

Martha Alvarez

From: Charlotte Marshall <squaremealcoat@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2021 9:36 AM
To: List - City Council; City Manager
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council Members,

I would like to voice my sincere support for both environmental issues that appear on the Agenda this week. While I realize that these initiatives will increase the cost of building, please take into consideration that these added costs are the price we must pay to ensure that we don't totally destroy our planet. The practices we have been following for many, many years...allowing runoff to freely flow into the ocean (polluting it), and utilizing gas to power our appliances (instead of clean energy)...have not taken into consideration what damage is done as a result. The fires, the floods, and other catastrophic weather-related events we have experienced recently must be curtailed...and these initiatives will help. Please continue to make decisions that will benefit, not destroy our City and planet.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Charlotte Marshall

Martha Alvarez

From: Ann Pitts1 <annpitts@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 10:49 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Environmental policies & protections

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Honorable Mayor Hadley and City Council Members, Some upcoming decisions affect water quality and contamination, and improving energy efficiency. I support item 11 to prevent contaminated water from draining into the ocean, and item 12 to shift away from fossil fuel appliances to more advanced alternatives and clean energy in new construction. I think imposing tighter restrictions is your job governing a sea-dwelling ocean dependent community. We can't leave it up to individuals or corporations to speed progress on environmental issues when they are more concerned with the bottom line. If they're reasonable please move forward towards protecting our resources and assets.

Thanks,
Ann

Ann Pitts
861 3rd St.
MB, CA 90266
310/527-1473

Martha Alvarez

From: Ben Harris <ben@lawaterkeeper.org>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 11:59 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment Letter on Agenda Item 11 for August 3, 2021
Attachments: Benjamin Harris Agenda Item 11 Comment Letter (8.2.21).pdf

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello,

Please see the attached comment letter regarding Agenda Item 11 for the August 3, 2021 City Council meeting.

Best regards,

BENJAMIN HARRIS

Staff Attorney

ben@lawaterkeeper.org

(415) 233-1590



Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
Bruce Moe, City Manager
City of Manhattan Beach

August 2, 2021

To the Manhattan Beach City Council:

My name is Benjamin Harris, and I am a staff attorney at Los Angeles Waterkeeper. I submit this comment letter in regard to Agenda Item 11 for the August 3, 2021 City Council meeting. I support the recommendations of the City of Manhattan Beach Sustainability Task Force, as well as staff for the Manhattan Beach City Council, to make updates to the City's Low Impact Development (LID) ordinances in order to reduce stormwater runoff from new development throughout the City.

Communities in the City, and visitors to the City's beautiful beaches and waterways, would be harmed by new development projects that lock in increased stormwater runoff for decades to come. Stormwater continues to be the largest source of water pollution in Los Angeles County, and the diverse array of pollutants in stormwater—including pesticides, heavy metals, oil and grease, toxic substances, and bacteria—can have significant public health impacts for people that recreate in water receiving stormwater discharges. Allowing stormwater pollution to persist from new development projects will continue this trend indefinitely.

Through stronger LID ordinances, the City could take a significant step to improve the quality of its local waterways as the City continues to evolve and grow. Reducing stormwater discharges in the City will result in cleaner water for the City's beaches and waterways, improving the health of local communities and increasing the value of tourism and ocean recreation activities. New development or redevelopment projects are an important focus to ensure that stormwater discharges decrease over time as the City improves housing and services for residents and visitors alike.

The Sustainability Task Force's recommendation to remove the minimum size threshold requirements for LID measures is necessary to hold all new development projects to the same standards for reducing stormwater runoff. In Ordinance 15-0004, Section 5.84.100 of the City's Municipal Code exempts development projects of different types from implementing best practices for reducing stormwater runoff, if those projects fall within certain size thresholds. As the Staff recommendation letter shows, most residential and commercial development in the City is currently exempt from the LID requirements, with only 192 single-family residential development and 318 commercial properties falling within the existing size thresholds. Removing these size thresholds would close these loopholes and expand beneficial LID measures to the rest of the City's development projects.

