

Jericho Moulder

From: Cindy D <cindyd0811@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 12:12 PM
To: City Clerk; City Council
Subject: June 24, 2026 Public Hearing Agenda Item #1, Climate Action Plan Update

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

Honorable Mayor, Deputy Mayor, and Councilmembers,

As a volunteer with the Sierra Club and its Oceanside group working to promote a good Climate Action Plan (CAP), I agree that this update is much better than the original one adopted in 2019. I want to express appreciation for that!

There are many Oceanside Residents, in addition to Sierra Club members, who are concerned about making our community more resilient and safer from climate disasters. Lowering our collective carbon footprint is crucial.

Therefore, it is disappointing to note that this update to our CAP does not meet the state of California greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction goals for 2045 and 2050. It should not be acceptable to build new houses now that would require extensive modification by 2045 to meet those goals. A proposed action of retrofitting 60,000 existing homes and buildings with no real program or funding in place is problematic since this is the single-largest GHG-reduction action in the entire plan, but is only vaguely described. Joining the Clean Energy Alliance (CEA) has been practically the only progress made in our 2019 plan. The City should actively look to partner more with CEA since they now have, and should have in the future, programs for reducing and eliminating the use of natural gas with building electrification. For example, CEA now is an administrator for the California Energy Commission-funded Equitable Building Decarbonization Program, which offers no-cost upgrades for heat pump water heaters, HVAC, induction cook tops, weatherization, and more — for income-qualified owners/renters. We would appreciate more thought going into how to promote these programs to our residents--for example, by including flyers about CEA with the City's water bills.

We do appreciate that the approved budget includes \$200,000 for sustainability implementation. Will this be enough to make enough progress?

We hope that performance reporting, whether annually or biannually, will document performance of activities undertaken as well as measurable results. In addition, more focus is needed on developing the data collection systems for key information regarding MW of solar installations, inventory of new buildings with electric water heating and HVAC systems, retrofits to buildings which eliminate natural gas appliances, and the net number of trees planted.

Additional growth due to SB79 has not been addressed. After the City has completed the TOD study for SB79 and updated GHG emission data, we believe that the schedule for updating the next CAP should be moved up instead of waiting 5 years for the next cycle.

We appreciate the work of the current Sustainability Program Manager, Justin Gamble, and hope that he will be appropriately supported to accomplish our CAP goals.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely

Cindy Davenport

resident since 2008

Stephanie Rojas

From: City Clerk
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 12:48 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: Comments for City Council Meeting, 24 June 2026, Agenda Item 1 (CAP update approval)
Attachments: 2026-06-24 CAP Measure E-3.pdf

From: Roger Davenport <solar-guy@gmx.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 11:39 AM
To: City Clerk <cityclerk@oceansideca.org>; City Council <Council@oceansideca.org>
Subject: Comments for City Council Meeting, 24 June 2026, Agenda Item 1 (CAP update approval)

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

The attached PDF file has some detailed comments about Measure E-3 in the proposed CAP. I plan to attend and make oral comments at the meeting, as well.

--
Cheers!
Roger Davenport
541 Crouch St
Oceanside, CA 92054
760-212-8267

Oceanside City Climate Action Plan Electrification Action (Measure E-3)

In the City Climate Action Plan (CAP), Measure E-3 was proposed as a way to electrify buildings in the City to decrease natural gas usage and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Specifically, the measure calls for “achieving 400 building energy efficiency retrofits by 2030 and 60,000 by 2045 with primary end uses converted to electric.” It should be noted that this single measure is proposed to provide about **72% of the total GHG reductions from ALL the proposed measures in the CAP** (e.g., 171,520 MT out of 239,346 MT by 2045). The measure includes creating a “reach code” to require that permitted retrofits and renovations initiated by a homeowner would include cost-effective upgrades. But to meet the goal of 60,000 retrofits by 2045, the measure would need retrofits to almost the entire existing housing inventory whose owners may have no plans for implementing any changes.

The CAP calls for the City to study the challenges and opportunities for electrification in Oceanside, and to develop a “strategy” for “retrofitting the majority of buildings in the City.”

We believe it will be very difficult to implement this Measure as it stands. There are several concerns:

1. Given the high cost of utility-delivered electricity in our area, it is difficult to make an economic case for electrification of the main energy uses (water heating and space heating) if a house has existing natural gas appliances for those tasks. The present cost of electricity for a basic household rate (DR) is \$0.37/kWh. Gas costs about \$1.10 per Therm, which translates to \$0.0375/kWh. So, for the same energy content, gas is about 10 times less expensive than utility-provided electricity. But the issue is made more complex since efficiencies differ, as demonstrated in the following examples:
 - a. **Water Heating:** Efficiency in a water heater is the amount of energy (heat) delivered to a water tank per unit of input energy. Electric heat-pump water heaters are about 350% efficient compared to older, resistance-based electric water heaters which are very close to 100% efficient. Gas water heaters are only about 65% efficient. So, comparing the cost to get one kilowatt-hour of heat into a water tank, you get the following results:

