energy and appliances they use in their businesses. We believe there are better, more cost-effective ways to clean our air and protect the environment.



California is facing unprecedented affordability issues: the costs of housing, transportation, and energy are on the rise. Everyday Californians are finding it difficult to provide for their families and make ends meet. It is therefore unreasonable to expect that everyone can switch out their appliances without facing financial hardship. Replacing appliances also may require an upgrade to both the electric panel and wiring, at great personal, additional cost to the homeowner. Californians who rent can expect to have these costs potentially passed along to them. Once homes are all-electric, energy bills will increase significantly. Households that use all-electric appliances pay almost \$900 a year more than mixed-fuel homes.

In addition, an electrification mandate would eliminate customer choice and make the term "energy options" completely meaningless in California. This would move the state to an all-eggs-in-one-basket scenario, jeopardizing energy reliability. Should blackouts occur due to natural or man-made causes, California residents will be completely without energy for cooking or space and water heating. It hardly seems prudent for the state to choose to eliminate all but one type of energy.

For these reasons, we respectfully oppose AB 3232 and request that the California Energy Commission **NOT** adopt the proposed legislation.

Sincerely.

President & CEO

Greater Palm Springs CVB