As the City Council has acknowledged, the City of Santa Monica offers an effective model of applying LID requirements across all types of new development or re-development projects, with limited exceptions where infeasible. *See* Santa Monica Municipal Code Section 7.10.090. Approving similar new LID regulations that eliminate a minimum project threshold would ensure that all new development projects in the City, no matter the size, type, or location, will not contribute to stormwater runoff and will instead utilize rainwater effectively for onsite reuse and/or groundwater infiltration.

Expanding LID requirements to all types of development projects will not impose a financial burden on developers. As the Staff recommendation letter acknowledges, the various best practices in LID ordinances are inexpensive solutions to reduce stormwater runoff from new development, while simultaneously enhancing project aesthetics and increasing the value of the property over time. Any small increases in up-front costs for developers are well worth the improvements in water quality around the Manhattan Beach pier, which is located adjacent to the City's stormwater outfall pipe.

Additionally, LID requirements and water conservation go hand-in-hand, and water conservation is of peak concern during drought conditions like those we are currently experiencing. Stronger LID requirements applicable to all development projects would reduce the need to enforce the City's existing Water Conservation Ordinance (Ordinance 15-0008). If expanded to all new development projects, the best practices in the City's current LID measures would reduce the risk that residential or commercial buildings in the City cause non-stormwater discharges to enter the municipal storm drain system, which is prohibited by Section 7.44.020(D)(2) of the Water Conservation Ordinance. Removing the significant exceptions for LID measures through the size threshold triggers, therefore, will harmonize the City's efforts to reduce water pollution from stormwater runoff with water conservation needs.

I urge the City Council to approve the recommendation of Staff, and the Sustainability Task Force, by pursuing and approving new LID regulations that eliminate minimum project thresholds. Thank you for your time and consideration on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Harris
Staff Attorney
Los Angeles Waterkeeper

Martha Alvarez

From: Portia Cohen <portiapcohen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 12:19 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Dana Murray; Kristina Haddad; Terry Tamminen
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 7th Generation Advisors Support for Enhanced Water Quality Protection
Attachments: 7GA Support for MB Water Runoff Measures copy.docx; ATT00001.htm; image.png; ATT00002.htm

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Honorable Mayor Hadley and Council Members,

Thank you for addressing the issue of water quality. Kindly accept our letter in support for enhanced measures as outlined in the attached.



August 2, 2021

Honorable Mayor Suzanne Hadley
Honorable City Council Members
City of Manhattan Beach, California

Re: Support for LID policy to enhance Water Runoff Reduction Measures

Honorable Mayor Hadley and Council Members:

On behalf of 7th Generation Advisors (7GA), kindly accept this letter in support of the adoption of a Low Impact Development (LID) policy for all new development, without size limitation, in the city's efforts to increase water quality and supply, and protect human and environmental health.

Manhattan Beach has been a leader in environmental sustainability and resilience. Your work is so important, and so appreciated, and will continue to be so for future generations.

The dangers to human and environmental health from polluted water runoff are no strangers to us – we see them locally and afar; and they are becoming more impactful. The challenge is how to minimize and manage it while still going about our business. It is fortunate that we have neighboring cities from which to benchmark.

The MB citizen's Sustainability Task Force carefully studied options and expressed support for the City to go beyond regulatory agency requirements to reduce urban runoff, capture more stormwater, reduce water pollution, and reduce water consumption. It is clear that protecting the quality and supply of water is of high priority to residents. And staff has thoroughly studied our options and laid out alternative paths.

7GA strongly supports the city staff and Sustainability Task Force recommendations to develop a LID policy and remove the minimum size threshold to require LID for all new development. Measures that will improve the city's permeability and runoff protection are reasonably inexpensive for developers and homeowners. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works conducted a Benefit-Cost analysis on several LID approaches and deemed that tree plantings, construction of infiltration basins and storm drain systems are cost-effective. What's more, we have the advantage of benchmarking our neighbor cities of Hermosa Beach, Santa Monica and others who have successfully implemented these measures and are headed toward better water quality and supply.

Here in Manhattan Beach, we too have the means to employ the best practices to ensure our future; and we have the citizen will to do it. We are blessed.

Thank you for your consideration, respectfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Portia P. Cohen".

Portia P. Cohen, Esq., Advisor
7th Generation Advisors
Phone: 310.991.7366

Seventh Generation Advisors is a 501c3 non-profit corporation (Tax ID: 20-8771636).

