



#2

Brianda Negrete

From: Andy Caldwell <andy@colabsbc.org>
Sent: Monday, October 3, 2022 7:45 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das
Subject: Elimination of Natural Gas Connections: COLAB Public Comment Letter Item D-2
10/4/2022
Attachments: boselectrification1042022.pdf
Importance: High
Categories: Public Comment

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Chair Hartmann and Members of the Board,

Attached is the comment letter from COLAB.

We believe your staff analysis on this proposal is woefully lacking in a myriad of ways.

Namely, of the global context of this effort along with the practical applications as it affects residents and business.

We hope that you will take our letter, along with the AAC and Farm Bureau letters, and forestall this effort for all the reasons stated therein.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andy Caldwell
COLAB

COLAB

The Coalition of Labor, Agriculture & Business

10/3/2022

Chair Hartmann and Members of the Board,

COLAB is opposed to Item D-2 the Electrification Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. This ordinance is a superfluous and meaningless effort in virtue signaling. The reason for that is:

a) The county's greenhouse gas inventory, according to the staff report slide #22, is 1,427,767 metric tons of CO2 meaning this effort to reduce the total by a mere 10,000 metric tons equates to less than a 1% reduction. Of course, these numbers are all meaningless because the county conveniently omits emissions from natural sources, including our offshore oil and gas seeps, which means all the emissions from sources other than transportation are quantitatively ZERO!

2. This effort is redundant as your staff report indicates that "The California Air Resources Board recently released its 2022 Scoping Plan, which serves as the State's plan to meet its carbon reduction goals. The Scoping Plan recommends all-electric buildings become standard for residential construction starting in 2026 and non-residential construction starting in 2029." Why must this board continuously jump the gun?

3. This effort is unrealistic and unreliable because California does not have enough electricity to keep the grid operating right now sans the electrification of all cars and trucks along with all homes. The evidence for this is:

a) Rolling Blackouts are proof positive that our grid demand is at capacity. Thereby, going all electric creates more problems by placing even greater demand on the grid. Furthermore, many people living in remote areas of our county have spotty electricity service right now. They rely on propane for many uses. Is propane on the chopping block too?

b) California had to create legislation to forestall the closure of the Diablo Nuclear Power Plant despite the fact that the plant generates a "mere" 10% of the state's baseload. Fossil fuels, on the other hand, generate upwards of 78% of our electricity by way of the Western States energy consortium that we rely on nearly every day. That is, your assertions that 3CE sourced electricity makes you a green energy island is simply a fantasy as all electricity is pooled.

c) The existing grid is not capable of handling the extra load of going all electric regarding either transportation, residential and/or commercial natural gas usage. This includes the ability to move this electricity from renewable power sources and distribute the same throughout the community.

COLAB

The Coalition of Labor Agriculture & Business

d) The requirement to create, distribute, and store electricity from renewables presents an enormously expensive (financial cost) and unrealistic (the amount of land necessary) scenario because the production from the same typically occurs during off-peak demand usage. For instance, solar panels are most efficient between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. while the peak demand for electricity is after 5 p.m.

4. Going all electric is unaffordable to lower income households and industrial and agricultural uses. I have been told by members of our coalition that they would be forced to close their operations due to the exorbitant cost of this mandate as applied to their operations (via additions and other possible triggers to existing business operations).

5. The use of natural gas is the most environmentally friendly form of energy available to our economy. That is, it burns clean, and it does not present the ecological costs associated with the procurement of raw materials by way of pit mining, the enormous amount of energy required to manufacture the panels (in China using coal as a power source), not to mention the ecologically disastrous disposal costs of solar panels. That is, by going all in on solar today, you are hereby creating tomorrow's superfund site. This was recently acknowledged by the Los Angeles Times which reported that "discarded solar panels are likely contaminating landfills across California. (I)t once again shows that the rush to adopt green energy policies may have unforeseen consequences". (The same holds true for electric vehicle batteries).

Moreover, as another LA Times story pointed out: "The California Department of Toxic Substances collected its first data on panels recycled by universal waste handlers in 2021. For handlers that accepted more than 200 pounds or generated more than 10,000 pounds of panels, the DTSC counted (*a mere!*) 335 panels accepted for recycling, said Sanford Nax, a spokesman for the agency. The department expects the number of installed solar panels in the next decade to exceed hundreds of millions in California alone, and that recycling will become even more crucial as cheaper panels with shorter life spans become more popular."

For all these reasons we ask that you cease and desist in this effort as it never makes sense to put all your eggs in one basket, especially when so many of your eggs are obviously cracked!

Andy Caldwell
COLAB