Water Heater Type	Cost to Deliver 1kWh of Heat to Water
Conventional Electric Water Heater	\$0.37
Heat-Pump Water Heater	\$0.10
Gas Water Heater	\$0.06

If a house has a conventional electric water heater, it is easy to justify its replacement with a heat-pump water heater, with operating cost savings of about

71%. But a gas water heater is about 40% cheaper to run than a heat-pump given current costs. If the existing water heater is gas, there is also the issue of providing power to a new heat-pump water heater. A new dedicated 30A, 220VAC circuit is required to operate the heat-pump water heater. The cost (which might vary from \$2K to \$10K) and time to install this circuit will be in addition to the cost of the water heater. Finally, considering that most hot water tanks are only changed out when the old one fails, a long delay in getting such a circuit installed would mean the residents would be without hot water for that period – not a good thing!

- b. **Space Heating:** The situation with space heating is similar to that for water heating. On the electric side, conventional resistance heating systems (such as baseboard heaters) are about 100% efficient at converting electric power to heat, and heat pump heaters are about five times as efficient, due to delivering heat at lower temperatures than needed for water-heating systems. A conventional natural-gas fired furnace operates at an efficiency of about 85%. So, again comparing the cost to deliver a kilowatt-hour of heat energy to a room, the results are:

Heater Type	Cost to Deliver 1kWH of Heat to Water
Conventional Electric Heater	\$0.37
Heat-Pump Heater	\$0.07
Gas Furnace	\$0.04

Again, replacing electric resistance heating with a heat-pump is a no-brainer, although there could be ducting and other costs of implementing a heat-pump system. On the positive side, heat-pump combination units also provide air conditioning with which many homes in our area are not now equipped, and which is becoming more and more necessary as the climate warms. As before, the cost of natural gas heating is significantly less than either electric option. However, it should be noted that natural gas cannot reasonably provide air conditioning (there are systems that do, but they are complex, inefficient, and expensive).

- 2. The rate of conversions in the period from 2030 to 2045 is very high. Over that 15 year period, converting about 59,600 homes comes out to one home every 2 work-day hours! Clearly this would require a tremendous effort.

Analysis and Suggestions:

- 1. **Utility Renewable Energy:** Sadly, there seems little hope that our regional electricity costs will drop dramatically in the future, due to the SDG&E’s renewable energy model based on using expensive transmission lines to bring power from remote solar and wind energy suppliers. Only if the utility begins to use energy sources closer to our area can we begin to enjoy the economic benefits of low-cost renewables. To encourage this change in philosophy, we recommend that the City work with our Community Choice Aggregator, Clean Energy Alliance (CEA), to investigate opportunities for more local

production of electricity, such as at the airport property and over municipal and commercial parking lots.

2. **Rooftop Solar:** In the meantime, the least-cost source of electricity for businesses and homeowners is our own rooftops. The primary benefit of “rooftop solar” is that the electricity is delivered “behind-the-meter” directly to the building, with no transmission/distribution or other utility costs added to it. In addition, local energy production increases autonomy and makes our homes and our local grid more resilient, especially if the solar generation is combined with battery backup (although cost savings are impacted due to the added cost of batteries, and needs to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis).

Consider the effect of implementing local (e.g., rooftop) solar PV at a home being electrified. PV system costs are about \$2.50/Watt, and such a system will deliver about 1.65 kilowatt-hours each year for every Watt installed. If the system lifetime is taken as 20 years (panels will actually deliver useful energy for 50+ years), that works out to an energy cost of \$0.075 per kilowatt-hour delivered to the house, **about 20% of the present cost of electricity from our utility.**

If that solar-generated electricity is used to power heat-pump appliances, their operating costs drop to about one third of the equivalent natural gas values – in the examples above, the resulting costs to deliver one kilowatt-hour of energy come to about \$0.02 for water heating and \$0.013 for space heating. **So, implementing rooftop solar on a house along with electrification of water and space heating makes the whole system cost effective.** As such, there should be a huge incentive for homeowners to both electrify and to add solar. CEA has a program (Solar+) for installation of solar and batteries with no up-front costs that is available to all homeowners. For renters, the (coming) availability of “balcony solar” systems ought to bring the same benefits to those who have access to a place where solar panels can be added to their household. We recommend the City become involved in promoting these and other programs.

3. **Pre-Installation of Utilities:** As pointed out above, water heaters are typically replaced in a hurry when the existing one fails. If we want to encourage people to install electric heat-pump water heaters, one thing the City could do is to help people pre-install the utility equipment needed for a heat-pump water heater. Then, the site would be ready to go when the existing water heater fails. A program that provides low-cost or subsidized water heater electrical circuit installations for Oceanside homeowners would enable and encourage electrification of this high-energy-use item at the next water heater replacement event.

We thank you for your consideration of these issues and suggestions. We welcome further dialog and look forward to progress under our new Climate Action Plan.

Roger Davenport
15 year Oceanside resident (541 Crouch St, 92054)
Sierra Club Oceanside Team Volunteer
solarguy@cal.berkeley.edu
760-212-8267