Mailing Address: 1223 Wilshire Blvd., #776 Santa Monica, CA 90403

Website: <https://7thgenerationadvisors.org>

Email: portiaPcohen@gmail.com

Website: www.7thgenerationadvisors.org

Seventh Generation Advisors is a 501c3 non-profit corporation (Tax ID: 20-8771636).

Mailing Address: 1223 Wilshire Blvd., #776 Santa Monica, CA 90403

Website: <https://7thgenerationadvisors.org>

Martha Alvarez

From: Gary Osterhout <garyosterhout@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 1:40 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Banner Policy (Agenda Item #10)

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

I do not care for the banner policies as worded. Reasons, comments, and suggestions below:

1. Banners should be meaningful, limited and rare. In general, they are visual blight.
2. City survey results show less than 2% of residents get their information from banners. The population favorably impacted by banners shrinks when you factor in whether or not a resident is even interested in the information. This is an important consideration. For the most part, I would assert that the only person that really is aware of these banners are the members of the organization that hung it or wanted to show off to their bosses something is being done. Other organizations want a banner simply out of a lack of knowing what else to do.
3. Studies show that the length and frequencies of banners lessens their impact, as people tend to begin to ignore the banner and banner placement, although the environmental impact of visual impairment and subliminal clutter continues. Further, such messages can be distractive to motorists.
4. Most nonresidents impacted by these banners have no interest in the related events, and so are negatively impacted without any benefit.
5. Need better definition of "free of charge" in the ordinance. For instance, all the 5K and 10K races and the Grand Prix have entrance fees, yet are not on the "no longer eligible list." "Open to the public" should be defined (to exclude events with limited attendance).
6. Need a definition of an event. I would prefer a definition of "event" to be something date-specific.
7. The MBEF hung banners last Aug/Sep for a fundraising appeal. Would this banner be allowed to be hung under the new policy (I hope not). If so, should there be some qualification that such hanging should coincide with an annual appeal, that is coordinated with similar information on their website?
8. The draft ordinance says a "Civic Event" would include events held by the City Business Improvement Districts. Does this mean the event has to be held by the BID, or does it extend to contractors. For instance, the Downtown BID contracts with the DBPA, which then operates the Farmers Market, which the IRS says is an unrelated business enterprise of the DBPA. How far down the subcontractor, unrelated business trail are you going to allow? In addition, I hardly think "Sidewalk Sales" are banner-worthy.
9. The Farmers Market is held each week, yet historically has received a banner placement seemingly whenever Staff wants to put one up. Under the proposed policy, does this mean the Farmers Market gets only 14 days (unless approved by the council as a long-term "awareness campaign"?)
10. I think that the list of City "co-sponsored" events should be listed and be available permanently on the city website.
11. I would urge you to put in a provision that no reference to a commercial entity (including logo) should be included on a banner. Thus, no "presented by" workarounds. No "Chevron Grand Prix," no Skechers Friendship Walk. If you don't want this exclusion, then specify that any such reference should be in much smaller typeface than the event.
12. The emphasis of this program should not be "advertising" nor to particularly stimulate participation or interest, but should instead be informational in respect to notification of availability, or to help engender excitement for the event. As in the ordinance wording "[to] impart information generally regarded as serving the public interest.

13. Similar to the pole banners, I think the date of placement should have reference to the date of the event. And that should be 7 days before the event (see #14 following).

14. Unless it can be proven otherwise, I think that 7 days (w/hanging on Monday) should be sufficient to most purposes. If there are midweek events, I could bend to allowing hanging on the Monday of the week before.

15. There should be better judgment and oversight regarding city PSA banners. It makes no sense to me that a "Composting Event" banner is hung at all, and especially over the July 4 holiday as it has in the past. The zen-like "REGISTER NOW" banner is understood only by the department hanging the banner. There was a "Water Wise Manhattan Beach" banner that was hung and circulated for months, but without any real actionable message. The "vote MANHATTAN BEACH" banner hid its message (and besides the recent mask banners, VOTE is one of the few PSAs I find worthy of placement).

16. I would urge you to discontinue all or a large part of the pole banner locations given the hardware removal/replacement costs and environmental impact of replacing. However, to the extent the cost of any hardware or pole replacement is incurred, such costs should be amortized into the user fees for banner installation.

