

Photo by Grant Porter from unsplash.com

What do local government staff say?

Evaluating California's local reach code adoption and implementation process

Lawrence Garber (he/him) Associate Building Decarbonization Coalition 6.3.21



OUR MEMBERS





01 02 Context Surve

Survey Results





Objectives for Today

After the presentation the audience will be able to:

- Gain new insight on the CA reach code adoption and implementation process
- 2. Identify nascent trends across jurisdictions
- Provide feedback on the next steps for understanding new construction reach code adoption and implementation



"All that you touch You Change. All that you Change Changes you. The only lasting truth Is Change."

– Octavia E. Butler, Parable of the Sower





1865









1. Overview

What are reach codes for new construction?

Zero-emission building ordinances adopted at the local level that exceed statewide code. For this survey, the term reach codes refers to various tools at local governments disposal to advance emissions reductions.



1. California Overview

46 Local Governments in California have taken action on New Construction since July 2019



Most cities have opted to use a reach code





Why new construction reach codes?



Safety/ Resilience









Equity considerations

2. Survey Goal

Evaluate the zero-emission reach code adoption and implementation process in California local jurisdictions.



Photo by Grant Porter from unsplash.com



BUILDING DECARBONIZATION COALITION

2. Survey

Number Reporting	
Sustainability Staff	9
Building Staff	6
Planning Staff	1















2. Questions

Adoption:

- Connecting with stakeholders
- Improve/change process.
- Additional resources
- How likely to pursue again?

Implementation:

- How many total projects?
- How many mixed use projects?
- How many units?
- How many affordable units?



On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being most difficult, how difficult did you find each of the following elements of code adoption?



2. Adoption Process Qualitative

What resources are most needed to improve or change the process?

1. Outreach/Information

- a. for consumers
- b. for developers

2. Technical support

- a. code language
- b. Legal support
- 3. All Electric
 - a. Exemptions confusing
- 4. Existing building strategy
 - a. Legal
 - b. Technical
 - c. Political



How likely are you to pursue a zero-emission building ordinance in your jurisdiction (again) in the 2022 code cycle? 5 = very likely, 1 = not likely

8 out of 9 cities - very likely to re-adopt

2. Implementation

	Number	Percent of Total	Jurisdictions Reporting
Projects approved/constructed	442	100%	8
Mixed Fuel projects approved/constructed	30	6.8%	3
Dwelling units approved/constructed	5269	100%	8
Affordable dwelling units	866	16.4%	8



2. Implementation

Jurisdictions reporting fossil fuel infrastructure in new construction					
	Number mixed fuel projects out of total approved	Percent mixed fuel (gas)	Type of Ordinance		
Jurisdiction 1	12/60	20%	Electric Preferred		
Jurisdiction 2	11/11	100%	All-Electric Reach		
Jurisdiction 3	7/29	24.1%	Natural Gas Moratorium		



3. Discussion - Implementation

Examples of Limitations to Mixed Fuel Reporting

- too early to have statistics, likely nearly all will choose gas for cooking.
- We don't track
- We don't collect it on a regular basis

Mixed fuel projects in cities with reach codes

- Opportunities for follow-up
- How are exemptions factoring in? eg. gas stove and ADUs

Overall

- Policies are in early days of implementation.
- Many are only effective as of a few months ago.
- 93.2% of reported projects were all-electric.



3. Discussion - Implementation

How many units classified as affordable?

- 16.4% of units reported as affordable
- Jurisdiction reported lack of data or process to track

Greenling Institute Equitable Building Electrification Framework

- Step 3 Develop Metrics and a Plan for Tracking
- How are other equity outcomes being measured?



3. Discussion - Adoption

- What was the adoption process like?
 - More difficult:
 - Technical cost effectiveness, legal
 - Relational contractors/builders, environmental justice groups
 - More straightforward:
 - Relational architects/engineers
- Alternative modes of assessment?
 - Instead of straightforward to difficult scale, consider
 "Spectrum of Community Engagement" to Ownership
 scale (Rosa Gonzalez, Movement Strategy Center)
 - Ignore, Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate, Defer To

On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being most difficult, how difficult did you find each of the following elements of code adoption?





3. Discussion - Adoption

How to improve or change the adoption process?

- Strong willingness to do the process again next time
- Outreach and Education
- Technical and Legal

The need for coordination and knowledge sharing is great feedback for non-profit organizations and government agencies to know as we design programs to incentivize these actions.

Additional resources

• BDC's Clean Building Compass





"All that you touch You Change. All that you Change Changes you. The only lasting truth Is Change."



BUILDING DECARBONIZATION COALITION

4.Q&A

- Synchronous and asynchronous discussion
- Google doc
 - What questions do you have?
 - Are there aspects of the results that surprised you?
 - What other information would be helpful for you?
 - How can we make this information more useful to you?
 - What else would you like to see?





THANK YOU!





lawrence@buildingdecarb.org

www.buildingdecarb.org

@buildingdecarb

Additional <u>Resources</u>

CREDITS: This presentation was created using Slidego, with icons via Flaticon, infographics via Freepik, and images via Pexel and Unsplash.





BUILDING DECARBONIZATION COALITION