

From: Sarah Mills
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2022 6:53 AM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Solar ready ordinance and congrats!
Mia, could you please include this in a future packet?

Commissioners,
A member of the public--who I've worked with through my day-job--sent this communication to my work email. I thought it appropriate to pass along to you all.

Sarah Banas Mills, PhD
Senior Project Manager, Graham Sustainability Institute
Lecturer, School for Environment and Sustainability
University of Michigan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Charles Griffith <charlesg@ecocenter.org>
Date: Wed, Nov 2, 2022 at 8:40 PM
Subject: Re: Solar ready ordinance and congrats!
To: Sarah Mills

Hi Sarah,

I meant to respond sooner, but can support the approach to electrification not to allow new gas connections. If there was not support for this policy, however, a "Readiness" approach could be a back-up by at least requiring that additional electrical capacity be installed in order support a more cost-effective conversion in the future. I agree this is not ideal given costs to supply dual infrastructure connections, but this could be a cost consideration that developers would have to take into account.

For solar, a readiness approach may make more sense, by requiring consideration of building roof orientation and landscaping to optimize opportunities for solar. I'm curious what the other city policies are that encourage solar-readiness.

Thanks.

Charles

On Oct 3, 2022, at 8:00 AM, Sarah Mills > wrote:

Hi Charles,

Thanks for the note.

On Planning Commission, the ORC suggested some next-steps for staff.

On electrification, **the policy on the table is to not allow natural gas connections in next buildings, big additions, or significant remodels.** Folks wanted more details on whether there might be unintended consequences and whether the grid can handle it. I can't speak for the commission, but at this point, I'm in favor of this approach. The "electric ready" for HVAC just doesn't seem like it'll work the same way as EV infrastructure, but I welcome additional thoughts (I'd want / need from our by-laws to send them to the whole commission as public comment).

On solar, discussion was around 2 general areas: whether to relax standards so solar can be built in more places (i.e., front yards, along rear property lines) and what we might do on a solar access ordinance. Neither would require having buildings be solar ready; **we already have some policies that encourage being solar-ready.** The ORC suggested staff present the options to the whole commission-- they are discrete enough and the first is really a matter of aesthetics. Personally: On relaxing standards, I'm in support--it's crazy that you can build a carport in your front yard and put solar panels on the roof but not just put solar panels in your front yard. On solar access: I think this is a wolf in sheep's clothing: it's an attempt to block tall buildings masquerading as a pro-solar ordinance. Again, your thoughts most welcome.

Sarah

Sarah Banas Mills, PhD
Senior Project Manager, Graham Sustainability Institute
Lecturer, School for Environment and Sustainability
University of Michigan

On Fri, Sep 30, 2022 at 11:59 AM Charles Griffith <charlesg@ecocenter.org> wrote:
Hey Sarah,

I loved turning on the radio last night and hearing you on the 1-A! Excellent discussion, and I look forward to your newest research effort.

And on a related note, I'm curious what the Ord. review committee had to say about Brett's proposals/questions on the solar and electrification-ready proposals.
<https://a2gov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11263905&GUID=E34C1F3E-58CC-4746-9BA5-F491093DD43A>

I must say, I'm a little worried about the electrification req's at this point—incentives would be (and will be great, we hope, from the IRA bill).

On the solar-ready, I thought the goal was more about encouraging new dev's to be pre-wired/ready, with consideration of orientation and landscape—similar to the EV-ready ordinance. The easement issues certainly are a challenge, however.

Would love to hear your thoughts when you get the chance.

Charles