17. Banner policy is short-sighted without associated regulation of banners hung on city fences and buildings. Stopping, for instance, TEDx from placing a street banner is nothing when they can plaster billboard-size posters with unrelated pictures of kids on all city fences. Registration for MBYB in my opinion does not belong on the fences, and certainly not for the 4 months it has been in the past. Since these banners cannot be read from the street, if placed such placement should be placed at below pedestrian eyesight level (i.e., farther to the ground), so that vistas are preserved. Additionally, staff in my opinion has not exercised the best judgment on placement and needs better oversight. For instance, a banner for the recent MB tennis tourney was placed high on the south ballfield fence for weeks, without any such banner on the tennis courts (this was eventually corrected, but late in the game). Park and Rec seems to often use the Catch-22 excuse of "we can place anything if it conforms to city police powers, and since we are city employees anything we place is automatically considered to be within police powers--so sue us if you don't like it." There needs to be better governance.

18. Similar to the above, you folks need to control staff's use of the orange trailers. Why one has been allowed to sit at the MBB/Valley Drive intersection for over a month is beyond me. These trailers were supposed to be special purpose traffic guidance message boards, not advertising vehicles for the DBPA (currently was notifying of a beach event, which is OK; advertising "Support Local" is not).

19. Limiting outreach to "organizations that have hung banners and would be affected by the change" is only a small microcosm of the population that should have been engaged in this. You've had plenty of time. If nothing else, this should have gone through the PPIC, which is charged with safeguarding our public right of way. To limit the outreach to banner-hanging organization implies empowerment to them of some privilege, instead of those (residents) that own the right of way and only provide this access out of grace. The natural default is "no banner."

20. I don't see the benefit of separating the Ordinance from the Regulation/Policy. And since you always seem to change both at the same time, I don't know why you don't incorporate the policy into the ordinance.

21. Since there are few banner locations, I don't see why the Council couldn't review the annual list of placement requests in advance, or ad hoc. I don't think staff or the organization need guidance as much as the city needs some oversight to protect the city from staff overreach.

22. If you want to know my concerns, I would say that, first, I want to make sure our city right-of-ways stay free of commercial advertising. Second, I would want our vistas to remain open. Thus, in order of worst to tolerable, I would list the banner at MBB/Morningside, Sepulveda banners, and North Manhattan Beach (since you approved the anti-climate change palm trees in NMB so that banners can be seen, might as well put up banners). The other areas are relatively benign to me. I have less problem with the "North Manhattan Beach" pole banners than I do the current "Lo-Cal" banners.

Thank you for your consideration,
Gary Osterhout

Martha Alvarez

From: Kim Martin <kim@kimlewandmartin.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 2:57 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support of Item 11 Option 1; and Item 12 Option 2

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Esteemed Manhattan Beach Council Members,

Most of you know me as a founder of Grades of Green and a member of the City's Sustainability Task Force, but the thing I am most proud of is my role as a resident of the City of Manhattan Beach. Manhattan Beach has always been a leader in protecting the environmental health of its citizens and environmental resources, and I urge the City to do so again via Items 11 and 12 in this week's City Council Agenda.

Item 11: I support Option 1

Before founding Grades of Green, I was an environmental lawyer who specialized on water quality impacts and, in particular, urban and stormwater runoff impacts to water quality from developments. That work has led me back to my current position as the Associate Director of the Los Angeles Waterkeeper (LA Waterkeeper), a former client when I was practicing. LA Waterkeeper has already submitted a comment letter regarding Item 11 on tomorrow night's City Council agenda related to "Additional Water Runoff Measures in the City for New and Commercial Residential Construction." I echo and support LA Waterkeeper's comments on Item 11 and wanted to add my own voice as a concerned citizen of Manhattan Beach a proud member of your Sustainability Council, and someone who has direct expertise on this subject. I strongly support Option 1 from the Staff Report recommending the City develop a policy for Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs) and remove the minimum size threshold to require such policy for all new development. I have personally worked with major developers to achieve such BMPs and can attest to the fact that they are doable and impactful, providing innumerable benefits to replenishing our water tables and precious coastal resources. Those coastal resources are what is at the heart of Manhattan Beach - people live and visit here precisely to recreate our beaches and waters. Thus, this won't just positively impact our coastal resources, but, as a consequence, also positively impact home values and tourism rates. I was so encouraged when the City pursued and obtained grants to add pervious surfaces to numerous City parking lots. Such ideas are needed for development in the City as well, particularly because so much development is constantly occurring in this town. The staff report provides thorough reasoning for the City to take this step. I thus hope the City will protect the health of our waterways and our community members, as well as the fiscal health of the City, by choosing Option 1.

Item12: I support Option 2

For Item 12, it will come as no surprise to you that I support Option 2. While my environmental legal career did not cover energy, mitigating climate change has been my passion project while on the Sustainability Task Force. I strongly believe climate change is the single biggest issue facing society today. The City has already taken several major steps to combat climate change, which I applaud. Notably it entered into a contract with Clean Energy Alliance, and then opted first the City, and then citizens, up to the 100% threshold level. By increasing the energy efficiency of buildings, Options 2 of Item 12 provides another mechanism for the City to do its part in mitigating climate impacts. Again, the staff report lays the issue out very clearly and provides extensive reasons for the City to take this approach. Staff has correctly stated the impacts of development on our climate crisis and it is truly an all hands on deck approach to address our climate crisis. I therefore support

Option 2 requiring All-Electric Reach Code for New Buildings. It is a critical step for the future of our city and planet.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kim



WEBSITE : kimlewandmartin.com

SOCIAL : [@kim_ecohabits](https://www.instagram.com/kim_ecohabits)

EMAIL : kim@kimlewandmartin.com

PHONE: 310-291-4476

Martha Alvarez

From: Ulrich, Laurel A <Laurel.Ulrich@marsh.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 5:44 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council Members-

PLEASE PUT IT ON THE AGENDA AND PASS A RESOLUTION TO REAFFIRM AND DEFEND THE DEED RESTRICTIONS ON THE COUNTY PROPERTY KNOWN AS BRUCE'S BEACH.

Laurel and Vance Ulrich

This e-mail, including any attachments that accompany it, may contain information that is confidential or privileged. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it was intended to be addressed. If you have received this e-mail and are not an intended recipient, any disclosure, distribution, copying or other use or retention of this email or information contained within it are prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately reply to the sender via e-mail and also permanently delete all copies of the original message together with any of its attachments from your computer or device.

Martha Alvarez

From: Portia Cohen <portiapcohen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 6:27 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Portia Cohen; Dana Murray; Kristina Haddad; Terry Tamminen
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 7GA Support for All-Electric ready Fuel Source Reach Code for New Buildings
Attachments: 7GA Support for MB Building Energy Efficiency.docx; ATT00001.htm; clip_image002.png; ATT00002.htm; clip_image003.png; ATT00003.htm; clip_image001.png; ATT00004.htm; PastedGraphic-3.png; ATT00005.htm

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.



August 2, 2021

Honorable Mayor Suzanne Hadley
Honorable City Council Members
City of Manhattan Beach, California

Re: Support for an All-Electric Fuel Source Reach Code for New Buildings in Manhattan Beach

Honorable Mayor Hadley and Council Members:

On behalf of 7th Generation Advisors (7GA), kindly accept this letter in support of decarbonizing and electrifying new buildings. 7GA supports an "All-Electric Reach Code for New Buildings" approach which would require all-electric fuel sources for new construction of buildings. This would be an economically and technically feasible requirement for new development.

Once again, city staff has prepared an accurate and thorough examination and assessment of the energy efficiency, carbon reduction, economics, and cost effectiveness of an all-electric fuel source requirement. We highlight the cost savings portion of the staff report, because we all know that these measures will save carbon and electricity:

"According to the California Energy Codes & Standards 2019 Cost-effectiveness study: Low-Rise Residential New Construction and California Energy Codes & Standards 2019 Nonresidential New Construction Reach Code Cost Effectiveness Study, completed by the California Energy Codes and Standards group, a reach code requiring electrification is cost-effective. This means that in the long run, new development owners would see cost savings from installing electric appliances in new construction.

Multiple studies, including Rocky Mountain Institute's The Economics of Electrifying Buildings and Environment and Economics, Inc.'s Residential Building Electrification in California have shown that using efficient electric heat pumps rather than gas-fired appliances is cost effective in newly constructed buildings and provides significant carbon pollution reductions. All- electric buildings are often cheaper to build due to the elimination of running expensive gas plumbing to the building. These lower first costs generally make all-electric construction more cost-effective on a life-cycle basis. This is particularly true for low-rise residential buildings, where it is also often increasingly more cost-effective for the owner to exceed the code by improving efficiency and adding solar. In fact, if one invests the savings from the gas infrastructure in additional PV capacity to offset more of the electricity load, in many cases the building is cost-effective for the owner and society from day one, meaning the building is both less expensive to build and cheaper to operate."

Once again, we thank you for your foresight in leading this City toward resiliency.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Portia P. Cohen".

Portia P. Cohen, Esq., Advisor
7th Generation Advisors
Phone: 310.991.7366
Email: portiaPcohen@gmail.com
Website: www.7thgenerationadvisors.org

Seventh Generation Advisors is a 501c3 non-profit corporation (Tax ID: 20-8771636).

Mailing Address: 1223 Wilshire Blvd., #776 Santa Monica, CA 90403

Website: <https://7thgenerationadvisors.org>

Martha Alvarez

From: Mike Michalski <mike@realestateedge.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 10:04 PM
To: List - City Council; City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 12 - Energy-Efficient Homebuilding
Attachments: The Blithering Idiocy of California's Energy Policies.docx

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Mayor Hadley and Council:

The proposal for potential regulatory actions to increase energy efficiency of buildings seems to be geared at banning natural gas appliances in new construction and remodeling (Item 12, Council Agenda for Aug 3).

If this is indeed on the table, it must be reviewed very carefully as it could prove to be a bad idea - bad for homebuilders and remodelers, bad for homebuyers and bad for our city.

1. Our electricity grid is of dubious reliability and any proposal to require electric appliances in lieu of gas appliances will only add more demand onto our already strained and unstable energy grid (see attached article).
2. Homebuilders will be looking at another construction mandate that may or may not produce higher costs that will have to be passed on to homebuyers (I believe there is a significant savings from not having to put in a gas line and gas connections but the electric appliances themselves may cost more).
3. Homeowners with only electricity as their energy source will be penalized as our electric rates in CA are the 3rd highest in the continental US (see ChooseEnergy.com).
4. Some consumers prefer gas, particularly in cooking (gas cooking is quicker and it cooks more evenly) and in fireplaces, but gas would not be an option under the most severe regulatory proscription.
5. Home remodelers may not want to incur the cost of replacing their existing gas appliances if they were planning to keep them in the remodel.
6. The cost-benefit equation must be carefully examined in order to avoid adding another in a long string of costs and regulatory hurdles onto home construction and remodeling here in Manhattan Beach. In particular, new home builders may be finding themselves less and less able to pass those costs along, eventually making home construction unprofitable here in our city, especially in a market downturn (housing markets are cyclical or have we already forgotten the 2008-2012 downturn?)

My recommendation is to do an in-depth study with input from the development community to see if all-electric construction is a practical option. I'll bet that if there is little or no overall construction cost increase but the city makes an effort to improve on its services in terms of expediting the plan approval process, the builders might actually come around, despite the potential for some homebuyer resistance (point 4 above) and the problem with the electric grid (point 1).

But then I'm not a developer, I just sell the finished product.

Mike Michalski

Michalski & Fujita

The Blithering Idiocy of California's Energy Policies



By [Susan Shelley](#) | letters@ocregister.com | Orange County Register

PUBLISHED: August 23, 2020 at 9:44 a.m. | UPDATED: August 23, 2020 at 9:49 a.m.

California's blithering idiocy is sometimes very photogenic, as when billions of dollars are wasted on a useless bullet train that never will be completed as advertised, or when idiotic water policies starve the farms into dust in the Central Valley and lead to toilet water recycling in Southern California.

But not all forms of blithering idiocy can be photographed. Some are experienced in total darkness, kind of like a séance. As the table lifts under our trembling fingers, the ghosts of stupid legislation speak to us from the Great Beyond.

“Cancel the contracts with the coal-fired plants!” the disembodied voices wail. “Close down the nuclear plants! Decommission the coastal gas-fired plants! Stop the construction of dams for hydro-electricity!”

Of course, they're not really in the Great Beyond; most of them are still in public office.

As politicians furiously point fingers of blame away from themselves, let's stop and look at a few of the decisions that led to rolling blackouts in California during a triple-digit heatwave.

First, consider the effect of the state's vaunted but idiotic climate policies. They're vaunted because the state's political leaders regard themselves as global leaders. They're idiotic because the entire state of California produces only 1 percent of the world's total global greenhouse

gases, so even if you uncritically accept every worst-case scenario about climate change and assign all the blame to humanity, the state's policies have no effect at all on the global climate.

That's usually the point when state leaders tell us they are really global leaders. What they don't tell us is that their climate policies slowly starve the state of reliable electricity while raising the cost of energy to California consumers. Raising the cost of energy raises the cost of everything else, contributing mightily to the state's highest-in-the-nation poverty rate when the cost of living is taken into account. About 20 percent of Californians live in poverty.

California's climate policies have included legal mandates on utilities that require a percentage of the electricity they sell to be generated from renewable sources. The idea is to gradually reduce greenhouse gases. The initial goal was 20 percent, then in 2011 it was increased to 33 percent. Later it was raised to 50 percent, then 60 percent. In 2018 state lawmakers set a target of 100 percent renewable energy by 2045.

But some renewable energy technology is more equal than others. Wind and solar energy count. But electricity generated from nuclear power or large hydropower plants, even though these are renewable and produce no greenhouse gases, do not count toward the mandate. The cramped definition of "renewable" makes these renewable energy sources financially unsustainable.

One of the problems with wind and solar energy, of course, is that they're non-continuous. This revelation was a problem for the goofy, stimulus-funded solar energy plant located off I-15 near the Nevada border. It works by reflecting the heat from the sun to boil water in tanks on towers, creating steam that turns turbines. But it gets cold at night, so the Ivanpah solar energy plant had to use natural gas to keep the water hot.

The sun goes down. Who knew?

Ivanpah is just one example of the gap between dreams and reality in California's renewable energy policy. As the state has increased the renewable-energy mandate, it has led the nation in electricity imports from other states. From 2013 to 2017, California was the largest net importer of electricity, bringing in an average of 89 million megawatt hours annually. Pennsylvania, a state known for coal production, was the largest net exporter of electricity, with an annual average outflow of 58 million MWh.

That's our "leadership" on climate. Our politicians pretend they're reducing emissions, and then we import electricity from places where people are less precious about it.

In 2010, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power derived 39 percent of its energy from coal, and at a cost per kilowatt hour that was lower than natural gas, which then made up 26 percent of the total. In 2013, coal-fired plants provided 42 percent of L.A.'s electricity. That was the year Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa announced that LADWP would divest from coal generation at an estimated exit cost of \$600 million. Then in 2015, the city raised electricity rates. Then in 2019, Mayor Eric declared that the LADWP would phase out three gas-fired coastal electricity generating plants, declaring the beginning of the end of natural gas. "This is what a Green New Deal looks like," Garcetti said.

A Green New Deal looks a lot like rolling blackouts and power outages as the demand for electricity surges on inevitable hot summer days. The California Independent System Operator, the nonprofit that runs the state's electricity grid and dispatches power, can't dispatch power unless there's a power-generating source that can be turned on when needed to meet peak demand. But in order for plants of that type to be cost-effective, their owners can't be barred by climate laws from having a market for electricity generated by natural gas or nuclear power.

The climate warriors don't care. "Any third-grader can tell you that we need more solar power, not less," said one environmentalist who was arguing for more battery storage.

Don't even ask what your electricity bill will be when your utility passes along the cost of a requirement to buy battery storage for solar energy.

Be careful with those candles. You know how fast the utilities turn off the power when there's a risk of fire.

Susan Shelley is an editorial writer and columnist for the Southern California News Group. Susan@SusanShelley.com. Twitter: @Susan_Shelley

Martha Alvarez

From: Gary Osterhout <garyosterhout@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 10:13 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ARPA Funds Agenda Item

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Councilmembers:

I am appalled at the lack of process and community engagement in regard to this agenda item. It has all the appearance of a staff cash-grab, with Council endorsement. From my reading, there is no rush that requires such immediate action.

My thoughts:

1. The staff report references the "Finance Subcommittee" recommendation. From the attached minutes to the agenda, the only council member in attendance at that meeting was Suzanne. The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m., and adjourned at 2:17 p.m. Yes, two minutes. I don't think there was opportunity for much substantive discussion of alternatives at that time. Rubber-stamping is not good governance, nor gives this resident much faith that our council is in control.
2. The community would be better served by a more accountable and traceable usage of these funds, to be expended for more specific items than the "flexibility" provided by designated to general services. Staff of course always wants "flexibility," because then staff-favored items can be easily satisfied via the loss of transparency through the fungibility of general fund monies.
3. One of the more readily identified items that the ARPA funds can be used for is water and sewer, including storm water. Staff has repeatedly complained about our storm water deficit (irrespective of what they define as "storm water costs"), yet there is no mention that this area should be a preferred usage by staff. No, staff would rather spend the money to cover up their budgeting/bidding error for the Polliwog play equipment--an error they are already trying to mask over through the windfall offered through the supplementary county park measure (and again, this is an asset replacement project which should have been already funded/amortized through regular CIP funds). Or, staff would rather keep this fund in deficit to try to force community taxation, playing politics when that is not their brief.
4. Note that one area that was specifically cut back in the 2020/2021 budget was landscaping and tree trimming. I would think that area should be specifically address in respect to usage of ARPA funds. As well as funding the improvements of the many community outdoor resources we flocked to during the pandemic.
5. The report references \$2.2M savings from postponing fleet replacements and department charges for the fleet fund at \$2.2M. In my opinion, stopping charge-outs to departments was a budget gimmick/funny money move, not a savings, so I'd look askance at using that shortfall as justification for replenishing general services. Actual deferred vehicle replacement is another story. [Also, I'm wondering about their numbers. The CM's 2020/21 budget report reads: "Other significant cost-cutting measures included postponing fleet replacements, for a one-year savings of \$1,133,000, and suspending Fleet Fund department charges, for a one-year savings of \$2,197,652." So it looks like they are \$1.1M shy in reference to this number, unless actual fleet expenditures wasn't suspended.]
6. I would ask that you specifically prohibit any of this money to be used for city staff compensation, or if so only to those under mid-management level.
7. I have trouble with the staff ever using the February 2021 "Budget Survey Results" in any capacity (except as an indication of staff incompetence in engaging the public in the budget process, or that they are intentionally leading the discussion to their desired conclusion). These results were non-scientific, and were gleaned over only one week after an email blast. There were only 750 respondents (or 450, if you read the February staff report). To suggest there is any ordering or ranking to the "Possible Future Projects" is specious, even if one would accept any validity to these numbers. Begg Pool at 18% is listed at #1, but it is only 1% higher (or 7.5 people more) than Joslyn, which is itself only 1% higher than Fire Station #2 (at 16%). The projects after than are 13%, 13%, 12% and 11%. Sure, you folks are informed enough

to ignore this data, but I doubt the regular population is. And if you did think this survey had validity, you would have decreased police/fire funding from 60% of the budget to 50%, consistent with the results,

8. There should be a public meeting solely to address alternatives and gather community preferences for the use of this ARPA money. In my opinion, for community building alone that venue should be used whenever there are significant supplementary monies available.

The ARPA funds do not need to be obligated until December 2024, and expended by December 2026. The usage certainly deserves more time than 2 minutes of a Finance Subcommittee rubber-stamp and a hurry-up council meeting in the middle of summer. There is plenty of time for you to do the right thing.

I hate the way we do money in this town.

Thank you for your consideration,
Gary Osterhout

Martha Alvarez

From: Ray Joseph <rayj310@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 3:01 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No On Energy Efficient Homes

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

NO MORE BANS!!

Do NOT ban Gas Appliances. It will hurt property values and lifestyles.
We live in a moderate climate at the beach, there is no need to force more standards on homeowners and builders.

Thanks,

Ray Joseph
One Pacific Properties
1219 Morningside dr
Manhattan Beach CA 90266
DRE #01397157
310-545-7295
Ray@RJFineHomes.com

The highest compliment my clients can give me is a referral of their friends, family and business associates.